

**APPROVED MINUTES OF THE
REDEVELOPMENT COMMISSION
OF GREENSBORO
JANUARY 4, 2017**

The regular meeting of the Redevelopment Commission of Greensboro (RCG) was held on Wednesday, January 4, 2017, in the Plaza Level Conference Room of the Melvin Municipal Office Building commencing at 5:00 p.m. The following members were present: Robert Enochs, Chair; Clinton Gravely; Dawn Chaney; and Charles McQueary. Staff present included Dyan Arkin, Hanna Cockburn, and Andrew Kelly, Attorney for the Commission. Also present were Tom Carruthers and Terri Jones, City Attorney's Office; Sue Schwartz, Planning Director; and City Councilwoman, Nancy Hoffmann.

ELECTION OF OFFICERS:

Mr. Gravely moved that all officers remain the same, seconded by Mr. McQueary. The Commission voted unanimously 4-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Enochs, Chaney, Gravely, McQueary. Nays: None.)

APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

a) December 7, 2016

Ms. Chaney moved approval of the December 7, 2016 meeting minutes as written, seconded by Mr. McQueary. The Commission voted 4-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Enochs, Gravely, Chaney, McQueary. Nays: None.)

SOUTH ELM STREET REDEVELOPMENT AREA:

a) Cell Tower Utility Duct

Ms. Arkin stated that the existing cell tower at 508 Arlington Street is a Verizon communications facility. The land is currently under lease with the Redevelopment Commission. They would like to install a conduit for a fiber optic line from the edge of the property line to the cell tower which would cross property owned by the Commission. They are planning to install the line along Arlington Street to service the cell tower.

Members are in receipt of a letter in their packets from the cell tower company regarding the cell tower utility duct. Counsel Kelly has asked that language be added to the document to install the fiber optic cable. Ms. Arkin indicated that they are waiting for Verizon's approval of the additional language.

Counsel Kelly explained that Verizon asked that the document be signed by the Commission with comments. The additional language to be added as a comment requires that the cell tower company has adequate insurance and assumes liability for the work that will be done on the property.

Responding to a question from Mr. McQueary, Counsel Kelly confirmed that this matter will have no bearing on the cell tower lease negotiation that will come due in 2018. No permanent easement would be created at the end of the lease term. Ms. Arkin pointed out that the cell tower company will have to remove their conduit at the end of the lease period.

Chair Enochs asked if the buried fiber optic line would impact the ability of SEDG (South Elm Development Group) to use the land. Counsel Kelly said that the Commission is agreeing that the line can be put in but they are not limiting the ability to do anything else on the property. The Commission is just allowing the cell tower company to bury the fiber optic line as a tenant on the property.

Counsel Kelly read the comment to be included into the record as follows: *Landlords consent to the above described work to be performed as conditioned upon tenant's agreement to indemnify and save harmless the Redevelopment Commission of Greensboro and thereby, the City of Greensboro, it's officers, agents, and employees against all claims, actions, lawsuits, and demands, including reasonable attorney's fees, made by anyone for any damages, losses, or injuries of any kind, including environmental, which may arise from or as a result of the work here and above described, which shall be evidenced by tenant causing said work to be performed.*

Mr. Gravely moved to allow the Chair to sign the agreement with the comment, seconded by Mr. McQueary. The Commission voted 4-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Enochs, Gravely, Chaney, McQueary. Nays: None.)

b) Petition for Annexation into Business Improvement District

Ms. Arkin said it has always been anticipated that the South Elm redevelopment property would be requested to be annexed into the Business Improvement District. At this point, there are not any taxable entities on this property and as far as staff's work plan; the matter of annexation has had no urgency. Downtown Greensboro, Incorporated (DGI) has proposed to bring in several different properties and has asked the Commission to provide a petition to be annexed. She said that the issue is timing and there is not a recommendation from staff about whether or not to become part of the bid although it probably is indicated at some point. It doesn't reduce the responsibility to develop this property or the authority of the Redevelopment Commission in relation to the adopted redevelopment plan for the South Elm area. The proposed annexation would provide for some services to be provided by the Business Improvement District management company which is DGI at this point.

Ms. Arkin felt that there was some potential confusion between what the Union Square Covenants, Conditions, and Restrictions (CCR's) require and what the bid could provide. In conversations with the master developer, staff has agreed that should this move forward to the point where annexation into the bid is eminent, the CCR's will be amended to allow for both the CCR's to govern and for the bid to provide services without duplication or without a double payment being required by future developers or future property owners. She explained that there is an assessment associated with being part of the bid. The assessment does not apply to non-profits or to government owned properties so it does not apply to the Commission's property at this time.

Mr. McQueary stated his opinion that it makes sense to become part of what is considered to be downtown as early as possible so that development of the area is thought about in those terms.

Ms. Chaney noted that the property exchanged with the Gray family is not included in the petition request. Only property owned by the Commission is covered under the petition. She felt the Gray property should be included if the boundary is to go to the Greenway. Ms. Arkin clarified that the ultimate decision for whether or not to sign a petition to request annexation lies with the property owner and would rest with Mr. Gray.

Zach Matheny, 536 South Elm Street, said that it is the intent of DGI to work with folks who want to be a part of the Business Improvement District and he would like for the district to be extended to inside the Greenway. At this point, they are only working with those who express interest in being in the district. Five properties located along side of the Greenway have petitioned to join the Business Improvement District which is why the timing of this request actually works moving forward. Mr. Matheny hoped that Mr. Gray would see the benefit of his property inside the redevelopment area coming into the bid since he does have other buildings inside the bid as well.

Mr. Matheny stated that John Merrill, project leader for Union Square Campus; Bob Chapman, SEDG; and Mr. Kitchen, Chairman of the Board at USC; have all indicated support for annexation petition.

Chair Enochs asked Mr. Matheny to comment on the advantage of petitioning to be in the bid now as opposed to later when there is more development activity. Mr. Matheny said that petitioning now to be in the bid is a good idea because there is currently momentum downtown and people in the private sector want to be a part of that momentum. There are already petitions in place and DGI would like to try to annex as many properties as possible at the same time.

Bob Chapman, SEDG, strongly supported and endorsed joining the bid now and said it is important for Union Square to be part of downtown. In addition, it is important for this to be in place before the next component developer gets involved because being part of the Business Improvement District will be viewed as an advantage.

Chair Enochs indicated that he did not see any downside to the bid and saw no reason to put it off until a later date.

Ms. Chaney agreed and felt that the Commission should move forward with the bid to increase the viability of downtown. She felt that all property owners in this particular area should be incorporated into the bid. Counsel Kelly said that Mr. Gray can be encouraged to join the bid but there is no way to enforce that. Ms. Arkin said that staff is in good communication with the Gray family and can let them know about the Commission's decision to endorse the bid. They have been very open in the past about trying to understand the Commission's vision for the South Elm Street redevelopment area.

