

**MINUTES OF THE  
REDEVELOPMENT COMMISSION  
OF GREENSBORO  
FEBRUARY 7, 2018**

The regular meeting of the Redevelopment Commission of Greensboro (RCG) was held on Wednesday, February 7, 2018, in the Plaza Level Conference Room of the Melvin Municipal Office Building commencing at 5:00 p.m. The following members were present: Chair, Richard Enochs; Dawn Chaney; Angela Harris. Staff present included Dyan Arkin. Also present was Tom Carruthers, Attorney for the Commission, City Legal Department.

Chair Enochs welcomed everyone to the meeting and stated that the election of officers would be best handled when all members were present and tabled the issue until the March meeting.

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES:**

**a) Minutes of the December 6, 2017 meeting. (APPROVED)**

Ms. Chaney moved approval of the December 6, 2017 meeting minutes as written, seconded by Ms. Harris. The Commission voted 3-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Chaney, Enochs, Harris. Nays: None.)

**South Elm Street Redevelopment Area**

**(3a) 741 South Elm Street**

Mr. Carruthers stated that a letter was received from Bill Benjamin, attorney for the Grays, and there is no dispute on the facts and a solution is being sought. It was suggested that an appointment be made with Mr. Benjamin and the Grays and options be explored.

Chair Enochs clarified that it was being suggested that the City Attorney's Office and City staff look into all the viable options for what to do about the problems about the Redevelopment Commission's property being on the Gray's property and the other Commissioner's agreed that this was a reasonable approach.

Mr. Gray stated that this was acceptable and that he wants to work with the Commission to resolve the issue.

Chair Enochs stated that it would be best to table the issue for now and have the City Attorney's Office speak with Mr. Gray and his attorney to come up with a cost/benefit analysis to determine the best way to proceed.

**(3b) Request for Extension of Letter of Intent to Develop (APPROVED)**

Dyan Arkin stated that the Master Development Team is planning to do an update for the Commission on what has been happening recently.

Bob Chapman of South Elm Development Group (SEDG) stated that Milton Rhodes works for the Arden Group, which is the development wing of the Parks family. They are working on projects locally and around the country. Mr. Rhodes is planning on building 97 residential units, which is 33/ acre for the project.

The main issue is that the City has borrowed money from HUD and the affordable housing regulations complicate the finances however, it is hoped that HUD will waive the requirement. The drawings for the project have been received and Mr. Rhodes has made a check out to the Redevelopment Commission for \$10,000 to show good faith.

Mr. Rhodes stated that the Arden Group needs a little more time to work on the business terms.

Mr. Carruthers asked what the terms of receiving the check are and what is being asked of the Commission in return. Mr. Chapman stated in response that it is a good faith deposit and it would be refundable if the Redevelopment Commission and Arden Group were unable to come to terms and could be viewed as a deposit towards the purchase price.

Ms. Chaney asked if the development team had been aware of the affordable housing requirements, and Mr. Chapman stated that it was completely disclosed in the RFP that there was a requirement for 51% of all for-sale units developed be affordable to households at 80% of Area Median Income (AMI). It had always been anticipated that residential development would be for rent rather than for sale, so this requirement had not been fully tested until this point.

Mr. Rhodes stated that the affordability criteria is likely to limit some of the density that is proposed.

Ms. Arkin stated that staff has been working with the developers, and all areas of possibility for providing assistance as needed to make the proposal work is being explored.

Mr. Rhodes stated that he had been close to having something to present at the first of the year; however, a project in Charlotte pulled him away and caused the delay.

Chair Enochs stated that he doesn't have a problem with the month extension since it's such a big project and a good faith deposit has been placed.

Ms. Harris stated she hoped that next month all the Commissioners would be present.

Ms. Chaney asked if within thirty days the estimate of cost would be clear and if a final proposal would be available and Mr. Rhodes stated that it would.

Ms. Chaney moved that the extension be approved for the developer to the next meeting in March, seconded by Ms. Harris. The Commission voted 3-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Enochs, Chaney, Harris. Nays: None.)

Marcus Jackson of Trademark Properties, 1001 Wade Avenue Suite 300, Raleigh stated that his company has two listing agreements with SEDG, one for the property being discussed. The second is for what he is calling Union Square East, which is the two and a half acres that surrounds Union Square Campus. The process of marketing the property hasn't officially begun but a draft flyer was presented to the Commission. The project will involve replacement of the temporary parking, so will probably involve some form of parking deck. It may be developed into office space, apartment or a hotel.

**(3c) Approval of Submittal of Annual Land Use Restrictions Update**

Ms. Arkin stated that a Land Use Restrictions Update (LURU) for the South Elm Brownfields Agreement has to be submitted to the North Carolina Department of Environmental Quality (NCDEQ) each year by the end of January. Commissioners approved Chair signature and submittal by email. A copy of the LURU as submitted was sent to Commissioners in the agenda packet.

**Staff Updates**

Ms. Arkin stated that the Commission voted to allow a second temporary parking area on the west side of South Elm Street, which required Technical Review Committee (TRC) approval, and that process has been ongoing. It will require some paved handicap parking to meet ADA requirements and that is being addressed.

**ADDITIONAL BUSINESS:**

Dyan Arkin stated that the Brownfields Agreement application for the properties at 107 West Bragg Street and 1201 and 1015 South Eugene Street was submitted to NCDEQ, but was required to be resubmitted in a revised format. The revised application needs to be re-signed by the Chair.

**ABSENCES:**

The absences of Mr. McQueary, Mr. Gravely and Ms. Hoffman were acknowledged as excused.

**ADJOURNMENT**

There being no further business before the Commission, the meeting adjourned at 5:37 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Sue Schwartz  
Planning Director  
SS/jd

**APPROVED MINUTES OF THE  
REDEVELOPMENT COMMISSION  
OF GREENSBORO  
SPECIAL MEETING  
MARCH 14, 2018**

The Special Meeting of the Redevelopment Commission of Greensboro (RCG) was held on Wednesday, March 14, 2018, in the Plaza Level Conference Room of the Melvin Municipal Office Building commencing at 5:00 p.m. The following members were present: Vice Chair Clinton Gravely; Dawn Chaney, Charles McQueary, and Ryan Saunders (Alternate Commission member). Staff present included Sue Schwartz, Dyan Arkin, and Hart Crane. Also present was Andrew Kelly, Attorney for the Commission, City Legal Department.

Vice Chair Gravely welcomed everyone to the meeting.

**INTRODUCTION OF NEWLY-APPOINTED ALTERNATE COMMISSIONER**

Dyan Arkin stated that Ryan Saunders has been appointed as the first alternate Commissioner, and if there is an absence on a particular night he will fill in and will have all the rights and responsibilities as a Commissioner.

Ryan Saunders stated that he is from High Point but has lived in Greensboro since 2010 and has been around the construction industry all his life.

**ELECTION OF OFFICERS**

Vice Chair Gravely nominated Chuck McQueary as the next Chairman of the Board, seconded by Ms. Chaney and Mr. McQueary accepted the nomination. Mr. McQueary also stated that he would like to see the Board continue to move in the direction of developing more of the properties that the Redevelopment Council has responsibility for.

Ms. Arkin requested that the Commission approve the addition of Hart Crane as an Assistant Secretary as a replacement for Hanna Cockburn. Mr. McQueary then moved that the nomination be accepted seconded by Ms. Chaney. The Board voted unanimously in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Gravely, Chaney, McQueary, Saunders. Nays: None.)

Mr. McQueary then moved to nominate Clinton Gravely as Vice Chair, seconded by Ms. Chaney. The Board voted unanimously in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Gravely, Chaney, McQueary, Saunders. Nays: None.)

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES:**

**a) Minutes of the February 7, 2018 meeting. (APPROVED)**

Mr. McQueary moved approval of the February 7, 2018 meeting minutes as written, seconded by Ms. Chaney. The Commission voted 3-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Chaney, Gravely, McQueary, Saunders. Nays: None.)

**South Elm Street Redevelopment Area**

**(a) Developer Update on Component Development**

Bob Chapman of 447 Arlington St. stated that his company has been under letter of intent with Greenline Properties, and they have been focused on building townhouses. Milt Rhodes has looked at this development opportunity to make a personal statement in Greensboro; however, his investors are wondering how the townhouses can be built if they aren't making a profit. Mr. Chapman stated that they think it best to build the townhouses to sell because the owners will take more pride and there will be more profit. Several developers have shown interest in the project and all seem to have come up against the same problem which is the price per square foot per month in rent. One developer that has taken a more serious interest is Laurel Street Developers who specialize in senior housing, and this could possibly be a better fit for the area since it would require less parking. Mr. Rhodes has written a letter to convince his lenders that this is a good investment and would like thirty more days to make something happen.

Mr. Rhodes stated that they have been working diligently to figure the situation out as far as what the lender will finance based on the business plan for the site. The gaps have been identified and are closer to being filled. Mr. Rhodes asked for the Commission's continued support in moving forward with the project.

Mr. McQueary asked if Mr. Rhodes believes he knows how to close the gaps and has reached a point of making a decision within thirty days, and Mr. Rhodes replied that that is correct.

Mr. McQueary then asked for an elaboration, and Mr. Rhodes stated that part of the challenge is meeting the 51 percent affordable unit requirement for low to moderate income housing and in for-sale housing, this limits who the buyers are.

Mr. Chapman stated that what is driving this is the 108 loans that the City took out and thinks that a waiver should be obtained from Washington.

Ms. Arkin clarified that other properties cannot be substituted elsewhere.

Sue Schwartz stated that from the beginning there was an assumption that the City was going to have to step in and help with the gaps for affordable housing. Homeownership is a possibility and the City would support that goal if that's the direction to be taken. It was advised that the Commission consider strongly giving Mr. Rhodes another thirty days to move forward.

Mr. McQueary stated that he wouldn't be opposed to another thirty days; however, the Commission is concerned about the constant delays and asked if everyone was familiar with the requirements from HUD. Mr. Chapman stated that there has been guidance from staff as far as the HUD requirements, but that he believed the low to moderate income level requirement meant households at 50% of area median income.

Ms. Chaney asked about the price point relating to senior housing and stated that, to meet the affordable housing requirements, for sale units would have to be considered.

Ms. Arkin stated that this has been discussed internally, and there is a question as to whether the 50% number for low to moderate area median income interpretation is accurate and that 80% was the staff interpretation.

Mr. Kelly stated that the housing expert people may be able to give a more accurate number.

Ms. Schwartz stated that staff in the Neighborhood Development department are responsible to make sure the Commission is compliant with HUD, so a written interpretation will be requested.

Mr. McQueary asked if the City will be able to do what is necessary in the thirty-day time period and Ms. Arkin stated that they would.

Mr. McQueary moved that the thirty-day extension being requested be granted, seconded by Ms. Chaney. The Commission voted 3-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Chaney, Gravely, McQueary, Saunders. Nays: None.)

Ms. Chaney stated that in order to give the thirty-day extension there should be a special meeting in April and the Commission agreed.

### **(b) Staff Updates**

Ms. Arkin stated that the Grays' property is still being worked on, and requests have been made to two engineering firms to look at options for moving the encroachments off the property keeping in mind cost effectiveness.

Ms. Arkin reminded everyone about the Housing Summit and stated that the department would be happy to register the members; however, she would need to know by Friday morning.

Ms. Chaney stated that the bond issue is looming and there may be some coordination with the City and the issues they are addressing. Ms. Chaney also stated that Tiny House issue on English Street was being asked about by a City Council member.

Mr. Gravely asked about the rezoning issue on Banner Avenue, and Ms. Schwartz stated that it is being requested by the SPCA of the Triad, which is not the same as the County's animal shelter, and that the location is surrounded by heavy industrial. Mr. Gravely stated that the problem with East Greensboro is that developers don't want to come in to a situation where it's hard to meet code and that developers should be held to the same standards throughout Greensboro, that what is required in east Greensboro should be the same as what is required in west Greensboro.