Mr. McQueary moved to petition for annexation of the South Elm Street redevelopment property into the Business Improvement District, seconded by Mr. Gravely. The Commission voted 4-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Enochs, Chaney, Gravely, McQueary. Nays: None.)

c) Stormwater Easement

Ms. Arkin informed members that the stormwater facility is actually located on the USC property but the easement extends and encroaches a distance of less than 20 feet. The City is requesting that the easement be granted because it is an easement to the City for the maintenance of their stormwater.

Mr. Gravely moved to grant the easement, seconded by Ms. Chaney. The Commission voted 4-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Enochs, Chaney, Gravely, McQueary. Nays: None.)

STAFF UPDATES:

Ms. Arkin stated that the Family Dollar Store ribbon cutting ceremony is scheduled for this Saturday, January 7, 2017 but may be cancelled due to the weekend weather forecast for snow. A decision about whether to postpone or reschedule the ceremony will be made on Friday, January 6, 2017.

Sue Schwartz, Planning Director, distributed copies of the Development Trends Report. The report is put out several times a year; however, the January report is the most comprehensive. Several good pieces of news are reflected in the report and she noted that the poverty rate in the City has significantly declined from 19.6 percent to 16.2 percent. In addition, the impact from bringing more jobs into Greensboro is starting to cycle into the economy. Councilwoman Nancy Hoffmann commented that the trends are moving in a good direction and she feels development will continue to be very good moving forward.

At the request of Mr. McQueary, Ms. Schwartz described the process of gathering information used in the report.

Ms. Schwartz commented that an area that could be improved involves the declining millennial population. Councilwoman Hoffman said that millennials are 8 percent of the population and that number needs to be at least 12 percent moving toward 15 percent. The declining number is job related and ways must be found to retain the student population that leaves the area after graduation.

ADDITIONAL BUSINESS:

Bob Chapman, SEDG, provided an update on the South Elm Street redevelopment area. He said that all across the country, cities are embracing their downtown area and he expressed enthusiasm for what is happening on South Elm Street. There are nine active prospects for parcels at USC and five of the prospects are very promising. He briefly reviewed highlights of the past five years that included the successful land swap with the Gray family, solving the railroad issue and gaining clear title, securing Trademark Properties to market the redevelopment area, and renaming Lee Street/High Point Road to Gate City Boulevard to serve as the gateway to downtown. He felt that amazing development commitments would be made in the next few months and he expressed enthusiasm for the future of the redevelopment area moving forward.

Ms. Arkin said the land use restrictions in the yearly Brownfields Agreement update need to be certified to NCDEQ (North Carolina Department of Environmental Quality). The report needs to be received by January 21, 2017. She requested that the Commission authorize staff to complete preparation and submittal of this report and approve or authorize signature by the Chair. According to Counsel, the final document can be part of the February, 2017 meeting for review and ratification of today's action can be made at that time.

Ms. Chaney moved to authorize staff to prepare the report, to authorize the Chair to sign the report and then following its submission, the Commission can ratify action taken by staff at the February, 2017 meeting. The motion was seconded by Mr. Gravely. The Commission voted 4-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Enochs, Chaney, Gravely, McQueary. Nays: None.)

At 6:13 p.m., Chair Enochs called for a brief recess and the Reporter was asked to stop recording due to the Closed Session.

MATTERS TO BE PRESENTED BY RCG ATTORNEY IN CLOSED SESSION:

Commissioner Chaney moved that the Commission go into closed session to preserve the attorney-client privilege in consulting with its legal counsel concerning the handling or settlement of a claim pursuant to G.S. 143-318.11(a) (3). The motion was seconded by Commissioner Gravely. The Commission voted 4-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Enochs, Chaney, Gravely, McQueary. Nays: None.)

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business before the Group, the meeting was adjourned at 7:06pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Sue Schwartz
Planning Director
SS: sm/jd

**APPROVED MINUTES OF THE
REDEVELOPMENT COMMISSION
OF GREENSBORO
FEBRUARY 1, 2017**

The regular meeting of the Redevelopment Commission of Greensboro (RCG) was held on Wednesday, February 1, 2017, in the Plaza Level Conference Room of the Melvin Municipal Office Building commencing at 5:00 p.m. The following members were present: Clinton Gravely, Acting Chair; Charles McQueary; Dawn Chaney; and Angela Harris. Staff present included Dyan Arkin, Hanna Cockburn, and Andrew Kelly, Attorney for the Commission. Also present was City Councilwoman, Nancy Hoffmann.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

a) January 4, 2017

Ms. Harris moved approval of the January 4, 2017 meeting minutes as amended, seconded by Ms. Chaney. The Commission voted 4-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Gravely, Chaney, McQueary, Harris. Nays: None.)

SOUTH ELM STREET REDEVELOPMENT AREA:

a) Union Square Campus Certificate of Completion

Ms. Arkin stated that the City of Greensboro has issued the Certificate of Occupancy establishing the substantial completion of construction of the first Union Square Campus (USC) building. The Commission can now issue the Certificate of Completion of Improvements which has been prepared by Counsel Kelly. Members are in receipt of the final version of the Certificate of Completion for approval and authorization for the Vice-Chair to sign for the Chair who is absent this evening due to illness.

Chair Gravely asked Ms. Arkin to send a copy of the Certificate of Occupancy to Commission members.

Counsel Kelly said now that Union Square Campus has received the final Certificate of Occupancy for the property at 124 East Gate City Boulevard, also known as Lot 1, the Commission is allowed to issue its Certificate of Completion of Improvements which is called for under its Sales and Development Agreement with Union Square Campus. When the certificate has been approved and issued, the master developer can commence the sale and development of another component parcel of the property within 6 months from issuance of the certificate. If USC were to exercise its option and make plans for the development of Lot 2, then the master developer would satisfy requirements under Section 9.3 of the Master Development Agreement.

Mr. McQueary moved to approve and authorize the Vice-Chair to sign the Certificate of Completion of Improvements, seconded by Ms. Chaney. The Commission voted 4-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Gravely, Chaney, McQueary, Harris. Nays: None.)

STAFF UPDATES:

Marcus Jackson, 1001 Wade Avenue, Raleigh, North Carolina is the Managing Director of Urban Investments for Trademark Properties. Trademark Properties has been retained by the master developer, South Elm Development Group (SEDG), to market the 2.9 acre future multifamily site at Union Square which is the west side of South Elm Street. Mr. Jackson distributed a final draft of marketing materials for SEDG to Commission members and explained his marketing program. The draft was designed to promote the 2.9 acres as well as Union Square and downtown Greensboro. His

goal is to be fully in the market by next week. They have already been talking to a number of developers who have shown interest. The project will not be put out to the market until next week when it will aggressively be marketed with listings through online services such as LoopNet. In addition, the project will be placed on Trademark's website and networking will occur to generate as much activity as possible.