Ms. Arkin state that she visited the Eastside Park Community Center and met with Phil Barnhill who is one of the Board members of the center. The lease for the center states that it should operate for the community and that is what is happening there. Mr. Barnhill asked if the Commission is satisfied, and Ms. Arkin stated that the center is operated under conditions of the lease.

Phil Barnhill of Eastside Park Community Center stated that he has been on the Board about nine years and that there has been an issue from the City's perspective for a number of those years. There has been some transition over the years and the Board has been downsized. The Board is looking at ways to re-engage the community along with trying to restart a neighborhood association.

### **ABSENCES:**

The absences of Mr. Enochs and Ms. Harris were acknowledged as excused.

### **ADJOURNMENT**

There being no further business before the Commission, the meeting adjourned at 5:58 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Sue Schwartz, Planning Director  
SS/jd

**APPROVED MINUTES OF THE  
REDEVELOPMENT COMMISSION OF GREENSBORO  
SPECIAL MEETING  
APRIL 18, 2018**

The Special Meeting of the Redevelopment Commission of Greensboro (RCG) was held on Wednesday, April 18, 2018, in the 3<sup>rd</sup> Floor GDOT Conference Room of the Melvin Municipal Office Building commencing at 5:00 p.m. The following members were present: Chuck McQueary, Chair, Dawn Chaney, Angela Harris, and Ryan Saunders (Alternate Commission member). Staff present included Dyan Arkin, Sue Schwartz, and Hart Crane. Also present was Andrew Kelly, Attorney for the Commission, City Legal Department.

Chair McQueary welcomed everyone to the meeting.

**APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES**

Minutes of March 14, 2018 Special Meeting

Approval of the minutes was postponed as Mr. Gravely has some changes to those minutes. It was felt that it would be better to wait until he is in attendance to talk about those changes.

Dyan Arkin asked that the discussion concerning the South Elm Street Redevelopment Area be moved up on the Agenda.

**South Elm Street Redevelopment Area**

**(a) Developer Update on Component Development**

Dyan Arkin stated that currently staff is speaking with the developer concerning a Sales Development Agreement for the South Elm Street Redevelopment Area, the proposed development parcel. Sue Schwartz will be speaking on this matter. Staff is not quite prepared to present a Sales Development Agreement this evening. The developer is here to answer any questions. There has been a lot of progress made and there are a lot of details to work out. Staff is probably going to ask for a little bit more time.

Ms. Chaney asked, from the developer's standpoint, what are the first two things that prevent the Commission from moving forward on a vote today. Ms. Arkin stated that there are a couple of things that are not finalized in the document and prior to having a vote by the Commission, they would like to be able to provide a final draft of the document. They have settled in on land price, how the relationship between Arden and the South Elm Development Group (SEDG) would work, and how the relationship with the City and the Redevelopment Commission will work. One of the challenges was that there is a component of affordable housing that is included in the project, and given that, they really wanted to see that move forward but did not want that to be an impediment to the rest of the project moving forward. The details of that took a little longer to work out than staff had thought it would. They have now determined what the gaps will be in order to do that, and they have found ways of filling that gap that are going to make the component developer, Arden, and SEDG whole within this project.

Sue Schwartz explained the framework for how the Development Agreement works between SEDG and the Arden Group. They have agreement on prices and phasing and now they need to go from the general framework to legal documents. They do see the light at the end of the tunnel and, hopefully, things will come to fruition in the very near future. When they get the Development Agreement signed and executed, staff can immediately work with the infrastructure and start moving things and getting

that updated, and can work on getting the sketch plan reviewed and the preparatory work done for final site plan approval. There are a very complicated set of moving parts and staff is trying to make sure they are all aligned so they fit well and move forward. This is a very long process but it is now moving along.

Ms. Chaney stated that the last time they made their proposal, and it was certainly a legitimate one, when the Commission analyzed the affordable housing, the cost of building anything is very expensive and then when you have to put in the formula necessary for affordable housing creates a whole different formula. Knowing that the Commission still has to address the idea of affordable housing, what can that capital be raised to make up the difference?

Ms. Schwartz responded that staff has now confirmed that it is the 80% threshold, so part of the Redevelopment Bond Funds for South Elm were included knowing that the HOME Funds for this project had an expiration date. Staff is looking at whether funding also comes from homebuyer assistance programs, and the challenge is trying to figure out which funding sources will work best.

Ms. Arkin stated that the next step would be finalizing the Sales and Development Agreement within 90 days. At that point it would need the Commission's approval and City Council final approval. Arden needs to finalize the development budgets and pro formas. Staff has seen several drafts of those and are working with the developers on final decisions. Staff has a pretty good idea of how that will work. At this point, construction completion is anticipated for two (2) years after the closing of the project.

Bob Chapman, SEDG, of 447 Arlington Street, stated that there is about an acre on the east side at the corner of South Elm Street and Gate City Boulevard that USCI has an option on, but it is essentially a Right of First Refusal. SEDG still has a contract with Marcus Jackson, who is marketing that lot and the acreage south of that lot, which includes the cell tower site. The cell tower lease expires in approximately three years. SEDG also have an executed contract with the Gray family to coordinate with them to develop their parcel. So there is plenty of land to show. and they are not going to do anything to impede the Arden Group. He has kept Milt Rhodes fully informed of all the other interests that they have. There are other qualified companies that are interested in doing something within the area and they are continuing to work on it. He does not feel that a motion is needed at this time.

### **Ole Asheboro Redevelopment Area**

#### **604 Gate City Boulevard 701-703 Martin Street**

Ms. Arkin stated that Hart Crane is the Project Manager for the Ole Asheboro Area and will give more information.

Mr. Crane summarized that at the March 19, 2018 Zoning Commission meeting, there was a request for 604 E. Gate City Boulevard, 701-703 Martin Street to be rezoned from R-5 to Commercial Low. At that meeting, the applicants requested the zoning be changed from Residential to Commercial Low. Mr. Brower, a representative from the Ole Asheboro Neighborhood Association, spoke in opposition to the rezoning request. The Zoning Commission voted to deny the request for 705 Martin Street on the grounds that it was too intrusive to the single family zoning and approved the zoning for 604 Gate City Boulevard and 701 and 703 Martin Street. Upon that decision, Mr. Brower appealed it to City Council

and the appeal was going to be heard yesterday, but was moved to the 24<sup>th</sup> City Council meeting. Upon further review of the Ole Asheboro Redevelopment Plan, staff identified that 604 Gate City Boulevard, is on the acquisition list for the Redevelopment Area. Ms. Schwartz added that in regard to the 604 Gate City Boulevard parcel, the owner intended to build a parking lot and the current use is non-



conforming, so the only remedy is to get it rezoned. The Redevelopment Commission needs to be given the opportunity to give an opinion on the appeal.

Mr. Crane stated that this particular lot is slated for potential acquisition in the Redevelopment Plan. The proposed zoning for this site in the Plan is single family, but the Plan also speaks to development along the Gate City Boulevard (formerly Lee Street) corridor being Mixed Use Commercial, so the current use is not inconsistent with what the Plan speaks to in terms of the corridor.

Ms. Schwartz stated that this is not a public hearing, so the Commission can have discussion and ask questions, but this is before the Commission's for their input and a recommendation to City Council. Mr. Crane stated that the appeal is to deny the zoning, so essentially not having to change from R-5 to CL. If the Commission supports the appeal, that is the recommendation to be made. For clarification, Mr. Crane stated that the business owners were attempting to up-fit the property and install a parking lot. They did not go through the proper channels and they received notification from the City that stated if they wanted to do that, since it is a non-conforming use, they would need to rezone. It was also noted that a store has been at this location for a very long time, upwards of 90 years.

Ms. Arkin stated that it is the Commission's prerogative to hear from either of the folks involved in this request.

Ms. Schwartz pointed out that if the zoning request is denied, the applicant would have to wait for one (1) year before resubmitting another zoning request. The parking lot was constructed illegally and that is the first issue, and part of the remedy is going through the process to get it rezoned, knowing that if that rezoning is not approved, they would have to tear out the parking area.

Carl Bowers, 907 Douglas Street, representing the Ole Asheboro Neighborhood Association, stated that there were already a couple of houses torn down. The Neighborhood Association does not feel it is feasible to put another house at that site. His appeal is because the applicant did not come to the Neighborhood Association before the work was done. Referring to pictures, he stated it is obvious that the parking lot is not built to code, meaning storm water runoff and those types of things were not taken into consideration. He pointed out that 703 Martin Street backs up to the existing parking lot and they are against that portion of it being rezoned. They do support the fact that a parking lot is needed by the store, as there is a safety issue involved. They want to make sure that in the future there would not be gas pumps near the residential properties to help protect the neighborhood residents as much as possible.

Commissioner Chaney asked if a privacy fence between the neighbors would suffice. Mr. Brower responded by saying that they still do not agree with the 703 Martin Street property as there is a structure existing there now, it is a duplex and is occupied. A privacy fence would go a long way to help the nature of the parking lot if it is done properly.

Chair McQueary stated that he does not feel that there is enough information to make a proper recommendation on how to do this and from his standpoint, he would recommend deferring to Council and not deciding on anything simply because there are a lot of issues that have not been addressed. He feels there needs to be consideration of the details of both parties involved in this in order to make a proper choice as to what recommendation to make.

Counsel Kelly pointed out that the Commission concerns are how the rezoning affects the Plan, not what someone may want to do with the property. So whether it is a single family house or an apartment, the Commission needs to look at how the zoning relates to the Plan and if the zoning is appropriate under the Plan. The Commission may also consider making an amendment to the Plan.

Ms. Schwartz pointed out that it is a goal of the Plan to establish more commercial uses along Gate City Boulevard. So that is, in part, why this is before the Commission for their input.

Commissioner Saunders stated that he echoes Ms. Chaney's thoughts, that this may set a precedence of challenging commercial zoning along Gate City Boulevard because he feels that development is necessary for the growth of the City. So that would be something that he would just like to put on the table.

Ms. Schwartz stated that she wanted to formally apologize to Carl Bowers because the City missed this and they should have caught this to make sure the neighborhood was advised of this request. Controls have been put in place so that this would not happen again. She also apologized to Mr. Kamar, owner of the business, because if this had been caught in time, everything would have moved along a lot more smoothly without all the stress that has been caused.

Shazad Kamar, 2401 United Street, stated that he also wished to apologize to the Neighborhood Association. They are doing a lot of development in the area and it was not done intentionally. They just did not know that they were required to speak to the Neighborhood Association. There are a lot of residential and commercial properties along Gate City Boulevard and they sent out 110 letters and held a cook out in the parking lot and invited everyone in order to be able to speak to the residents of the immediate area. Almost 90+ people attended and signed a petition in favor of the new parking lot. He presented photographs that indicated that this is not an eyesore for the area. It is really dangerous for people coming to the store to have to park on Gate City Boulevard to come into the store. Sometimes there are two wheels on the sidewalk and that is how some of the trucks are unloaded. The children come out of vehicles onto the street to come into the store. That is a very dangerous situation and he was only hoping to better the situation and make it safer.

Chair McQueary asked if any Commission member wished to make a motion for a recommendation on the proposal request. No Commission member wanted to make a recommendation.

Ms. Chaney left the meeting at 5:51 pm.

Chair McQueary stated that it appears that both parties are anxious to reach a satisfactory conclusion in this matter and since this Commission is not the one to provide approval of the request, he thinks there will be no vote for a recommendation on this matter.

City Councilman Skip Alston stated that he has been an advisor for them for a number of years and he just wanted to make sure he was informed about what is going on.

### **Staff Updates**

Ms. Arkin stated that in regard to 741 S. Elm Street, the property owned by the Gray family, which butts up against the temporary parking area of the South Elm Redevelopment Area south of the Union Square Campus. Staff is pursuing the idea of removing those encroachments. An engineer has been hired to look at the different options on this property. They are moving towards a resolution but at this point, have not obtained a resolution on this matter. They will continue to keep the Commission updated with information on that.

Mr. Crane stated that staff has received a proposal for the MLK, Jr., A-2, A-3, and A-4 sites. The Redevelopment Commission owns A-4, which is .9 acre lot on the back side of the Family Dollar Store site. Staff are excited about it and have reviewed the submittal for basic criteria, which it meets, so staff will start an internal review and will give the Commission updates as they go through the process.