Ms. Cockburn thanked Commissioners who attended the ribbon cutting ceremony for the new Family Dollar that was constructed on Martin Luther King, Jr. Drive. She reported that the store has been very busy since it opened. Responding to a request from Mr. McQueary, she indicated that staff can keep members informed on the economic viability of the store moving forward. She commented that the neighborhood association is very pleased with the store.

Ms. Chaney suggested that Commissioners be given a rating on the new Family Dollar's first quarter report as it compares to other stores that have opened in the same time period.

ADDITIONAL BUSINESS:

None.

MATTERS TO BE PRESENTED BY RCG ATTORNEY:

Counsel Kelly presented a resolution to allow the Chair to approve closed session minutes and general accountings as a matter of efficiency.

Counsel Kelly read the Resolution to Allow the Chair to Approve Closed Session Minutes and General Accountings into the record as follows:

WHEREAS, the Redevelopment Commission of Greensboro ("RCG") is a public body;

WHEREAS, on occasion, RCG has cause to enter into closed session pursuant to North Carolina General Statute 143-318.11;

WHEREAS, RCG desires that the closed session minutes and/or general accounting nevertheless be approved and maintained until such time it is appropriate that they be opened for public inspection.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE REDEVELOPMENT COMMISSION OF GREENSBORO:

That, in order to promote efficiency, the Chair of the Redevelopment Commission of Greensboro, in his/her discretion, may approve the closed session minutes and general accountings of this Commission.

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED:

That the attorney for the Redevelopment Commission of Greensboro shall monitor whether the purpose for which any such minutes and/or general accountings would no longer be frustrated by public inspection and that upon such time, the particular minutes and/or general accountings shall be unsealed.

Mr. McQueary moved approval of the Resolution as presented, seconded by Ms. Harris. The Commission voted 4-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Gravely, Chaney, McQueary, Harris. Nays: None.)

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business before the Group, the meeting was adjourned at 5:34 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Sue Schwartz
Planning Director
SS: sm/jd

**APPROVED MINUTES OF THE
REDEVELOPMENT COMMISSION
OF GREENSBORO
MARCH 1, 2017**

The regular meeting of the Redevelopment Commission of Greensboro (RCG) was held on Wednesday, March 1, 2017, in the Plaza Level Conference Room of the Melvin Municipal Office Building commencing at 5:00 p.m. The following members were present: Robert Enochs, Chair; Clinton Gravely; Charles McQueary; and Angela Harris. Staff present included Dyan Arkin, Hanna Cockburn, and Andrew Kelly, Attorney for the Commission.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

a) February 1, 2017

Mr. Gravely moved approval of the February 1, 2017 meeting minutes as amended, seconded by Ms. Harris. The Commission voted 4-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Enochs, Gravely, McQueary, Harris. Nays: None.)

ROSEWOOD REDEVELOPMENT AREA:

a) Conveyance of Rosewood Park to City of Greensboro

Ms. Arkin explained that ownership of Rosewood Park was never transferred from the Redevelopment Commission to the City of Greensboro. The Commission was asked to consider the conveyance of Rosewood Park to the City of Greensboro.

Mr. McQueary moved to convey Rosewood Park to the City of Greensboro, seconded by Ms. Harris. The Commission voted 4-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Enochs, Gravely, McQueary, Harris. Nays: None.)

SOUTH ELM STREET REDEVELOPMENT AREA:

a) Arlington Street Cell Tower Consent—Indemnification Language

The Commission recently signed a document allowing the cell tower company to cross Redevelopment Commission land with their conduit. Modified language was sent back and forth between Verizon and the RCG attorney. Ms. Arkin reported that Verizon has since approved the modified language sent to them by Counsel Kelly. She asked the Commission to consider signing the revised document.

Chair Enochs asked staff to clarify what items in the revised document had changed since the Commission signed the original document. Counsel Kelly said that the modified document states that Verizon indemnifies the Commission from any type of liability that would occur as a result of the proposed work. In addition, Verizon has affirmatively stated that they will do the proposed work. He read the recommended modified language into the record as follows:

“Tenant agrees to indemnify and save harmless the Redevelopment Commission of Greensboro and thereby, the City of Greensboro, its officers, agents and employees, against all claims resulting from or arising out of the negligence or willful misconduct by Tenant, its employees, contractors or agents in performance of the work herein above described, except to the extent such claims or damages may be due to or caused by the negligence of willful misconduct of the Landlord, or its employees, contractors or agents”

Mr. Gravely moved approval of the indemnification language added to the agreement on the Arlington Street Cell Tower consent, seconded by Ms. Harris. The Commission voted 4-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Enochs, Gravely, McQueary, Harris. Nays: None.)

GUEST LECTURE ON CULTIVATING NEIGHBORHOODS:

Ms. Arkin informed members that the City of Greensboro is one of the sponsors putting together a workshop being done by the Incremental Development Alliance, a non-profit organization. The night prior to the event there will be a free seminar given by a guest lecturer who periodically works with Incremental Development Alliance. The lecturer will introduce the concept of incremental development and talk about cultivating neighborhoods.

Reggie Delahanty, Economic Development and Business Support Office with the City of Greensboro, gave an overview of the two events and answered questions from the Commission. Incremental develop is a popular topic in planning and development. It focuses more on the neighborhood and how to encourage citizens to invest in their own community and build their own wealth. Monte Anderson has been scheduled to lead the workshop and also to be the guest lecturer at the free seminar.

Ms. Arkin indicated that staff has talked about putting together a presentation board at the seminar and having flyers and information about available properties owned by the Redevelopment Commission.

The Commission was asked to consider supporting the free lecture with a sponsorship of \$1,000.

Members discussed how to measure the success of efforts to create incremental small development and defining the next steps. Ms. Cockburn pointed out that several things are aligning in the City that will play into this initiative. She explained that when the bond referendum was passed last November, four million dollars was set aside to establish a new program to support small scale infill development and this initiative fits very nicely into that. The City has struggled to secure developers for sites the Redevelopment Commission and GHDP (Greensboro Housing Development Partnership) have interest in. This initiative starts a conversation with members of the community to create local developers who want to invest in their community and bring a project to fruition.

Mr. McQueary was supportive of the sponsorship with the caveat the Commission needs to see something that shows this initiative has the potential for growth and not just funding for a one day session. He would like to see something to convince him there is reinforcement to build upon what is learned at the workshop. Mr. Gravely commented that the key point in pursuing this initiative is being able to take it further to make incremental development a reality. Ms. Harris would be supportive of the sponsoring the class but preferred that the lecture be done in house.

Mr. McQueary moved to support the lecture with a sponsorship of \$1,000 as requested by staff, seconded by Mr. Gravely. The Commission voted 3-1 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Gravely, McQueary, Harris. Nays: Enochs.)

Staff noted concerns stated by the Commission. They plan to return with a plan to address the concerns that have been raised.

STAFF UPDATES:

Ms. Arkin invited Commissioners to attend the March 7, 2017 City Council meeting to approve annexation of RCG and other property into the Business Improvement District.

Staff asked the Commission to consider moving from paper copies of the meeting agenda and notes to a fully electronic version that would be emailed to members. A paper copy can be sent upon request in addition to the electronic version. Following discussion, Commissioners agreed to receive the electronic

version for a few months to see how it works out. Members requested that a paper copy be available at the meeting.

ADDITIONAL BUSINESS:

It was requested by Mr. McQueary at an earlier meeting that the Redevelopment Commission bylaws be updated to be gender neutral and inclusive. Staff has updated the bylaws to accommodate this request. Ms. Arkin distributed copies of the updated bylaws reflecting the requested changes. Commissioners will review the updated bylaws and vote on their acceptance at the next meeting.

Referring to Heritage House, Counsel Kelly said that in 2016 the Commission approved a resolution for the City to file to process in accordance with the redevelopment plan. Counsel Kelly requested the Commission to specifically authorize him to file an eminent domain action on behalf of the Redevelopment Commission against the remaining units. There are 27 remaining units and 18 defendants including property owners as well anybody who has an interest in the property. Counsel Kelly read the language into the record as follows:

RESOLUTON AUTHORIZING FILING OF EMINENT DOMAIN PROCEEDING

WHEREAS, the Redevelopment Commission of Greensboro ("RCG") is a public body authorized to exercise the right of eminent domain pursuant to North Carolina General Statue 160A-515:

WHEREAS, upon motion duly made and carried at its July 6, 2016 meeting, the RCG authorized acquisition of the remaining blighted units within the Heritage House Redevelopment Area;

WHEREAS, it appears to the RCG that the condemnation of said remaining blighted units is necessary to implement redevelopment of the property known as Heritage House in accordance with the Heritage House Redevelopment Plan;

WHEREAS; the RCG now desires to specifically authorize the filing of an eminent domain proceeding to acquire said remaining blighted units;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE REDEVELOPMENT COMMISSION OF GREENSBORO:

That, in accordance with the North Carolina General Statues 160A-515 and 40A, the RCG hereby instructs its attorney to institute the necessary proceedings to acquire the blighted units within the Heritage House Redevelopment Area that have not otherwise already been acquired and transferred to the RCG as of the date of this resolution.

Mr. Gravely moved to accept the resolution authorizing the filing of eminent domain proceedings as presented, seconded by Mr. McQueary. The Commission voted 4-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Enochs, Gravely, McQueary, Harris. Nays: None.)

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business before the Group, the meeting was adjourned at 6:05 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Sue Schwartz
 Planning Director
 SS: sm/jd

**APPROVED MINUTES OF THE
REDEVELOPMENT COMMISSION
OF GREENSBORO
MAY 3, 2017**

The regular meeting of the Redevelopment Commission of Greensboro (RCG) was held on Wednesday, May 3, 2017, in the Plaza Level Conference Room of the Melvin Municipal Office Building commencing at 5:00 p.m. The following members were present: Robert Enochs, Chair; Clinton Gravely; Charles McQueary; Dawn Chaney; and Angela Harris. Staff present included Dyan Arkin, Hanna Cockburn and Russ Clegg. Also present was Andrew Kelly, Attorney for the Commission.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

a) March 1, 2017

Ms. Harris moved approval of the March 1, 2017 meeting minutes as written, seconded by Mr. Gravely. The Commission voted 5-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Enochs, Gravely, McQueary, Chaney, Harris. Nays: None.)

WILLOW OAKS REDEVELOPMENT AREA:

a) Willow Oaks Redevelopment Plan Update

Russ Clegg, Planning Department, reviewed the update recommendations and said that Commissioners will be receiving a draft of the update shortly. He provided background information on the Willow Oaks neighborhood and described areas of the redevelopment as they exist today.

The Advisory Committee for the update was composed of stakeholders, area schools, business representatives, and City staff as well as a neighborhood steering committee to help drive participation and develop an overall sense of the neighborhood. Positive feedback was received from the neighborhood about the way things have been developed. He noted that the residents of Willow Oaks are anxious to see everything finished out in the neighborhood. The following key issues were noted as a result of the public process: (1) changes in the market resulted in positioning the neighborhood differently to get development started; (2) there is a need to address concerns of the residents such as parking and green space issues since the neighborhood has now been lived in for several years; (3) transitioning between Willow Oaks and the bigger redevelopment area is an issue; and (4) there should be a flexible program that will attract new development but also maintain the high standard of architecture and quality of houses that currently exist.

To aid in developing the update plan and identify opportunity sites, the entire redevelopment area was divided into five different zones. Area 1 is the core zone and the goal is to complete filling in this area. They are looking at building a two to three story building to accommodate senior citizens. Referring to a map, Mr. Clegg identified the location of a proposed traffic circle. Where they were originally looking at commercial property, an open air covered flexible space is being proposed that could accommodate food trucks, a farmers market or neighborhood activities. There will be an open green space behind this area. They are proposing alley-loaded attached single-family homes next to the open air market area with detached single-family homes nearby. The attached and detached homes would build on the infrastructure that is already there.

Referring to the map, Mr. Clegg pointed out areas with gaps in housing and indicated that Area 2 will be used to fill in these areas with single-family housing.

Area 3 is being seen as an area not so much for City investment but as supporting the rehabilitation of housing that is already there. Older obsolete housing will be replaced.

Area 4 is located on the other side of Highway 29 and is the site of several three-story apartment buildings that will continue to be marketed primarily to students who attend nearby universities. This will provide an opportunity for more people to move into the neighborhood

Development in Area 5 will more than likely be a longer term project and will require a significant investment. Better road circulation and putting in a different type of housing stock will be necessary to create a more cohesive neighborhood.

Additional suggestions in the plan relate to the parking situation. Allowing people to take advantage of parking that is already there and finding new places to put in parking spaces will help alleviate some of the parking concerns. Other recommendations include taking some of the vacant lots to create passive outdoor green space and connecting the neighborhood in a better way to the YMCA, universities, and other amenities in the area and along Gate City Boulevard.

A draft of the plan will be released shortly for public review. After the review process, staff will present the redevelopment plan and neighborhood plan to the RCG and the Planning Board before it goes to City Council.

RCG BY-LAWS:

(a) Consideration of Revisions

This item was postponed until the next meeting.

STAFF UPDATES:

Ms. Arkin followed up with the City Clerk's office about terms of service for Commissioners. She indicated that Chair Enochs and Ms. Chaney are currently eligible for reappointment. Ms. Arkin plans to speak with the City Clerk's office regarding their reappointments. Mr. McQueary will be eligible for reappointment at the end of December, 2017; Mr. Gravely's term runs through 2020; and Ms. Harris will be eligible for reappointment at the end of 2018 when her term expires.