**ABSENCES:**

The absences of Mr. Enochs and Mr. Gravely were acknowledged as excused.

**ADJOURNMENT**

There being no further business before the Commission, the meeting adjourned at 5:59 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Sue Schwartz  
Planning Director  
SS/jd

**SPECIAL MEETING MINUTES  
REDEVELOPMENT COMMISSION OF GREENSBORO  
MAY 9, 2018**

The Special meeting of the Redevelopment Commission of Greensboro (RCG) was held on Wednesday, May 9, 2018, in the Plaza Level Conference Room of the Melvin Municipal Office Building commencing at 5:00 p.m. The following members were present: Charles McQueary, Chair; Dawn Chaney; Angela Harris; and Ryan Saunders. Staff present included Dyan Arkin, Russ Clegg, and Hart Crane. Also present was Andrew Kelly, Attorney for the Commission.

Chair McQueary welcomed everyone to the Special meeting of the Redevelopment Commission of Greensboro.

Chair McQueary stated that the absences of Clinton Gravely and Bob Enochs are excused. Mr. Gravely has not been able to attend the last two meetings because he is dealing with the difficulties associated with the major damage sustained by his place of business during the recent tornado. Councilwoman Hoffmann will not be able to attend tonight's meeting as well.

Dyan Arkin announced that Russ Clegg will be taking Hanna Cockburn's place as the Manager of the Long Range and Strategic Planning Division effective June 1, 2018. Commission members congratulated Mr. Clegg on his new position.

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES:**

**a) March 14, 2018**

Ms. Arkin stated that these minutes were brought before the Commission at the last meeting. Approval of the minutes was deferred until this meeting because Mr. Gravely wanted to make some revisions to a section of the minutes. The Commission agreed to postpone approval of the March, 2018 minutes until Mr. Clinton can be present to discuss the revision.

**GLENWOOD NEIGHBORHOOD PLAN AREA:**

**(a) Property Owner Presentation**

Jeff Sovich, Planning Department, gave a brief overview of the Glenwood Neighborhood Plan area and how it relates to redevelopment plans that had been in place at one time in this area. The Glenwood Neighborhood Plan was adopted in February, 2008 and was later amended in March, 2009 in order to bring the land use recommendations of the plan into sync with the land use categories that were adopted in the Central Gateway Corridor Plan. The plan was amended a second time in September, 2011 in order to account for the plan brought forward by UNC-Greensboro for their Spartan Village Campus expansion project. The overarching goals of the neighborhood plan were to increase home ownership, maintain and improve walkability and bike-ability, to promote desirable infill developments, to reduce crime and the perceptions of danger, and to promote vibrant and accessible retail and services. Since the plan was adopted some of the outcomes in the neighborhood include a reduction in the total number of crimes reported in the neighborhood, new businesses have been established, several public art pieces have been installed and created in the neighborhood, new sidewalks have been constructed on Lovett Street, and Glenwood residents have organized a market that is held on

most Thursdays between April and November as a gathering event to sell and buy locally produced food and crafts.

Ms. Arkin explained that three redevelopment plans were adopted between 1975 and 1981. The third plan was adopted in 1981 and all activities from those plans have been completed since 2000. Any work in the neighborhood at this point that the Commission would be involved in would be guided by the neighborhood plan which in a sense supersedes the redevelopment plans. Redevelopment plans were attempts to control some of the blight in the neighborhood and to bring back investment. Once those activities were complete a neighborhood plan was indicated and requested by the neighborhood. Ms. Arkin explained that neighborhood plans and redevelopment plans are separate. Neighborhood plans are generally done at the request of the neighborhood and are controlled and implemented by the neighborhood. In a redevelopment plan, the public entity comes in and brings investment where it is needed with the outcome hopefully sparking private investment at some point. The Glenwood plans are considered inactive which means that all activities have been completed and the City is no longer working in neighborhoods under the redevelopment umbrella. She said that it is the neighborhood plan that guides the growth and development of the neighborhood.

Chair McQueary asked about the feedback mechanism between the City and the people who live in the area about whether or not the neighborhood plan is progressing. Mr. Sovich said that the only communication is through the lead planner on the neighborhood plan and representatives of the neighborhood.

Ms. Arkin informed members that a property owner in the neighborhood has asked to have an opportunity to speak with the Commission about some challenges and issues he sees in the neighborhood.

Bulent Bediz, 808 Lexington Avenue, has been a resident of Glenwood since 1976. Mr. Bediz indicated that although his story is complex, he will focus on one issue today that relates directly to the Redevelopment Commission. Mr. Bediz distributed a packet of information to members relating to the Commission helping with the repair of a commercial building. This particular issue regards a commercial building that he has owned since 2004 located at 800-802 Lexington Avenue. The 8,000 square foot building is located at the entrance of neighborhood. His reason for strategically purchasing in this area was to preserve the character of the neighborhood along Haywood Street and Lexington Avenues as well as his desire to create an artistic community. Eventually he owned a total of 70 properties in the neighborhood by 2007. At that time he had financial backing and plans for a mixed-use infill development to cater to the needs of the neighborhood, City and UNC-Greensboro. Unfortunately, incidents of crime and the recession of 2008 caused him to file bankruptcy.

Chair McQueary asked Mr. Bediz to clarify what action he wishes the Commission to consider.

Mr. Bediz stated that the property at 800-802 Lexington Avenue is tied in closely to his original vision of creating an artistic community. This particular property would serve the community by providing gathering space, studio space, exhibit space and perhaps a pub. Mr. Bediz stated that the property is now being used as a storage space. It was condemned in 2009 and the City said the only way it could be used was for storage purposes.

Chair McQueary asked Mr. Bediz to work with Ms. Arkin and staff to clearly state what he would like the Redevelopment Commission to consider. The Commission will be glad to do so if it is something appropriate and within their purview.

Mr. Bediz stated that he now has a contractor, a structural engineer and the funds to move forward with his project. He would like to use one of the City's programs, as distributed to members. He wants to make sure he can benefit from the program before he moves forward with the project.

Chair McQueary suggested that Mr. Bediz work with Ms. Arkin to determine if what he wants to do qualifies for the program and if it does qualify, the Commission will provide consideration for it.

Ms. Arkin commented that staff has never used this exact program and research must be done moving forward.

Mr. Bediz stated that the Glenwood story is a very complex story and he requested that a time be set to allow him to go more in depth about what has happened there.

Ms. Harris stated that she is familiar with the history of Glenwood. She asked Mr. Bediz to let the Commission know what he wants and the best thing is to work with Ms. Arkin to determine if he meets the necessary criteria for the program.

### **WILLOW OAKS REDEVELOPMENT AREA:**

#### **a) Disposition of Property to City of Greensboro for Recreation Space**

Mr. Saunders joined the meeting at 5:32 p.m.

Russ Clegg stated that one of the consistent things staff heard during the planning process for Willow Oaks was that there was not enough green, open space in the area. It was suggested in the plan that the two subject parcels, 601 Jennifer Street and 2102 Charles Harshaw Avenue, should be a place for a recreation field to serve the neighborhood. The Parks and Recreation Department has been visibly building a new field there and the neighborhood is excited to see this effort moving forward.

Mr. Clegg stated that ownership of this property needs to be transferred from the Redevelopment Commission and GHDP (Greensboro Housing Development Partnership) to the City of Greensboro so that Parks and Recreation can maintain it long-term. He asked the Commission to direct staff to go ahead with the disposition process to transfer the property to the City.

Counsel Kelly explained that staff is asking the Commission to authorize the transfer of those two parcels to the City of Greensboro. It is currently being maintained by Parks and Recreation pursuant to the redevelopment plan.

Ms. Chaney moved recommendation that the Redevelopment Commission deeds over lots 601 Jennifer Street and 2102 Charles Harshaw Avenue to the City of Greensboro for the use of Parks and Recreation as a park in that area, seconded by Ms. Harris. The Commission voted 4-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: McQueary, Chaney, Harris, Saunders. Nays: None.)

Ms. Chaney asked staff to inform the Commission when the recreation field has been completed so that a visit to the site can be arranged. She felt it was very important for Commissioners to see the properties and what the results are.

**CITY OF GREENSBORO EXTERNAL AUDIT CONTRACT:**

Ms. Arkin stated that members are in receipt of a copy of the City of Greensboro External Audit Contract in their packets of information. The Redevelopment Commission is being asked to review and sign off on this contract. The contract is between an outside auditor and the City of Greensboro but because the Redevelopment Commission is somewhat of a separate entity under the City's larger umbrella, both the Transit Authority and the Redevelopment Commission are asked to sign this document. This is the third year that it has been requested. She asked the Commission to vote to allow Chair McQueary to sign the document.

Ms. Chaney moved to authorize Chair McQueary to sign the document, seconded by Ms. Harris. The Commission voted 4-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: McQueary, Chaney, Harris, Saunders. Nays: None.)

**STAFF UPDATES:****(a) 741 South Elm Street**

Ms. Arkin said that there is a slope encroachment on this property that occurred during the construction of the temporary parking area which is located just to the north. Sidney Gray, representing the Gray family on the Greenway, has spoken to the Commission in the past and the direction that was given to staff was to move forward directly with the Gray family to work through this. Staff has met with them several times and has executed a small contract with an engineering firm to do an analysis of that location. The firm will provide one or more recommendations as to how the encroachments can be moved back onto Redevelopment Commission property and remove them from the Gray's property. An estimate of cost to perform the work will also be provided by the firm.

Ms. Arkin has not received a written response from the engineer as of yet but it will be provided at the next meeting. Staff will also provide their recommendation for the next indicated action moving forward to resolve this issue with the Gray family on the Greenway.

Chair McQueary asked staff about discussions that are going on about Phase II of Union Square. No decision has been made about Phase II yet but there have been many discussions. Ms. Arkin referred to a map and pointed out the current Union Square building, the cell tower, the parking area, and a lot that is under option to the Union Square Campus, Inc. from the Redevelopment Commission for their second building if they should so choose. They have the right to exercise their option on the lot but if the Master Developer brings another developer who is interested in that parcel, then Union Square Campus, Inc. must make their decision within a certain amount of time.

Continuing with the South Elm Street update, Ms. Arkin pointed an area that is under a soft agreement with the Arden Group for development. She updated the Commission that conversations have been ongoing and productive with the Arden Group. They are working through the final details of their sales development agreement. This coming Friday staff is meeting with the neighborhood development group again to talk in more detail about the possibilities for support for the affordable housing component. The schedule is to have that draft available for legal review by both sides by the end of the month and then give them the month of June to allow them to make sure the contract is acceptable. Noting the deadline, Ms. Arkin stated that the matter will be addressed on the July 11, 2018 agenda.

**(b) MLK North Site**

Hart Crane said that a development proposal was received for three MLK sites. One lot is across from New Zion Church, the second lot is behind Nettie Coad Apartments, and the third lot is to the rear of Family Dollar. The proposal is for all three lots. Staff went through the proposal and it met the requirements of a submittal. The development company is Prestwick Companies and updates will be available as the process moves forward.

Ms. Chaney asked what is being proposed for the lot behind the Family Dollar. Mr. Crane indicated that a two-phase development approach has been proposed. Phase I would be the property behind Family Dollar and the property behind Nettie Coad Apartments. They have proposed a tax credit project for senior living which staff feels is a good fit. Mixed-use development is being proposed for the remaining site with commercial uses along Gate City Boulevard and Martin Luther King, Jr. Drive with residential behind it.

Ms. Arkin stated that she spoke earlier in the day with Ms. Chaney and Chair McQueary about providing updated information about properties owned by the Redevelopment Commission. She distributed a sheet of information about the properties and the current neighborhood development programs and other programs to support affordable housing and quality housing in the City as a whole. Staff is producing an updated map of these properties and will provide those maps as they become available.

Ms. Chaney said that the Redevelopment Commission owns all this land in different lots and the majority of it is in Districts 1 and 2 where there was damage from the recent disaster. If a developer could be found who could build 1,200 to 1,500 square foot houses on those lots zoned for single-family housing, the Redevelopment Commission could give the land. The developer could build the houses for sale and/or lease to people in the area. The land has been sitting vacant for a long time and could be used to be more productive for the neighborhood and for the citizens of Greensboro. If approved, she felt that builders could be found who would be able to build the houses for \$50,000 to \$60,000 because the land would be donated.

It was noted that some of the properties have been owned by the Commission for quite a while.

Chair McQueary agreed with Ms. Chaney and felt the suggestion should be looked at further. There are at least three lots that are not buildable and it seems there should be some way to figure out what to do with a strip of land that is not buildable to get it off the books.

Ms. Arkin said that the way the City deals with lots that are not buildable is to initially offer the property to the neighbors. The first choice would be to divide the lot and offer it to each of the neighbors. Another choice would be to create areas of small pocket parks. Some of the problem with these lots is that nobody wants them and the City has just held on to them because there is no other good option. The City is continuing to find a way to dispose of the lots. She noted that some of the lots have a maintenance cost that the City has been carrying for years.

Chair McQueary asked staff to expand on what "not buildable" means and tell the Commission which lots are not buildable and what possible dispositions exist.

Ms. Chaney referred to the lots that are buildable and felt that this would be a good opportunity for some people who have lost their homes.



Counsel Kelly commented that since federal funds were authorized yesterday with respect to Greensboro, plans are being developed for programs for relocation assistance and rehabilitation. Now that the federal government has agreed on assistance, the City is waiting to see what that assistance is going to be so they can utilize local funds to complement those federal funds. The Neighborhood Development Department has been scrambling to put programs together in response to the tornado damage but as of today, they are trying to make a concerted effort to see what programs the federal government will offer so they can align themselves with those programs.

Staff plans to talk directly with the Neighborhood Development Department to make sure they are aware that these properties owned by the Redevelopment Commission are aware for use if that works into their bigger plan.

Council Kelly said that Ms. Chaney's plan would require a further look into the specific redevelopment plan for each of these properties. This would be a new program and not one that was envisioned by any of the plans.

### **ADJOURNMENT**

There being no further business before the Group, the meeting was adjourned at 6:20 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Sue Schwartz  
Planning Director  
SS: sm/jd

**APPROVED MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE  
REDEVELOPMENT COMMISSION  
OF GREENSBORO  
JUNE 6, 2018**

The regular meeting of the Redevelopment Commission of Greensboro (RCG) was held on Wednesday, June 6, 2018, in the Plaza Level Conference Room of the Melvin Municipal Office Building commencing at 5:00 p.m. The following members were present: Chair Charles McQueary; Robert Enochs; Dawn Chaney; Angela Harris; and Clinton Gravely. Staff present included Dyan Arkin and Russ Clegg. Also present was Andrew Kelly, Attorney for the Commission.

Chair McQueary welcomed everyone to the meeting of the Redevelopment Commission of Greensboro.

Ms. Arkin informed the Commission that Councilwoman Hoffmann will not be able to attend tonight's meeting.

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES:**

**a) March 14, 2018 Special Meeting**

Ms. Arkin stated that approval of the minutes was deferred until this meeting because Mr. Gravely wanted to make some revisions to a section of the minutes.

Ms. Arkin stated that there were two revisions that already been noted. Mr. McQueary's name was spelled incorrectly and Mr. Gravely was listed as Mr. Clinton. Mr. Gravely explained the clarifications he was requesting.

Mr. Gravely moved to approve the minutes as amended, seconded by Ms. Harris. The Commission voted 5-0 to approve the minutes. (Ayes: Enochs, Gravely, Harris, Chaney and McQueary. Nays: None.)

**b) April 18, 2018 Special Meeting**

Ms. Arkin stated that a typo in the minutes for April 18, 2018 meeting would be fixed and the header changed to the correct date.

Ms. Harris moved to approve the minutes, as amended, seconded by Ms. Chaney. The Commission voted 4-1-0 to approve the minutes. (Ayes: Gravely, Harris, Chaney and McQueary. Nays: None) (Enochs abstained)

**c) May 9, 2018 Special Meeting**

Ms. Chaney moved to approve the minutes for May 9, 2018, seconded by Ms. Harris. The Commission voted 4-1-0 to approve the minutes. (Ayes: Gravely, Harris, Chaney, and McQueary. Nays: None) (Enochs abstained)

**OLE ASHEBORO REDEVELOPMENT AREA:****(a) Consideration of Extension to Single Family Lot Initiative Development Agreement with Greensboro Housing Development Partnership (GHDP)**

Ms. Arkin stated that this agreement is the Development Agreement that allowed GHDP to take ownership of 27 lots and then to provide for the development of those lots by contracting with builders and sub-developers to build single family houses for sale at an affordable level. This agreement has been in place since March of 2007 and terminated in April of 2015. Somehow it slipped through the cracks. GHDP approved doing an amendment to cover from the time it expired until April 1, 2020. The original agreement is in the packet and the final page contains a very brief amendment that allows this agreement to go on until April 1, 2020. There are 12 to 13 parcels remaining to be developed.

Mr. McQueary asked if there was any issue about retroactively approving the previous end date. Counsel Kelly responded that there was no issue with it. Essentially what you are doing is ratifying the actions taken and in place between the time when the lapse effective date happened. This amendment will take care of that.

Mr. Gravely moved approval of the amendment, seconded by Mr. Enochs. The Commission voted 5-0 to approve the minutes. (Ayes: Enochs, Gravely, Harris, Chaney and McQueary. Nays: None.)

**SOUTH ELM STREET REDEVELOPMENT AREA:****a) Update on 741 South Elm Street**

Ms. Arkin stated the property is south of the Union Square Campus and owned by Grays on the Greenway, subsequent to a property exchange with the Commission. They initially owned the same acreage in the center of the block and the Master Developer asked that you do an exchange with them a few years ago to provide a contiguous space for development to the north. During construction of the temporary parking lot there were some encroachments on their property, and staff has been working with them at the Commission's direction to come to some agreement about how to resolve those issues. There are a couple of ways to resolve the issues. Staff and the Redevelopment Attorney have had discussions with the Grays and their attorney about the possibility of a lease or an easement, and staff has been working with an engineering firm to identify a methodology and cost opinion for removing the encroachments. Methods for removal of the encroachments have been discussed with the Water Resource and GDOT departments because there are storm lines that encroach and changes will impact the existing drive into the temporary parking. She didn't have any more information today but just wanted to reassure the Commission that we a final report from the engineer will be reviewed by staff and a recommendation will come back to the Commission. She must consult with legal to see what if any action will be taken at that time. The Grays have been informed as well.

In the next couple of weeks there will be a final report from the Engineer that will be circulated internally with City staff and a recommendation for the Commission's information. In response to a question concerning how to reach closure with the Grays, Ms. Arkin stated that staff will provide a recommendation to the Planning Director, Division Manager, and City Legal to potentially move the encroachments off that property.

Mr. Enochs asked who was responsible. Ms. Arkin stated that it fell on everybody that was involved. There were some very time-sensitive decisions that had to be made in order to get the Union Square Campus open on time. There were some engineering challenges, some construction challenges, and there is a difference of opinion between the engineer and contractor about who should own most of that

error. There were some staff issues as well. There is not an intention to hold them responsible. Staff will take the responsibility and continue to try to make it right.

### **STAFF UPDATES:**

#### **Heritage House**

Ms. Arkin showed a picture of the Heritage site location. The Commissioners have requested an update at every meeting.

Counsel Kelly gave the update and recommended that they go in Closed Session to discuss this.

#### **Update on the Glenwood Plan**

Dyan Arkin stated that Mr. Bediz came and spoke with the Commissioners at the last meeting. At the Commission's request, staff has met with him and have spoken with him about possibly getting some assistance for the properties he owns in Glenwood. It's staff's opinion that there is no authority or action that the Commission can take. He may be interested in coming back to talk about his ideas that the Commission could possibly help him on.

Chair McQueary asked if there was any closure at this point. Ms. Arkin stated that they gave him information for the Housing Group for Neighborhood Development Department. Her understanding is he's going to contact them again about some assistance, maybe through the Bond funding or some other help. Staff does not know at this point if that will be possible.

Counsel Kelly stated that there was closure, because the Commission can't assist him.

#### **South Elm Street Component Development**

Ms. Arkin gave a quick update on the South Elm Street component development. She stated that they were moving forward. The final draft of the Sales Development Agreement is with attorneys of all three parties. The final agreement will come back to commission on July 11, 2018 meeting.

Chair McQueary wants to be notified immediately if they can't come back on July 11, 2018. They may call a Special meeting to find out what's going on. The Commission should be receiving the Agreement that is believed to be the Final Agreement.

Ms. Chaney stated that if they were not ready to provide the final agreement at the July 11, 2018 meeting that the Commissioners should know about it.

#### **Washington Street Area**

Ms. Arkin stated she had responded to a request from the attorney of a prospective buyer of a parcel in the old Washington Project 1 area and that staff periodically gets requests about properties in inactive redevelopment areas. There are a variety of redevelopment deed restrictions that are still recorded. Most of them in inactive areas have expired, but this one has a portion of it that was in perpetuity, so it never expires. This is something that is handled at the staff level. To her knowledge, there are no violations of any of the restrictions.

Chair McQueary stated he wants to find a way to move the Commission-owned properties along with the way they were intended if there is no buyer. For each property he wants a plan of action about what to do with them.

Ms. Arkin stated that since the last meeting various staff members have been working on updating maps and the list, to make sure they are completely accurate and asking for information on properties that are not buildable and the strategy for removing them from the inventory. Their goal is to come up

with a series of maps that better show the properties in context so the Commission might have a good sense of how they might work together. She has also asked the Neighborhood Development Housing Team to provide one or more staff members to come to the July meeting to talk about the programs in existence and an update on the tornado recovery.

Ms. Chaney asked if there was any feedback from the proposal she had discussed last month.

Ms. Arkin stated that staff members have spoken about different possibilities. They want to make sure existing programs are used as much as possible or as fully as possible to respond to issues related to the tornado and the people affected by the tornado. In terms of creating a new program it is important to look at what already exists and how the Commission can better participate in meeting the goals of the existing programs. There has been no specific response as yet.

Ms. Chaney stated that there are plans out there. Habitat has a plan helping to get buildings that are built by some of the participants and they may have the option to buy the property. Freddie Mac and Fannie Mae now give loan opportunities for people in disaster areas. One property has been sitting inactive since 1926. She wants to see the Commission take some action to see if we can't get some housing built, particularly in the most needed area of the tornado damage. She also spoke with a developer on building three to five 1200-1400 square foot, two to three bedroom houses affordably. To cut the price and get them to a price that would be affordable.

Ms. Arkin stated that they will continue to move forward to come up with a plan they can recommend. Chair McQueary stated that next time it would be an agenda item and talk about Ms. Chaney's idea. Ms. Chaney stated that there are several lots that cannot be built on, but maybe build a playground on those lots. Mr. Enochs stated that there is the Parks and Recreation Department budget to take care of things like that. Ms. Chaney stated that selling the lots will help to pay to bring a playground to this area. Mr. Enochs stated that you must be upfront with Parks and Rec before building a park. Ms. Chaney stated that one was made into a family garden and the community takes care of it.

Ms. Chaney stated that they need a plan before any work can begin. Chair McQueary asked if they had sold any lots. Russ Clegg stated that a few lots in Willow Oaks have sold.

Ms. Chaney stated that they need map dimensions of the lots and zoning and a plan to seek out developers for a price and then find a funding source to get owner-occupied, if not rentals. Ms. Arkin stated that they would bring information to the next meeting.

Ms. Arkin stated that she sent out emails and asked about people wanting to go visit properties. She would like to contact Commissioners directly and arrange some time to tour the properties.