Ms. Arkin informed members that the Family Dollar Store on Martin Luther King, Jr. Drive is for sale. She requested more information from the developer of the store but has not received a response. She will update the Commission when information becomes available.

At the last meeting, Commission members asked staff to follow up on the March 20, 2017 Incremental Development Workshop and come up with plans for steps that can be taken to maintain the momentum. There have been several internal meetings about what to do next and how to offer opportunities to the public. Ms. Arkin will be meeting tomorrow with Reggie Delahanty, Economic Development and Business Support Office with the City of Greensboro, who has been in touch with the Incremental Development Alliance. She reported that the talk that was held the evening before the workshop was very well attended. The next day was the actual workshop and approximately 90 people were in attendance. There were many conversations between the participants about ways they could partner and move forward to get additional information. She plans to discuss plans to move to the next level for interaction with the Incremental Development Alliance and their 2-day boot camp which is specifically designed for small developers or incremental development people who have projects. She will advise the Commission at the next meeting about requirements or commitments for the boot camp.

ADDITIONAL BUSINESS:

Ms. Arkin distributed the latest installment of the Growth and Development Trends report to Commission members. This issue focuses on job creation and associated development activity.

Ms. Arkin provided an update on the South Elm Street Redevelopment Area and the master development group. There have been several visits to the site by residential and mixed-use developers. South Elm Development Group is anticipating receiving a letter of intent from one of those developers. Most of the developers are talking about developing the whole block as one project.

The construction of the Greenway in the redevelopment area has begun. The deadline for completion is mid-June of this year; however, it is likely that they will ask for an extension. Design of the Phase Two infrastructure has also begun. They are working with an engineering firm to update and finish the design plans that were previously done. The design plans will come back to the Redevelopment Commission for review and approval when they have been completed.

Counsel Kelly advised the Commission that papers have been filed and the City is working to acquire the remaining 27 Heritage House units at their appraised value.

Ms. Arkin stated that staff sent a letter to Bob Chapman, South Elm Development Group, using the Certificate of Completion of Improvements, authorized by the RCG on February 1, 2017, as the trigger point for the clause within the master development agreement that begins the six-month period to present another component parcel. Therefore, another component parcel will need to be brought to the Commission by September 1, 2017. Counsel Kelly indicated that no response has been received from the master developer regarding the letter.

Ms. Arkin said she has frequent communication with Bob Chapman and he contacted her immediately after receiving the letter. He discussed meetings that were being held with interested developers and marketing of the property. He felt that the timeline for September 1, 2017 can be met.

Ms. Chaney requested that the Commission go into closed session to review Heritage House.

Ms. Chaney moved that the Commission go into closed session to preserve the attorney-client privilege in consulting with its legal counsel concerning the handling or settlement of a claim pursuant to G.S. 143-318.11 (a)(3). The motion was seconded by Mr. Gravely. The Commission voted unanimously 5-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Enochs, Chaney, Gravely, McQueary, Harris. Nays: None.)

Ms. Chaney moved to go out of closed session, seconded by Ms. Harris. The Commission voted unanimously 5-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Enochs, Chaney, Gravely, McQueary, Harris. Nays: None.)

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business before the Group, the meeting was adjourned at 6:08 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Sue Schwartz
Planning Director
SS: sm/jd

**MINUTES OF THE
REDEVELOPMENT COMMISSION
OF GREENSBORO
JULY 5, 2017**

The regular meeting of the Redevelopment Commission of Greensboro (RCG) was held on Wednesday, July 5, 2017, in the Plaza Level Conference Room of the Melvin Municipal Office Building commencing at 5:00 p.m. The following members were present: Robert Enochs, Chair; Clinton Gravely; Charles McQueary; Dawn Chaney; and Angela Harris. Staff present included Dyan Arkin, Hanna Cockburn and Russ Clegg. Also present was Andrew Kelly, Attorney for the Commission.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

a) May 3, 2017

Mr. Gravely moved approval of the May 3, 2017 meeting minutes as written, seconded by Ms. Chaney. The Commission voted 5-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Enochs, Gravely, McQueary, Chaney, Harris. Nays: None.)

WILLOW OAKS REDEVELOPMENT AREA:

a) Willow Oaks Redevelopment Plan Update Public Hearing (FAVORABLE RECOMMENDATION)

Hanna Cockburn stated that Russ Clegg would be making the presentation. Staff had presented an overview of the plan to the Commission at previous meetings and printed copies of the Plan were given to each Commission member for their review. Staff explained that the Commission was asked to hold a public hearing and to vote whether or not to recommend the Plan to City Council for their consideration, and to ask the Planning Board to conduct a technical review of the plan as per North Carolina Redevelopment Law.

Russ Clegg, Planning Department, stated that Commissioners have received a draft of the update. He provided background information on the Willow Oaks neighborhood and described the area in the Redevelopment boundaries as it exists today. The Willow Oaks Neighborhood Plan is a plan within a plan and the area in the Redevelopment Plan is bigger than the Willow Oaks neighborhood. The Willow Oaks Neighborhood Plan focuses on the area for which the Greensboro Housing Authority received a Hope VI Grant to replace Morningside Homes with a neo-Traditional mixed income neighborhood based on traditional building methods. The Willow Oaks Redevelopment Plan is a bigger area, which was designed to spread that improvement out across neighborhood broader area. Staff is recommending that the Plan name be changed from Morningside/Lincoln Grove Redevelopment Plan to Willow Oaks Redevelopment Plan.

Per North Carolina Redevelopment Law, the RCG holds a public hearing and then makes a recommendation to City Council and asks City Council to hold a public hearing at their next meeting and consider adoption.. The Planning Board reviews the technical aspects of the Plan and makes a recommendation to City Council to either adopt the Plan, not adopt the Plan, or adopt it with some modifications, The Neighborhood Plan piece has been reviewed by the Planning Board at a public hearing at their last meeting in July and their recommendation will also be going to City Council at the September 5, 2017 meeting.

This project started before the year 2000, with a lot of planning, meetings, and neighborhood input from Morningside Homes and surrounding residents. In 2000, the original Redevelopment Plan was

adopted. A master developer was selected and the development went well until the recession in 2008, when development stopped. However, at that point, enough had been completed for the Greensboro Housing Authority to close out their original grant for the Hope VI project, and development transitioned to the RCG and the Greensboro Housing Development Partnership. A few years later, the Agreement with the developer ended, so at this point in time there is no Master Developer or builder on site associated with the project. Since that time, City staff put out a commercial RFP in 2014, which did not get any responses. They have worked with the neighborhood to get a sense of what development would make sense to them. They also worked with the National Development Council on technical analyses.. Mr. Clegg showed a map of the redevelopment area, which is substantially bigger than the Willow Oaks neighborhood. It was originally divided into five (5) zones, which were shown on the map and explained in detail.

The planning process started last fall with three public meetings. A Technical Advisory Committee, composed of stakeholders, area schools, business representatives, and City staff, and a neighborhood steering committee helped drive participation and develop an overall sense of the neighborhood. Positive feedback was received from the neighborhood about the way things have been developed. Mr. Clegg noted that the residents of Willow Oaks are anxious to see everything finished out in the neighborhood. The following key issues were noted as a result of the public process: provide smooth transitions between the Willow Oaks neighborhood and the surrounding areas; address parking and green space issues that have become apparent since the neighborhood has now been lived in for several years; and create a flexible program that will attract new development but also maintain the high standard of architecture and quality of houses that currently exist.

The boundaries of the updated Redevelopment Plan are the same as what was originally adopted. At this time there is no plan to purchase additional property or do additional relocations.

In terms of land use, this plan does not have any changes to the General Future Land Use Maps (GFLUM). The one suggestion for a zoning change would be to increase the area of traditional neighborhood zoning, but that will not be done at this time since the area will probably not be ripe for redevelopment for a while.

The Plan addresses identified parking issues by adding stripes where there is on-street parking to make it clear that parking is allowed there and by moving the curb over to create some parking spaces where possible. In areas of new development, more parking will be included.

Other recommendations include taking some of the vacant lots to create passive outdoor green space and connecting the neighborhood in a better way to the YMCA, universities, and other amenities in the area and along Gate City Boulevard.

Suggested changes to the streets include possibly adding a round-about in the area at the corner of Gillespie Street and McConnell Road and closing off a portion of Lincoln Street to alleviate some of the traffic issues in the area. Another suggestion is an open air, roofed commercial space that would be a good way to create a neighborhood center without building a commercial building that may become vacant based on current estimates of demand for retail. The community could start with a pop-up farmer's market and pop-up tents to see what would work in this area and what the neighborhood is interested in doing. The Plan proposes alley-loaded attached single-family homes next to the open air market area with detached single-family homes nearby. The attached and detached homes would build on the infrastructure that is already there.

He explained that Area 3 is being seen as an area rehabilitation of housing that is already there and for the replacement of older obsolete housing. The Plan does not call for direct City involvement in this area.

Area 4 is located on the other side of Highway 29 and is the site of several three-story apartment buildings that will continue to be marketed primarily to students who attend nearby universities. The Plan recommends keeping the zoning the same in this area.

Development in Area 5 is projected to be a long-term project and will require a significant investment. Better road circulation and putting in a different type of housing stock will be necessary to create a more cohesive neighborhood.

In response to questions posed by Commission members, Mr. Clegg stated that the big changes would be consolidation of the existing plans into one document, so from a developer's standpoint, it would be a lot simpler. Flexibility is being added to the design standards to make it a better opportunity for development without compromising quality. Staff is also working on the platting for the area and trying to make more flexibility. They are also conscientiously making green space. Plan implementation will be monitored by staff and the neighborhood residents.

Councilwoman Hightower stated that she is very opposed to a Family Dollar in this area. Sue Schwartz stated that staff has also done a market research report by an outside entity and one report stated that the recommendation is for a flexible event space in this area for more of a community market space.

Chair Enochs asked if there were speakers wishing to speak on this matter.

Public Hearing:

Maria Hamlin, Habitat for Humanity of Greater Greensboro, stated that they applaud all the work that has gone into this Plan and that the architectural standards are very high. She feels it would serve the community better if there was affordable and work force housing development. She likes the farmer's market idea. Habitat has built six houses in this area and renovated five. She suggests that lot sizes be increased to allow room for a rear yard for families with children, and parking should be addressed. She also mentioned that steep stairways are unsafe, and they have found that their clients are not interested in that style of house. The elderly population would also have difficulty with that type of stairway.

Phil Barbee, Habitat for Humanity Director of Land Development, stated that they are trying to build houses that work for both young families and the aging in place residents. The architectural guidelines produce beautiful, but expensive houses, and some of the requirements, especially the windows are much more expensive. Some of the trim required added to the costs.

Councilwoman Hightower stated that they have been working closely with the neighbors about what their community wants and she hears the concerns from Habitat that they want to make it affordable for them to build, but they cannot always just go the cheap route. Standards were put in Willow Oaks for a reason and Willow Oaks is in a great area. One of the failures of Willows Oaks was marketing and it is recognized that marketing was not done very well on those properties. Now is the opportunity to market this area properly and be able to promote this community to its highest and best use. The idea of a farmer's market is great and the neighbors are the ones that suggested that. There are community gardens all around and that is one way to pull people in a cohesive way to be able to network with one another.

There being no other speakers the public hearing was closed.

Mr. Enochs moved to recommend the proposed Willow Oaks Plan to City Council as submitted by staff, seconded by Mr. McQueary. The Commission voted 5-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Enochs, Harris, McQueary, Gravely, and Chaney. Nays: None.)

SOUTH ELM STREET REDEVELOPMENT AREA

(a) Master Developer Update

Robert Chapman, South Elm Development Group, stated that Southside is a model for the whole country as it is diverse, integrated, and has a range of housing prices available. It has been four years since they signed a 12-year Master Developer Agreement with the Redevelopment Commission. The first objective was to write some very stringent architectural guidelines, green building guidelines, and to then begin the process of recruiting occupants to this site. The first focus was on winning the competition to be the site of the downtown university campus, Union Square Campus. About 20 different sites were considered, and this one was chosen. Last year, they signed a Letter of Intent with a very well-known local developer who wanted to acquire all the property on the west side of South Elm Street to build 260 or more apartments. As they began crunching the numbers they ran into a brick wall with low comparable rents, and ultimately, their president stated they simply could not give their investors the return on equity that they had to have to get the equity needed to do the project. So last September, they excused themselves and the Letter of Intent was negated. Last summer, Bob Isner introduced them to a developer from Charlotte, who assigned two people to work on making their plans happen. They then determined that they, also, could not make the numbers work. Another development company was then identified, and they said that they needed substantial subsidy from the City in order to make the project work. He invited Marcus Jackson to speak on the matter at this time.

Marcus Jackson, Managing Director of Urban Investments for Trademark Properties, based in Raleigh, NC, presented an information package to the Commission members. He specializes in investment advisory services, both brokerage and development, only in urban locations. He has a heavy presence in Durham, Raleigh and Chapel Hill and is now prominently entering the Triad area, although he has been operating in the Triad area for about 15 years. In their research on multifamily rents, they found that Greensboro tends to range around \$1.35/sq. ft. Rents would need to be raised to \$1.60/sq. ft. to justify urban apartment construction, which would include a parking deck. The City of Greensboro has shown a will and capacity to develop and provide housing for this area. With regard to marketing, they have done email blasts and deployed a number of different vehicles to promote a property, including LoopNet, which is similar to MLS listings for commercial property sales. They have also been speaking with a number of multifamily developers and other types of developers hoping to get some response on this project.

Mr. McQueary stated that A&T State University has a very strong Engineering school and their relationships may be important to potential developers. John Merrill would be the best contact person.