## **ADJOURNMENT**

There being no further business before the Commission, the meeting was adjourned at 5:41 p.m. Motion to reconvene the Closed Session was made by Ms. Chaney and seconded by Mr. Gravely. The Commission voted 5-0 to approve to go back into Open Session. (Ayes: Gravely, Harris, Chaney and McQueary. Nays: None)

Andrew Zimmerman, 3412 Old Onslow Road, stated he was proud of the parking across the street that is now open. He is hoping it would bring jobs there. He wanted to know if the South Elm Development had an accountability going forward to hold people true to a timeline of something that will be a catalytic development for downtown Greensboro. More housing is needed in downtown Greensboro. Who should be accountable in the City for taking so long? He does not think things have been handled well

to get the development to move forward, instead of years of empty lots. Chair McQueary stated that point is well taken and he agrees.

There being no further business before the Commission the meeting adjourned at 5:48 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Sue Schwartz  
Planning Director  
SS: pr/jd

**APPROVED REGULAR MEETING OF THE  
REDEVELOPMENT COMMISSION  
OF GREENSBORO  
July 11, 2018**

The regular meeting of the Redevelopment Commission of Greensboro (RCG) was held on Wednesday, July 11 2018, in the Plaza Level Conference Room of the Melvin Municipal Office Building commencing at 5:00 p.m. The following members were present: Chair, Charles McQueary; Angela Harris; and Clinton Gravely. Staff present included Dyan Arkin, Russ Clegg, and Cynthia Blue. Also present was Andrew Kelly, Attorney for the Commission.

Chair McQueary welcomed everyone to the meeting of the Redevelopment Commission of Greensboro.

Ms. Arkin made an announcement that this was scheduled as a Special meeting, but is really a Regular meeting. When the Commission voted on their annual meeting schedule, it became a Regular meeting.

Mr. Kelly stated that if there was a desire by the Commission to consult with its Attorney about the terms and conditions of the Sale/Development Agreement, they should go into Closed Session and that if the Commission wished to give him instructions on negotiation of the claim by the Grays on the Greenway regarding their property at 741 South Elm Street, they should also go into Closed Session.

Ms. Arkin asked the Commission to move the Neighborhood Development presentation to the beginning of the agenda.

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES:**

**a) June 6, 2018 Special Meeting**

Minutes were not ready for approval. They will be considered at the next RCG meeting.

**Neighborhood Development Department:**

Cynthia Blue, Manager of Housing Services from the Neighborhood Development Department, provided an update to the Commission on the Tornado Recovery Effort.

An organization called Storm Recovery Alliance was created after the tornado hit. It consists of all the agencies that help clients with home repairs or financial assistance and they were formed to help people walk through the process of getting assistance. It is located in a one-stop service area called the Housing Hub at 1031 Summit Avenue. They are in Phase 3 of the recovery assistance process. Phase 1 was getting set up and identifying the people who were severely impacted and getting them into a relocation process. Phase 2 was the application process for FEMA and Small Business Administration assistance. Phase 3 is long term recovery.

They are trying to extend the FEMA application deadline because they have had 1,500 registrations and approved 283. Other needs addressed include cars that were impacted, furniture that was destroyed, or food that went bad, and other things that FEMA addresses besides housing repairs. Chair McQueary asked if FEMA does all the adjudication for that. Ms. Blue responded that it does. He asked if Greensboro authorities play a role in that or strictly FEMA. Ms. Blue said that the individual applies to directly to FEMA. Chair McQueary asked about satisfaction of other needs besides lost property. The community has raised \$744,000 dollars and that money is going into various relief efforts. There are

two ways people can get help: they can call the 211 resources or call the Neighborhood Development Department directly to get directed to the right resources.

Three houses have been repaired and 20 more are in progress. People that don't have enough money to pay their insurance deductibles can apply through the Storm Recovery Alliance to get help with those deductibles. City Council will be deciding on a disaster relief home owner repair program at their next meeting.

Chair McQueary said his concern is with the people that are in the most need, whether there is somebody trying to help them to achieve what needs to be done to get them back on their feet. Ms. Blue said that is where the Case Management is comes into play to make sure that those folks are getting what they need.

Ms. Blue described existing City programs for affordable housing assistance. There is a down payment and closing cost program that can offer up to \$10,000 as a five-year forgivable loan for small households up to 120% of Area median income and up to 140% of Area median income for large households thanks to the Housing Bonds. There is a \$5,000-dollar bonus for anyone buying in a Redevelopment area.

Chair McQueary asked how can the Redevelopment Commission, with the 74 properties they have, can work closely with those programs, so the City and citizens can take advantage and use some of these properties. Ms. Blue stated that the Greensboro Housing Development Partnership has transferred lots for single family housing development. Over the last two years seven lots have been put under contract for development. The first two have sold, three are in construction, and the other two will be in construction shortly. Dyan Arkin said the planning group is looking at the properties to better identify the specific developments. Chair McQueary said he would like to see something done. Dyan Arkin said that the question was why they would choose them, what makes our property desirable option for people? Chair McQueary says you must want people to invest. Dyan Arkin said that they are looking at how to promote these properties. The deal must work for the buyer and the builder.

### **SOUTH ELM STREET REDEVELOPMENT AREA:**

#### **a) Sale/Development Agreement**

Milt Rhodes of Greenline Holdings and Arden Construction said that at the last meeting they were directed to finalize the Sale/Development Agreement by the July meeting. They have worked with the City over the last two months on a weekly basis and have made good progress. Ms. Arkin said they had hoped to bring a completed agreement to the Commission this evening, but there are one or two points they are still trying to work through. The Redevelopment Attorney is working with the attorney for Greenline to work out language that meets everyone's needs and provides the best outcome for all three groups. They will talk more about the details in Closed Session. They have worked through almost everything, but one or two points need more discussion. They are very close and may be able to request a Special meeting prior to the next meeting. Chair McQueary said the agreement should not take another month. Mr. Gravely asked if the proposal was the same as before. Ms. Arkin said that the proposal was still for single family town homes and rentals, with a percentage of the units affordable to folks at 80% or less of Area Median Income per the agreement with HUD. The phasing plan shows construction of the single-family housing first and then the mixed-use, multi-family building on Gate City Boulevard. The agreement calls for quite a few things to be done between execution and closing on any property. There are a variety of things the Commission will need to approve, and the developers will bring a package to them within a required time period. There are a few things that the Commission needs to do as well before closing on the property.



**741 South Elm Street**

Ms. Arkin reminded the Commission that, at the October 2017 meeting, Mr. Gray expressed concern about the impact of the construction of the temporary parking area on his property at 741 South Elm Street. During the construction of that area and the installation of the storm water Facilities and installation of access from that area on the Gray's property, the elevation was raised several feet, which resulted in the grade change. Mr. Gray and their attorney Mr. Bill Benjamin have stated that the City should return the property to the way it was and/or lease the property until one or both properties are scheduled to be developed. The Grays have an Agreement with the South Elm Development Group to cooperate on redevelopment. They have not discussed plans or a timeline for development. Both the parking area and the encroachments are temporary. Ms. Arkin showed where the new storm lines are now and where they used to be. She said that the storm lines extend about 15 feet onto the Gray's property to connect to an existing storm line. She reminded the Commission that there are several ways to address the concerns of the Grays. They can change the location, the shape and or the size of the sand filter and pond and then regrade to get the profile on the Gray's property closer to what it was prior to construction, the addition of a retainment wall on the property line, a lease or easement of the property until the time of development. They have received the final draft of the engineering study and do have staff recommendations that they will discuss in Closed Session.

Mr. Gravely asked how they got to this point through the permit process and the approval process. Ms. Arkin said there was a time constraint in that the parking area was expected to be completed in time for the Union Square Campus to open by the fall semester of 2016. As the project was moving forward there were some changes made in the field. She said on the face of it, each change was acceptable, but due to the time constraints there was a lack of communication and coordination. The City has accepted the responsibility and is moving forward to come up with a resolution.

Chair McQueary asked if the contractor worked from a different set of plans and whether they delivered what they signed up for, to try to understand what happened and why. Ms. Arkin said the contract did define what they were supposed to do. The communication between the contractor and the engineer was not good and each inspection seemed to go well enough, but in the end, this is what was left. Ms. Arkin invited the Grays to speak.

Bill Benjamin, Attorney for the Grays, said that this problem has been going on for quite a while. He doesn't know why it happened, but it's a trespassing on the property. There is a Development Agreement with the Master Developer to install an alley way. He presented a picture of the change in grade from the original grade and asked how that to put that in, the site will have to be changed a lot. They are talking about some sort of settlement. This needs to come to an end. He doesn't think this happened by accident. He presented pictures to the Commission that explain this. These pictures were taken by Mr. Gray and the blue line is the pipe work. He says that the pink dot represents where the City surveyors marked the property line. There are flags that represent different property lines. Their lot is narrow and for them to use their property as they were hoping to they will contribute four feet to the alley way, with 16 feet coming off the adjoining property, which would enable them to have access to their site. He just wants to bring this to a conclusion.

Chair McQueary asked if there was anything else to be presented in Open Session. Ms. Arkin said there was nothing from her, except that the June meeting minutes will be submitted at the next meeting.

Ms. Harris made a motion to go into Closed Session. Seconded by Mr. Gravely. The Commission voted 3-0 to go into Closed Session. (Ayes: McQueary, Harris and Gravely. Nays: None.)

A motion was made by Mr. Gravely to adjourn, seconded by Ms. Harris. The commission voted 3-0 to adjourn (Ayes: McQueary, Harris, and Gravely. None.)

### **ADJOURNMENT**

There being no further business before the Commission, the meeting was adjourned at 7:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Sue Schwartz  
Planning Director  
SS: pr/jd

**MEETING OF THE  
REDEVELOPMENT COMMISSION  
OF GREENSBORO  
AUGUST 1, 2018**

The Regular meeting of the Redevelopment Commission of Greensboro (RCG) was held on Wednesday, August 1, 2018, in the Plaza Level Conference Room of the Melvin Municipal Office Building commencing at 5:00 p.m. The following members were present: Chair, Charles McQueary; Dawn Chaney; and Clinton Gravely. Staff present included Dyan Arkin, Russ Clegg and Sue Schwartz. Also present was Andrew Kelly, Attorney for the Commission.

Chair McQueary welcomed everyone to the meeting of the Redevelopment Commission of Greensboro.

Chair McQueary stated that the absences of Angela Harris and Robert Enochs are excused. Councilwoman Hoffmann will not be able to attend tonight's meeting.

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES:**

**a) June 6, 2018 Regular Meeting**

Ms. Chaney moved to approve the minutes as submitted, seconded by Mr. Gravely. The Commission voted 3-0 to approve the minutes. (Ayes: McQueary, Gravely, and Chaney. Nays: None.)

**b) July 11, 2018 Special Meeting**

Ms. Chaney moved to approve the minutes as submitted, seconded by Mr. Gravely. The Commission voted 3-0 to approve the minutes. (Ayes: McQueary, Gravely, and Chaney. Nays: None)

**SOUTH ELM STREET REDEVELOPMENT AREA:**

**Presentation of Sale/Development Agreement** – A Sale/Development Agreement for development of the west block of the redevelopment area has been finalized with Greenline Holdings II LLC and the South Elm Development Group (SEDG) and made available to the Commission for review. The Commission is asked to consider recommending the sale of land for the development of residential and commercial/retail space under the terms and conditions of the Sale/Development Agreement to City Council for approval.

Chair McQueary said Commissioners didn't have copies of exhibits, but were being asked to approve the entire document including exhibits. We need to make sure that we are comfortable with what we approve. Dyan Arkin stated that she will let attorney speak on to how they can move forward tonight. She passed out Exhibit "A," the proposed development program.

Counsel Andrew Kelly went over each additional exhibit with the Commissioners.

Mr. Gravely asked if the requirements include minority participation. Ms. Arkin explained that two of the exhibits addressed MWBE participation: the City of Greensboro's MWBE program, which will govern contracts or agreements funded by the City, and the policy statement of the South Elm Development Group, in which they have committed to 20% overall MWBE participation rate for the full project.

Chair McQueary asked whether the developer, by following these documents, will meet the intent of the MWBE program. Ms. Arkin responded that was correct.