Bob Chapman stated that in January they received a call from a person that he and Marcus had met a number of times in Winston-Salem, Milt Rhodes, who is a resident of Southside and works for Arden Development Group, which is a subsidiary or controlled by Parks Family, (Parks Motor Company) in the region, and their principal is a planner at heart, and was a member of the Planning Department of the City of New York for many years. He showed a short clip of a development he worked on with Milt Rhodes in Durham, a Master Plan for infill development on a 13 acre car dealership site. That project did not move forward because another entity purchased that property.

Greenline Holdings, an arm of the Arden Development Group, has submitted a Letter of Intent (LOI) for development of the three acres between South Elm Street and the railroad tracks.

Dyan Arkin stated that the LOI can be discussed further at the scheduled August meeting, unless there is a need for a Special Called meeting before then. Mr. Chapman stated that Mr. Rhodes has stated that he would be happy to come a make a presentation and answer the Commission members' questions in about two weeks. Mr. McQueary asked that Dyan and Bob work together and let the Commission know if a Special meeting is needed before the August meeting to discuss the LOI.

Evon Smith, South Elm Development Group, stated that she developed some of the first for-sale housing in downtown Winston-Salem and feels that it really spawned a sense of ownership and place making, because it showed the area was not a transient community. It was very well received. She wants to see the right thing done for the community here in Greensboro, also.

Bob Isner, South Elm Development Group, stated that Commissioners should go visit the Arlington Street townhomes as they are a unique property and have really been an upgrade for this area. Ms. Arkin asked Commissioners to look at the website for the Weldon Village, which the Arden Group is developing. Website information is included in the Commission members' packets.

Mr. McQueary suggested that Ms. Arkin move forward with SEDG. Chair Enochs asked that Ms. Arkin keep the Commission updated.

RCG BY-LAWS:

(a) Consideration of Revisions

Ms. Chaney moved to recommend the revisions to the By-Laws, as submitted by staff, seconded by Ms. Harris. The Commission voted 5-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Enochs, Harris, McQueary, Gravely, and Chaney. Nays: None.)

STAFF UPDATES:

Ms. Arkin followed up with the Clerk's office on term expiration dates for Commission members. She has clarified the process. Ms. Chaney has been reappointed. Mr. Enochs has not been reappointed, and staff is still waiting on information on that. Mr. McQueary will be eligible for reappointment at the end of December, 2017; Mr. Gravely's term runs through 2020; and Ms. Harris will be eligible for reappointment at the end of 2018 when her term expires.

Ms. Arkin informed members that the Family Dollar Store on Martin Luther King, Jr. Drive is for sale. She requested more information from the developer of the store, and there is an accepted offer on it, but the due diligence period has not been completed. She will update the Commission when information becomes available.

ADDITIONAL BUSINESS:

Ms. Arkin stated that Mr. McQueary had sent a very intriguing e-mail about Growing High Point, which is an organization in High Point that addresses food security with community gardens on land purchased from public entities. They are funded by a family foundation, and there is not a family foundation in Greensboro doing anything similar, but that there are some interesting things going on in Greensboro. In 2015 a Fresh Food Access Plan was approved, and in 2016 the Local Food Promotion Program Implementation Grant for \$470,000 was awarded to the City of Greensboro. There are a lot of

initiatives that have happened since then and a lot of organizations working on food security issues. She suggested a presentation from folks that are more involved in it to see if there is an overlap between the property owned by the Commission and some of these initiatives. She will keep the Commission updated on this if there is an interest. She will try and get something together for the August meeting.

Ms. Arkin presented flyers regarding the new PART intermodal structure that has been constructed off West Market Street. Hanna Cockburn stated that the new hub is north of I-40 and is adjacent to their Administrative Offices. It has allowed them to consolidate and they are in the process of constructing a new maintenance facility, bringing everything together for PART. The site is named for Howard Coble in recognition for the work that he did for many years on the Transportation Committee in Congress and for his contributions toward getting some funding reserved for this project. Part intends to request LEED certification for this facility.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business before the Group, the meeting was adjourned at 7:03 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Sue Schwartz
Planning Director
SS: jd

**APPROVED MINUTES OF THE
REDEVELOPMENT COMMISSION OF GREENSBORO
AUGUST 2, 2017**

The regular meeting of the Redevelopment Commission of Greensboro (RCG) was held on Wednesday, August 2, 2017, in the Plaza Level Conference Room of the Melvin Municipal Office Building commencing at 5:00 p.m. The following members were present: Robert Enochs, Chair; Clinton Gravely; Charles McQueary; Dawn Chaney; and Angela Harris. Staff present included Dyan Arkin and Hanna Cockburn. Also present were Andrew Kelly, Attorney for the Commission and Tom Carruthers, City Attorney.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

a) July 5, 2017 (APPROVED)

Mr. Gravely moved approval of the July 5, 2017 meeting minutes as written, seconded by Mr. McQueary. The Commission voted 5-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Enochs, Gravely, McQueary, Chaney, Harris. Nays: None.)

SOUTH ELM STREET REDEVELOPMENT AREA

a) Master Developer Update

Robert Chapman, South Elm Development Group (SEDG), stated that SEDG was selected as the Master Developer for the South Elm Redevelopment project over four years ago. They have been diligently, for the past year, seeking developers for the parcel on the west side of South Elm Street. As part of that, they engaged Trademark Properties to do a broad-scale marketing effort. There have been a number of serious inquiries as a result of that marketing effort. During this period, starting back in January, Milton Rhodes began discussing the project opportunity with them. He currently lives in Southside and understands what the Commission has done to create great places within Greensboro. SEDG will be presenting to the Commission an updated Master Plan and is on target for design workshops to be held in Winston-Salem the 7th, 8th and 9th of September or the 21st of August, depending on scheduling issues.

Marcus Jackson, Managing Director of Urban Investments for Trademark Properties based in Raleigh, NC, stated they have continued marketing the subject three acres and that in the last couple of months there has been some progress as real estate developers are getting a greater and greater understanding of Greensboro and the credibility starts to build, which has been helped tremendously by the momentum that Zack Matheny and Downtown Greensboro, Inc. have generated recently. Two multifamily developers have been interested in the site for about eight months, but were busy with other projects and now have again expressed interest. The first, Milhaus, based in Indianapolis, has a Charlotte, NC, office. The other, EYC Companies based in Charleston, is a mixed use developer heavily into urban apartments. They are very interested in integrating the [Eugene Street] five acres on the other side of the railroad tracks into the Plan. Both of these potential developers have been informed that a Letter of Intent (LOI) is under negotiation with another group and that SEDG may ultimately pair the two together. Development of a revised Master Plan will inform how the ownership housing and any rental housing should fit together. Trademark is not specifically marketing the other five acres because, legally, they need an agreement with the Commission in order to do so.