Mr. Gravely asked if SEDG's MWBE program followed the City's. Ms. Arkin explained they do not have a program associated with their 20% commitment, but made the commitment in order to assure the Commission and the City they intend to do their very best to make sure all the component development meets this aggregated goal of 20% or comes as close as is possible.

Ms. Arkin said that Exhibit "G" is an Environmental Impact Statement Waiver. When the City did the HUD environmental review, it found the noise level was higher than HUD finds acceptable for projects that they have assisted with funding in, so we were required to do an Environmental Impact Statement or to request a waiver. The waiver lays out what the City agrees to do and agrees to make the developer do to address whatever environmental issues were found. Chair McQueary asked where the noise was coming from. Ms. Arkin said that mainly it was the traffic on Gate City Boulevard. Ms. Chaney said that she thinks ultimately the noise will decline with the Greenway coming through there with fewer and fewer people bringing their cars versus using the Greenway. It won't be overnight, but she is thinking about long term. Ms. Arkin stated that that would be a very positive thing for that area.

Chair McQueary asked if Commissioners wanted to go over the Agreement and ask questions. Ms. Arkin gave a brief presentation of the development program and the terms and conditions of the Agreement.

Greenline is proposing to develop 64 sales residential units in townhouse style and a multi-use building with 39 rental units and approximately 8000 square feet of commercial retail space on the first floor along Gate City Boulevard and the associated site improvements on approximately three.

Three phases of construction are anticipated and can be implemented concurrently or broken down in sub-phases with RCG. There will be separate agreements with the City for funding and construction of the site preparation and the remaining infrastructure and streetscape. Chair McQueary asked if that was an agreement between the City and the developer, and Ms. Arkin said it would be. Phase 2 is the construction of the for-sale townhomes. Not less than 51% percent of those townhomes are required to be sold to purchasers with income at or below 80% of area median income, which reflects the agreement that the City made with HUD when it borrowed the \$3 million dollars under the Section 108 Loan Guarantee program. Exhibit "A" is the preliminary draft of the development budget, site plan, and proposed development program, which will come back to the Commission for final approval prior to closing. Phase 3 is the construction of the multi-use building. Around 20% of the rental units will be required to be affordable to households at 80% or below median income threshold.

Two closings are contemplated under this Agreement; the first for approximately 2.25 acres for development of the for-sale units; the second for approximately .75 acres for the multi-use building. Greenline can propose a different phasing program or schedule but it must be approved by the Commission.

The Declaration of Covenants Conditions and Restrictions will be revised by the Master Developer to be consistent with the property's inclusion in the business improvement district. They will also revise the approved Master Plan and assign their option to purchase the property to Greenline.

Ms. Arkin said the purchase price is dependent on the final site plan and final survey of the property. Ms. Arkin said that there is a formula in the Master Development Agreement that allows for calculation of the price of the land at any given time. The price is calculated to be approximately \$1,365,407.67, which will be subject to adjustment when the survey is done. At closing, Greenline will make a cash payment of \$535,000 and the remainder secured by a Deed of Trust and forgiven in accordance with

the approved phasing schedule. After each phase is completed, a Certificate of Completion of Improvements will be issued for that part of the project.

This document provides for 120 days to initial closing, then 60 days from closing to the beginning of construction. All improvements need to be completed within three years from the effective date of the Agreement, but includes an option to request before the Commission an extension for up to a year. Mr. Gravely asked about parking, and Ms. Arkin said Greenline has introduced a unit type that is a park under. There is some surface parking and street parking anticipated, but folks who reside on this site will have parking associated with their units. Under the mixed-use building there will provided parking. We don't know how many spaces there will be until they get the final plans.

The next steps would be Commission approval of the Agreement tonight, so it can be considered by City Council at their August 18<sup>th</sup> meeting.

Chair McQueary asked for a tightly managed schedule of events, so that the Commissioners can plan their time to be available when decisions need to be made. Ms. Arkin said that it would be a one-time approval process for the various things required under the Agreement

Counsel Kelly explained the Commission is being asked to make a recommendation to City Council to sell the property to Greenline pursuant to the approved Redevelopment Plan.

Ms. Chaney asked about the sale of this piece of property to this company that is going to develop it. If within the 3 to 4-year period debts occur, is there any liability on part of the City? Counsel Kelly said when a portion of the land is conveyed, and the developer seeks additional financing, the land will be encumbered by a 3<sup>rd</sup> party bank, so there is no liability for the City or the Redevelopment Commission other than what the Commission has agreed to do, with respect to clearing the site. Counsel Kelly said that it is the City and Redevelopment Commission's responsibility to ensure the developer is following the restrictions of HUD. If HUD found this project to be out of compliance, then there would be some ramifications to the City. Generally, you pay the money back and risk losing HUD funds in the future. There will be restrictive covenants placed on the property that say future developers will have to follow the Redevelopment Plan.

Mr. Gravely moved that the Sale/Development Agreement be recommended to City Council for final approval, seconded by Ms. Chaney. The Commission voted 3-0 to approve the minutes. (Ayes: McQueary, Gravely, and Chaney. Nays: None.)

Chair McQueary thanked everyone for making this decision and getting it moving along. He said that we need marketing plan that will somehow market what is being done for the City of Greensboro. To go with that, the Commissioners need a one-page talking paper so that way when they are talking to the press it sounds like they are all saying the same thing. He asked to get that done quickly. He wants to make a public announcement and coordinate what they say. The City will make the announcement. Counsel Kelly said that after City Council approves the sale, the announcement will be made. Chair McQueary asked Ms. Arkin to keep the Commission informed. Ms. Arkin will get copies of the exhibits to the Commissioners.

### **STAFF UPDATES:**

Ms. Arkin stated that Hart Crane will be at the September meeting and will be bringing a development group to do a brief presentation of development in the Old Asheboro area.

The Comprehensive Plan update process is moving forward, and Ms. Arkin would like to have it as a continuing item on staff updates as they are moving forward. Russ Clegg stated that they are moving forward on several fronts. The Advisory Committee went over the basics and part of the process of what that plan would be. There is a Dropbox set up.

Ms. Arkin stated that work on a plan for disposition of RCG-owned property has not moved forward, as staff has been too busy this month and will do their best to finish it by the September meeting.

Counsel Kelly stated that there is an October trial date set for the remaining condemnation actions for Heritage House. The owners of the Meridian Center have asked that their part of the trial be continued, but he is not sure if the judge has signed off on that yet.

### **ADJOURNMENT**

There being no further business before the Commission, the meeting was adjourned at 6:15 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Sue Schwartz  
Planning Director  
SS: pr/jd

**MEETING OF THE  
REDEVELOPMENT COMMISSION  
OF GREENSBORO  
September 5<sup>th</sup>, 2018**

The Regular meeting of the Redevelopment Commission of Greensboro (RCG) was held on Wednesday, September 5<sup>th</sup>, 2018, in the Plaza Level Conference Room of the Melvin Municipal Office Building commencing at 5:00 p.m. The following members were present: Chair, Charles McQueary; Dawn Chaney, Clinton Gravely, and Angela Harris. Staff present included Dyan Arkin, Russ Clegg and Hart Crane. Also present was Andrew Kelly, Attorney for the Commission.

Chair McQueary welcomed everyone to the meeting of the Redevelopment Commission of Greensboro.

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES:**

**a) August 1<sup>st</sup>, 2018, Regular Meeting**

Mr. Gravely moved to approve the minutes as submitted, seconded by Ms. Harris. The Commission voted 4-0 to approve the minutes. (Ayes: McQueary, Gravely, Chaney, and Harris. Nays: None.)

**Ole Asheboro Redevelopment Area:**

Ms. Arkin said Mr. Crane would provide the update. This is a preliminary meeting to meet the developer from Prestwick and have a chance to ask some questions. Mr. Crane will also go over a timeline for executing a Sales Development Agreement.

Mr. Crane said the nature of this meeting is introductory and informational. In the fall of 2017 staff received a proposal from Prestwick Development Group for properties in the Ole Asheboro area. The Redevelopment Commission owns the A-4 property which is a little over an acre of land. The original Redevelopment Plan was adopted in 2004 and was eventually revised into the Martin Luther King North Initiative TND plan. The MLK North Initiative TND plan highlights the priority areas that are the largest redevelopment opportunities in the redevelopment area. A-1 includes development of the New Zion Church, and A-2 is where the Greenway will be built. Prestwick has proposed development of the A-2, A-3, and A-4 parcels with affordable senior living facilities, mixed-use buildings, and townhomes. Phase 1 will be senior living facilities on A-3 and A-4. Phase 2 will be mixed use with commercial on the first floor and residential above on the A-2 parcel. Mr. Harris is with Prestwick Company out of Atlanta, Georgia. This is their first venture in N.C. He has previous experience with another company and fell in love with Greensboro. They pride themselves with trying to fit into the community. They want to be ready with the first phase for Low-Income Tax Credit pre-applications in January 2019. They still need to meet with the neighborhoods. They propose to build about 35 rental units on one parcel and 48 units on the other, targeted at the residents at 60% of Area Median Income or below, with a 20-year affordability requirement.

Ms. Arkin asked if Mr. Harris could add a little bit more information about the sort of senior living they anticipate. Mr. Harris said that it would not be assisted living facilities. Each unit will have its own kitchen with a full bedroom. Chair McQueary asked about the sizes of the apartments. Mr. Harris responded that they will be mostly one-bedroom unit and a few two bedrooms. The one-bedrooms are

about 700 square feet and the two bedrooms will be around 800 square feet. Chair McQueary asked if there would be any HUD involvement. Mr. Harris said they will use a local bank to purchase tax credits.

Mr. Gravely asked about meeting with the neighborhood. Mr. Harris said they have a conference call next week with neighborhood leaders. Mr. Crane has told the neighborhood to get them thinking about the project and is in the process of setting up a meeting with the neighborhood.

Ms. Chaney asked when they thought Phase 2 would start and be completed. Mr. Harris is looking at focusing on Phase 1 through the January, February and March of 2019 to get the applications in. He has a counterpart that focuses on the market-rate piece and he is working on that now, so they will probably be able to bring something back to the Commission, first or second quarter of next year. Mr. Gravely asked what they needed from the Commission. Mr. Harris said they need Option Agreement or Sales Agreement that shows that they will have site control pending an award of tax credits. That time line will be about a year-long contract. They will close in the first quarter of 2020 and start construction after they close. Mr. Crane said they are going to try to get an Agreement for all three parcels; A-2 is owned by GHPD, A-3 is owned by the city and A-4 is owned by the Redevelopment Commission. Phase 2 will start later. There will be three Sales Agreements with the three entities. Mr. Gravely asked if it will tie up the land if they don't get financing for Phase 2. Mr. Crane said it doesn't prohibit other people from showing interest in the properties. Ms. Arkin said that it would be very similar to the Sales Agreement they just did with Greenline for the South Elm Street redevelopment area. The Agreement would be contingent on things in place by a certain date. Chair McQueary asked who would manage the upkeep of the units. Mr. Harris said they would subcontract with a management company with an onsite management team.

Counsel Kelly asked about the low income tax credits for the senior living facilities. He wants to know if there will be private financing and if the City of Greensboro will be asked to assist. Mr. Harris said that the market-rate pieces will be mostly private financing and they are looking at the opportunities that are available from the City of Greensboro to help with site preparation. Counsel Kelly asked about the need for site control then having to wait to get the tax credit award, then waiting to close on the other parcels. They are labeled as different phases, so by the time of closing, will they have all financing in place? Mr. Harris answered that is correct. Ms. Arkin said that in 2016 they passed a referendum for bond funds for assistance in this area. They feel comfortable with the bonds being used to support these projects, just like at the South Elm Street project.

Chair McQueary asked about why the lots are owned by so many different entities? Ms. Arkin said she thinks that the Redevelopment Commission owned the A-2 site at one time, but will have to do some more research, because she wasn't directly involved. She will bring that information back to the Commission.

Chair McQueary asked if Prestwick had their own construction company, and Mr. Harris said they do, but they will hire subcontractors locally. They are a general contractor; the labor force will be local. They have been acknowledged by HUD, based on their Section 3 and MWBE participation as an example of how things should be done. Their construction company is a Section 3 contractor, which means the work force will be local.

Mr. Gravely asked Ms. Arkin about what is expected from the City? Ms. Arkin said that would be part of the Sales Development Agreement, much like the one they had just done. Staff will share that with the Commission as soon as they get everything nailed down. Mr. Gravely and Chair McQueary said that they need to have a community meeting. Mr. Crane said they expect to be meeting by phone with the neighborhood board on Monday evening. He is working to get Mr. Harris to meet the stakeholders and get support from them. They now have a full picture of the proposed development and are ready to share it. Mr. Crane is the staff liaison and will give updates from the community to the Commission.



**STAFF UPDATES:****A. Comprehensive Plan Update and Speaker Series**

Russ Clegg stated that there is a meeting tomorrow at 2411 Gate City Blvd with the Advisory Committee. Staff will be at the Folk Festival getting thoughts from the people. They will be doing focus group meetings. There is a kick-off event on October 5th downtown at City Center Park, with food trucks to celebrate the launch of the update process. On October 4th the Chamber of Commerce is having a Manufacturing Symposium and they will have speakers there from small-scale manufacturers. November 5th Majora Carter to speak about the community input to build up community involvement. She has worked a lot in South Bronx. Ms. Arkin will send links to the websites to the Commission.

**B. RCG-Owned Property**

Ms. Arkin explained not a lot of progress has been made on the Commission's request about the properties they own Staff has meetings set up for next few weeks and has been working on mapping and analyzing the properties and how they can work together. Chair McQueary wants a measurement of the properties that have been sold. Ms. Arkin said they do have a listing of properties and will share that with the Commission.

**C. Heritage House Redevelopment Area**

Counsel Kelly said nothing has really happened within the last month or so and he hopes to have something by the next meeting. Chair McQueary asked if the city needed to do anything. Counsel Kelly said the Meridian Center has moved for a motion to continue the Meridian Center portion of the complaint separately, which could slow down demolition of the residential portion.

**D. Distribution of RCG Annual Report – FY2017-18**

Ms. Arkin stated that it is not ready.

**Additional Business**

Counsel Kelly asked to go into closed session to discuss the Grays on the Greenway. Ms. Chaney moved that the Commission go into closed session to preserve the attorney-client privilege between its attorney and the Commission to consult with its attorney concerning the claim of the Grays on the Greenway, L.L.C and to give instructions in the handling or settlement of a claim pursuant to N.C.G.S 143-318.11 (a)(3).

Seconded by Mr. Gravely, the Commission voted 4-0 to go into Closed Session. (Ayes: McQueary, Gravely, Harris and Chaney Nays: None).

The Commission went in to closed session at 5:50 p.m. and back into Open Session at 6:19 p.m.

**ADJOURNMENT**

There was a motion by Ms. Chaney to adjourn, seconded by Ms. Harris. The Commission voted 4-0 to adjourn (Ayes: McQueary, Gravely, Harris and Chaney. Nays: None).

There being no further business before the Commission, the meeting was adjourned at 6:20 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Sue Schwartz  
Planning Director  
SS: pr/jd

**MEETING OF THE  
REDEVELOPMENT COMMISSION  
OF GREENSBORO  
November 7<sup>th</sup>, 2018**

The Regular meeting of the Redevelopment Commission of Greensboro (RCG) was held on Wednesday, November 7<sup>th</sup>, 2018, in the Plaza Level Conference Room of the Melvin Municipal Office Building commencing at 5:00 p.m. The following members were present: Chair Charles McQueary, Dawn Chaney, Clinton Gravely, and Robert Enochs and Nancy Hoffmann, City Council Liaison. Staff present included Dyan Arkin and Hart Crane. Also present was Andrew Kelly, Attorney for the Commission.

Chair McQueary welcomed everyone to the meeting of the Redevelopment Commission of Greensboro.

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES:**

**a) September 5<sup>th</sup>, 2018, Regular Meeting**

Mr. Gravely moved to approve the minutes as submitted, seconded by Ms. Chaney. The Commission voted 3-0-1 to approve the minutes. (Ayes: McQueary, Gravely, Chaney. Nays: None. Abstained: Enochs.)

**Ole Asheboro Redevelopment Area:**

Hart Crane made a PowerPoint presentation and stated that staff has been working with Prestwick Companies out of Atlanta, GA, to negotiate Sales/Development Agreements for their proposed senior living and mixed-use developments in the Ole Asheboro Redevelopment Plan area. The final agreement will be presented to the Commission for consideration at the December 5<sup>th</sup> regular meeting. A-1 includes development of the New Zion Church, and A-2 is where the Greenway will be built. The A-3 and A-4 areas will be a tax credit senior living facility multi-family project. A-2 will be mixed-use with commercial on bottom and residential on top. A-4 will be approximately 33 units with approximately 38 parking spaces. A-3 will be approximately 48 units with approximately 49 parking spaces. They had community meetings last week. There were about 25 people at the meeting, and they were supportive of the proposed plan.

In November the work plan includes finalizing the sales development agreement terms, the recombination of the A-3 and A-4 properties, and continuing to develop community support. In December the plan is to have the Sales/Development Agreement brought before the Commission and City Council. In January Prestwick will apply for Low-Income Housing Tax Credits (LIHTC).

These are things that have to be done prior to closing: review and approval of detailed site plans, proof of LIHTC award, documentation of authority to undertake activities within Guilford County, market study showing viability of proposed projects in the area, and evidence of financial ability through capital contributions, grants, liens, or otherwise to complete improvements in accordance with the Agreements.

Chair McQueary asked whether the Redevelopment Plan had been re-examined since it was adopted in 2004. Mr. Crane said this project speaks specifically to what is outlined in the TND Plan, which is an amendment to the Ole Asheboro Plan. The developer is submitting plans that speak to what is required. Dyan Arkin said that the way that changes get made is by the market. This is a little bit different than what was proposed in the plan, but the plan is flexible enough to allow for it. The developer has done preliminary market studies and believes this is the right fit for that area. Staff also believes that it meets the intent of the redevelopment plan. Mr.

Gravely asked what kind of comments were made against the proposed project. Mr. Crane said that there were concerns about how the proposed buildings would look among single-family dwellings. There were some questions about what amenities would be included, but no comments opposed to the development.

The first phase of this project will be the A-3 and A-4 parcels, contingent upon the developer receiving the tax credit. Councilwoman Hoffmann asked if Prestwick had done this kind of project before. Mr. Crane responded they had. This is their first venture in NC, but they have done several tax credit projects.

Ms. Arkin said that even though the two projects are called phase one and two, they are not necessarily sequential. While they are waiting on the tax credit approval they can get started on finalizing their plans on phase two.

Ms. Chaney asked if the second phase would have any impact on the Greenway, which will be finished by then. Mr. Crane said it would be unavoidable to have construction on that site and not affect the Greenway. Ms. Arkin stated they would be required to leave the site as they found it. Ms. Chaney stated that closing the Greenway would not be a good idea.

Chair McQueary asked if there was anything RCG can do to maximize the chance the Prestwick will get tax credits on their first submission. Ms. Arkin said no, that Prestwick has been to Raleigh and attended all the workshops for tax credit applications, but she doesn't know if they have consultants on the application. Mr. Gravely stated that City support would be very helpful to them in the scoring process.

Nancy Hoffman stated she thought it was a great location for this project.

Chair McQueary asked about the process of awarding the tax credits. Counsel Kelly and Ms. Arkin explained that it's an annual request for applications and that Prestwick would not know if they receive an award until August 2019. Chair McQueary asked what they can do to maximize their chances. Mr. Crane said that proximity to the Family Dollar, being close to bus lines, and being in a redevelopment area all serve to add points to their score.

### **RCG-owned Property Disposition Analysis and Strategy:**

At the request of the Commission, staff has worked on an analysis of RCG-owned properties with the goal of providing a comprehensive strategy for disposition. Ms. Arkin presented an overview of what has been accomplished to date. Commissioners were asked to provide feedback as staff continues to work towards a final strategy to be presented at the December 5<sup>th</sup> regular meeting.

Ms. Arkin stated there are six active redevelopment areas: Arlington Park, Eastside Park, Ole Asheboro, Willow Oaks/Cottage Grove, Phillips Lombardy, and South Elm. The Commission owns 57 parcels, which have been aggregated into 27 development packages. Disposition strategies include: single-family lot initiatives, request for qualifications/proposals, developer/builder solicitations, realtors, and signage and advertising. The methods RCG can use to dispose of real property are: upset bids, conveyance for public purposes or to non-profits, public auctions, sealed bids, exchanges, and leases.

Chair McQueary asked if they could use the land for community gardens. Ms. Arkin said she is not sure, but it's possible if an experienced non-profit wanted to purchase the land. Other things to be considered are: redevelopment plans, the Comprehensive Plan, other plans, zoning, funding sources, market forces, and surrounding uses.

Chair McQueary asked what would happen if nobody wanted the property. Ms. Arkin stated she plans to get with Counsel Kelly to ask if there is anything that can be done in that case. Councilwoman Hoffman asked if

they could give it to somebody to place a single-family home on it. Counsel Kelly stated that would be the most likely scenario.

Chair McQueary asked if they could give it to a university. Counsel Kelly said a state-run university could fall under 'conveyance for public purposes'. If it was a private university it would fall under 'conveyance to non-profits'. Dyan Arkin walked the Commissioners through the lots they own in Arlington Park as an example of the analysis that has been done.

Chair McQueary asked about next steps. Ms. Arkin stated that she was open to ideas. Almost 30 acres of land that there are no taxes being paid on them. Chair McQueary said that it sounds like the easiest thing to do is to try to sell the property to an adjoining lot, but Ms. Arkin explained that because these properties are in redevelopment areas, they are subject to redevelopment plans and often the easy answers don't meet the intent of the plan.

Mr. Enochs said if there are properties that are not viable to develop, they could they sell them to a neighbor and add tax value to the neighbor's lot. Dyan Arkin said that there is only one lot out of 57 that fits that scenario and that often people don't have any incentive to take the additional property when it is already being mowed and maintained by the City.

#### **STAFF UPDATES:**

##### **A. South Elm Street**

The Redevelopment Commission approved a Sales/Development Agreement with the Arden Group in August and would be asked to consider authorizing the closing at the December meeting. Chair McQueary asked if there was anything that could get in the way of that happening in December. Ms. Arkin stated that they were not sure yet. Counsel Kelly stated that it would be tough to close five days before Christmas and more likely the closing would occur in the beginning of the New Year. Milt Rhodes, the developer, gave a brief update on progress to date. There has been a sketch plan meeting with City staff and an engineer has been engaged to work on the final site plan. Chair McQueary said if they are not meeting the anticipated schedule, the Commissioners need to understand why and how to get it back on track. Ms. Arkin stated they needed to filter through what might not be able to be completed by those dates. Mr. Rhodes said that there is still a lot of work to do. Councilwoman Hoffman asked if the closing date would be in January, and Counsel Kelly explained that he is not saying it couldn't be in December, just that it's a difficult time to schedule everyone to do a closing.

##### **B. Comprehensive Plan Update and Speaker Series**

Ms. Arkin explained that two community meetings for PlanIT GSO would be held on November 8<sup>th</sup> from 4 to 7 p.m. and November 27<sup>th</sup> from 4 to 7 p.m. Chair McQueary asked if there was anything that she would like for the Commission to do. Ms. Arkin said that if they can, attend and provide feedback as residents of Greensboro.

##### **C. Heritage House Redevelopment Area**

Counsel Kelly said that he would produce a report, that there is no bad news, all good news to report. They went to court the 22<sup>nd</sup> and have settled on all the residential units, but the commercial component is still being worked on.

##### **D. Security Badges for Commissioners**

Ms. Arkin reminded the Commission member to pick up security badges.

##### **E. RCG Annual Report – FY2017-18**

Ms. Arkin stated that the report was not yet complete.

**Additional Business**

No additional business was added to the agenda

**ADJOURNMENT**

There being no further business before the Commission, the meeting was adjourned at 6:03 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Sue Schwartz  
Planning Director  
SS: pr/jd/pr

**APPROVED MEETING MINUTES  
OF THE REDEVELOPMENT COMMISSION OF GREENSBORO  
December 5th, 2018**

The Regular Meeting of the Redevelopment Commission of Greensboro (RCG) was held on Wednesday, December 5th, 2018, in the Plaza Level Conference Room of the Melvin Municipal Office Building commencing at 5:00 p.m. The following members were present: Chair, Charles McQueary Clinton Gravely, and Robert Enochs. Staff present included Dyan Arkin, Russ Clegg, and José Colon. Also present was Andrew Kelly, Attorney for the Commission. Chair McQueary welcomed everyone to the meeting of the Redevelopment Commission of Greensboro.

Chair McQueary welcomed the new Planning Department staff member, José Colon, and stated he was glad to have him on board. Ms. Arkin stated that Angela Harris was not going to be with them this evening and that she has requested she not be reappointed. Chair McQueary wanted a notation in the minutes stating that she has done a great job and he appreciated all her hard work and her service on the Commission. Mr. Enochs stated that he is sorry to see her go and he echoes Chair McQueary's appreciation for her service. He stated that he is going to keep an eye on his court schedules and he will continue pushing through to attend meetings for right now, but he really enjoyed getting to know Ms. Harris.

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES:**

**Draft Minutes of the November 7<sup>th</sup>, 2018 Regular Meeting Minutes** Mr. Gravely moved to approve the minutes as submitted, seconded by Mr. Enochs. The Commission voted 3-0 to approve the minutes. (Ayes: McQueary, Gravely, Enochs. Nays: None.)

**SOUTH ELM STREET REDEVELOPMENT AREA:**

**Development Update and Status** Milt Rhodes, 1134 Parrish Street, on behalf of the Arden Group informed the Commission that a Technical Review Committee meeting was held in September on the previous plan and triggered some adjustments and modifications. The mixed-use building has grown as it has added a significant office component to it. There are 45 apartment units in there, which may adjust downward to 42, but that is still up from the 39 that they had initially proposed. They have attempted to keep the retail space of 8,000 square feet. So, they have an office component and a multi-family component that sits above the retail on floors two through four. The plaza in the corner is part of the Union Square.

South are 32 Rowhouse Townhomes. They replaced the smaller townhome units that were 650 to 700 square feet because they were cost prohibitive and took up a big chunk of land as well. So, looking at a market response to the proposal, they expanded the building which became more consistent with the overall plan and fit it better into Rowhouse Townhomes with the longer plaza that connects them from the Greenway up to the office building. One of the benefits of expanding the building to this size, is it lets them look at parking underneath in a different way. The previous plan showed somewhere between 70-80 parking spaces. They think they can fit comfortably 160 spaces. They think they may be able to get more with this footprint as there is an opportunity to do a two-tiered parking approach. They are working on the cost associated with that. There are two entrances into the building. The one on the left will access one level of parking and one on the south will access the lower level of parking so it becomes a much more efficient use of that property. For the Rowhouse Townhomes, the size is about the same, ranging somewhere between 1,400 to 2,000 square feet. One of the differences in the plan after working with the market folks, there was a concern of selling

double stack townhomes in Greensboro at this time. So, they are showing traditional three-level townhomes as park-unders rather than stacked townhomes, which would be two floors below two floors as separate units. So, the unit count went from somewhere in the high eighties to about 77 units because these are now counted as eight units instead of 16 units. They maintain frontage on the Greenway and access the same way the other ones did.

There have been four meetings since September with City staff about engineering, infrastructure, transportation and community development meetings along the way too. They may get some on-street parking on Gate City, but they may need to work out more space as about five more feet in width is needed. Backing the building up and the sidewalk a little bit will give them room to put on-street parking on Gate City Boulevard. The lane has been sized to hold utilities, water, sewer and storm and other utilities has helped with the fire access. So, this has grown a little bit, but still exits out onto South Elm Street and aligns with the Master Plan. The other laneway has become more of a plaza at the ground level with the office building to still provide sufficient fire access.

Mr. Gravely asked about how the HUD requirements are being addressed. Ms. Arkin said that it is based on a 51% requirement for the for-sale units be sold to households at 80% of area median income or less. If there are 32 units then 16 or 17 would be sold to folks in that income range and the rest would be sold at market rate. Mr. Rhodes said that the multi-family rentals have a 20% affordability requirement.

Ms. Arkin stated that at the last meeting they were not sure how far they were going to be able to get with all the different pieces prior to closing by this meeting. All work plan items are in progress. She gave an overview of the things that are in production, in progress, final and in review.

They are working through the site preparation and an agreement for how that will be funded, and the construction will be done. The city has taken on doing geotechnical analysis and the soil sampling required by the North Carolina Department of Environment Quality (NCDEQ). Chair McQueary asked if this was new or something they had expected to do. Ms. Arkin stated there is a requirement for vapor barriers in the construction of the buildings, and if the developer doesn't want to be tied to that requirement, they must show that there is no longer a need for them. They had done that for the Union Square Campus building as well. Counsel Kelly stated that as the numbers were being crunched, that was a way to reduce cost.

Ms. Arkin said that infrastructure and streetscape design is still underway and they have gotten the concept approved through NCDOT. The traffic impact study is currently in progress as well. Chair McQueary asked if the traffic study will drive design or simply give information. Ms. Arkin said it may drive design, but they are not expecting a significant difference from the previous traffic impact study because the uses and numbers are similar. Mr. Rhodes and his group have moved forward with their design based on a set of assumptions from that first traffic study. They have talked about this strategy with the consultant that is doing the second study and they are relatively comfortable with it.

Ms. Arkin stated that she had just been informed that Berkshire Hathaway has provided a marketing proposal to the Arden Group, and there should be more information about it in a week or so. A draft of CCR amendments has been provided by the South Elm Development Group and is under review. The South Elm Development Group will be assigning their option to purchase this



property to Greenline Holdings and that document is also in production. The City has hired a consultant to carefully analyze the affordable housing components. They are assisting with putting the package together that will be offered to the buyers or renters of those units. Everything is in progress and a lot of these things will come to closure around the same time and feed into the requirements under the Sales/Development Agreement, so they will be able to produce a package that will come before the Commission. They are anticipating pushing back closing by a few weeks and construction will begin in March 2019, depending on the weather. Zack Matheny, Executive Director of Downtown Greensboro Inc., stated this is a huge project for Greensboro and they fully support it and are doing everything they can to get it started.

**Review of the South Elm Street Redevelopment Plan** Ms. Arkin stated that the Redevelopment Plan shows the needs for improvements to Gate City Boulevard. It has always been acknowledged that it has acted as a barrier to development coming across to the redevelopment areas to the south. It is very important that Gate City Boulevard act as a gateway for the southern communities, not as a barrier. There is an existing Lee Street corridor plan that ends at Eugene Street and GDOT is contracting for additional conceptual design and analysis that will extend east past the redevelopment area to the Downtown Greenway crossing at Murrow Boulevard and Martin Luther King, Jr, Drive that is scheduled to start construction in early spring of next year. There have been some changes made in land use, primarily on the north side of Gate City Boulevard and still a lot of opportunity along there. The Master Developer and the Component Developer have been consistent in encouraging better design and access across Gate City Boulevard.

She presented copies of a resolution supporting continued efforts to improve Gate City Boulevard:

Resolution to continue efforts to Enhance Gate City Boulevard and implement streetscape improvements that promote pedestrian and bicycle mobility, commercial viability, quality development and private investment adjacent to the South Elm Street Redevelopment Plan Area.

Whereas, the Redevelopment Commission of Greensboro is committed to implementation of the adopted South Elm Street Redevelopment Plan as a catalyst for private investment and quality development in surrounding neighborhoods that have experienced decline and blight.

Whereas, in order to encourage investment and development, Gate City Boulevard should be an attractive gateway connecting the Redevelopment Area, its surrounding neighborhoods, and the south end of downtown.

Whereas, the South Elm Development Group, LLC, Maser Developer for the Redevelopment area and Greenline Holdings II, LLC, component Developer, under an executed Sales Development Agreement have expressed concerns about the viability of additional office and retail development along Gate City Boulevard as it is currently configured.

Now, therefore, be it Resolved by the Redevelopment Commission of Greensboro, that in order to promote pedestrian and bicycle mobility, commercial viability, investment and

quality development within the South Elm Street Redevelopment Area and the surrounding neighborhoods, the Commission supports continued effort and allocation of resources to enhance Gate City Boulevard and implement streetscape improvements that promote pedestrian and bicycle mobility, commercial viability, quality development and private investment adjacent to the South Elm Street Redevelopment Plan Area.

Chair McQueary asked to delete “neighborhoods that have experienced decline and blight” and end it at “neighborhoods.” Chair McQueary asked what weight such a document has. Ms. Arkin said it is a show of support and intention by the Commission. Counsel Kelly stated that this is not a commitment for the Commission to do anything besides recognizing that there are folks trying to do things in redevelopment areas. Counsel Kelly said it is his understanding this was requested by the developer to assist them in going forward. Mr. Enochs stated he thinks it is a great idea to encourage traffic from downtown continuing across Gate City Boulevard smoothly and for people to feel safe going across what is a busy road. Mr. Gravely said that he agrees with Chair McQueary about stopping at “neighborhoods.” Counsel Kelly said this could be something that other developers might use in the future. Mr. Matheny said at the City Council level and he thinks at the State level, documentation you have support of initiatives carries weight when it is passed to the right people. This is one of the more important sections of town for future growth. He stated that there has been discussion with a City Manager about a parking deck. Chair McQueary said he is fine with it, with the modification noted, and would accept a motion. Mr. Gravely moved to adopt the Resolution with the modification as previously suggested, seconded by Mr. Enochs. The Board voted 3-0 in favor of. (Ayes: McQueary, Gravely and Enochs. Nays: None).

## **STAFF UPDATES**

**Comprehensive Plan Update and Speaker Series** Russ Clegg stated staff is transitioning from getting feedback on the goals to the Comprehensive Plan to crafting strategies and policies. They have just wrapped up six different meetings at Rec Centers in different City Council districts and will have a final community pop up meeting at the Farmers Market this Saturday. The online survey will close this Friday night. There are no future speakers lined up right now.

**Heritage House Redevelopment Area** Counsel Kelly said that nothing has changed since the last meeting. The event center piece won't be wrapped up until the trial in March 2019. Mr. Gravely asked about the event center's plans, and Counsel Kelly said they have every intention of staying there. They have been informed that staff and the Commission are willing to work with them to ensure demolition of the residential tower would affect them as little as possible, but they want control of the site or control of the tower, which are not viable options for redevelopment purposes. Chair McQueary asked if they owned the land the event center was on, and Counsel Kelly said they do.

**Ole Asheboro Redevelopment Area** Hart Crane was at the November Commission meeting to talk about the planned project on the A-2, A-3, and A-4 properties. Staff has been working with Prestwick Land Holdings on the Sales/Development Agreement and plan to bring it to the Commission in January and to the City Council later in January.

**Security Badges for Commissioners** Ms. Arkin reminded Commissioners to get their I.D. badges.

**RCG-Owned Property Disposition Analysis and Strategy** Ms. Arkin said there was no update.

**RCG Annual Report – FY2017-18** Ms. Arkin said there was no update.

### **ADDITIONAL BUSINESS**

Ms. Arkin stated that the next meeting is scheduled for January 2<sup>nd</sup>, 2019. Commissioners agreed to move it to the following Wednesday, January 9<sup>th</sup>, 2019.

Chair McQueary thanked all the Board Members and wished everyone happy holidays. He thinks that it has been a great year, and he appreciates how the Commissioners have worked together. He thanked the staff for all their contribution they have put in this year and thanked Councilwoman Hoffmann for her leadership and support of the Redevelopment Commission.

### **ADJOURNMENT**

There being no further business before the Commission, the meeting was adjourned at 6:03 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Sue Schwartz, Planning Director

SS: pr/jd