Trademark has been studying the market for Class A multifamily rental in downtown Greensboro and has provided an analysis of downtown Durham, downtown Charlotte, downtown Winston-Salem, and downtown Greensboro to Ms. Arkin. Downtown Durham and downtown Raleigh are averaging rent of

about \$1.70 per square foot, but they have a 15% vacancy rate for Class A because there have been a lot of units placed on the market. Winston-Salem appears to be more advanced than Greensboro, as their downtown rental rates are about \$1.49 per square foot. Greensboro's average rents in three recent projects are \$1.37 per square foot. This is valuable data to inform a revised Master Plan for this project.

Mr. Chapman stated that SEDG will be presenting a proposal to the Commission about the [Eugene Street] five acres sometime in the near future.

Milt Rhodes, The Arden Group, stated that his family has recently moved from Southside to 1134 Pear Street in Fisher Park. He said he enjoyed his time in Southside and his daughter graduated from Grimsley and had a very unique experience living in downtown Greensboro. He went over what the company does and has done and is looking to do, including a project they are working on in Kernersville. They are looking forward to coming up with a feasible plan for the three acres just south of Gate City Boulevard [west of South Elm Street]. In response to a question, Mr. Rhodes explained that Greenline Holdings, LLC is a company affiliate of The Arden Group that they use for acquisition and holding of real estate during project planning and determination of which division within the company should take on the project. The Arden Group, Gemcap Companies, and Arden Communities are different divisions within the organization that do specific things. Right now, the LOI is from Greenline Holdings.

Mr. Gravely asked if during the examination period, which may take up to one year, there may be funding issues. Mr. Enochs stated that this is exploratory and they are not binding themselves to anything at this time. Mr. Rhodes stated that was correct, at this point in time, they are not prepared to write a contract or make an offer on the property. They need to do a thorough analyses with the Master Developer, the Commission, and others engaged in the market to make sure their vision for owner-occupied housing that meets the current demand. He has been talking with the Master Developer for several months, and the LOI was put together in late June.

Ms. Chaney asked if there was a model that is mixed use. Mr. Rhodes responded that they are very interested primarily in doing owner-occupied housing in a row house or townhouse format, not flats or large apartment buildings. Although The Arden Group and Arden Communities have built townhomes elsewhere, they do not have an urban townhouse model that is ready to be put on the ground, which is one of the main reasons to do the planning and design workshop. Ms. Chaney asked what the average square footage and sales price would be. Mr. Rhodes stated they have done a preliminary market study and hired a researcher to do more study in the market, and the townhomes would probably range from 1550 to 1850 square feet and average \$230 - \$235K per unit. They still have research to do, but the numbers are encouraging.

Mr. McQueary asked if the units would include garages. Mr. Rhodes stated that, yes, they will look at both park-under garages and detached garages to figure that out.

Mr. Rhodes stated it was important to them that the Commission knows progress is being made towards development that meets the intent of the Commission. Mr. Chapman stated they have until December 31st to come up with a full purchase contract that would be structured as a rolling option based on performance. The Commission would keep control of the property until the first component met established success criteria. They are looking at the next five months to get the Commission's approval on a revised Master Plan.

Mr. Enochs reminded everyone that there is also the September deadline that was spelled out in the letter, and Mr. Chapman stated they are beginning the process with this group and ready to start today. Mr. Enochs asked if this LOI would satisfy the Master Development Agreement requirement that SEDG cause to be commenced the sale and development of another component and parcel of the property. Mr. Chapman said that was correct. Mr. Enochs stated that it sounds like a motion to continue to him,

that there was an original deadline of next month, and now they want to bring in someone who is not agreeing to buy the parcel, but just agreeing to talk about buying it and maybe something can be sold within the next six months.

Mr. Chapman stated that he feels SEDG is acting in total good faith and doing everything that can be done. They have done diligent marketing, interviewed lots of prospective sub-developers, and they now think they have someone who will be ideal, as they have financial capacity, they are motivated, and are willing to stake their reputation on it. Mr. Enochs pointed out that they are supposed to bring a proposal including verification of financial capacity and development plans. He stated all the Commission now has is a letter, and that he is not saying this group does not have the wherewithal to get this done, because he believes that they probably do, but then again, going back to the facts, there is a LOI but no proof and nothing to show they will follow through. Mr. Chapman stated that if there is someone else out there, they would welcome them. They feel they have been going as fast as they possibly can and believe that even if they were not here, the Commission could not do better than what Arden is going to do. They hope the Commission will choose to proceed so they will have a chance to fulfill this.

Mr. Rhodes stated that they have committed to fund a design workshop, but do not want to do it if they don't have another side that wants to work with them. They are ready to go, with a preliminary budget, and have started lining up designers and staff on their end. But they cannot proceed with the workshop without some kind of assurance that they're not just doing it for a loss.

Mr. Jackson stated that the Commission may want to ask for a schedule of what is going to happen in the next four months and add a term to the LOI which would advantage the Commission in the case that Arden does not proceed by allowing them to capture the due diligence payment. Mr. McQueary replied that was a key point if they are to proceed and things don't work out.

Counsel Kelly stated that he has reviewed the LOI and explained that it is really a "pre-look" that does not bind a potential purchaser. It is an exclusive Letter of Intent, which states the property cannot be marketed to anyone else while the Arden Group or Greenline Holdings is taking a look at it.

Counsel Tom Carruthers asked if the LOI is intended to be signed before the design workshop is done, before the feasibility study is complete, and before there is a firm proposal before the Redevelopment Commission. He believes under the current agreement, the developer is required to come forward with a proposal and evidence of feasibility and financing to enter the door to begin the next phase of development.

Mr. Chapman stated that he has submitted SEDG financial reports to Ms. Arkin that now exceed \$800,000 worth of effort. They have not been paid anything for all their efforts to recruit the Union Square Campus, and the Commission could not have sold anything on the west side because they had no title insurance and it could not be insured. They did all the work and they are experts. He has done over a half billion dollars' worth of built projects, and he is committed to this, if the Commission wants them. If the Commission does not want them to participate, please let him know. There have been five years of work put into this project, and they have recruited a superb company. They have a chance to produce something great in this area.

Counsel Carruthers feels that if they could take the next step and come forward with a new proposal, detailing what it is and if it is feasible and how it would be carried out, that would be a box that would be checked. He pointed out that on September 1, there would be a 30- or 60-day period for the Commission to continue to discuss.

Mr. Chapman stated that the Commission has not been asked to make a financial commitment to pay for the design workshop and that Arden's commitment was made, contingent upon there being a relationship or LOI that they would stop SEDG from talking to other people who are calling them. They have to make a choice based on their best judgment. They don't need to be splitting hairs, they need to

be talking about what is best for the site and best for Greensboro. He does not feel that there is a better team than Seth Harry, Lou Oliver, Milt Rhodes, himself, and Stuart Parks. There was a LOI last year from Weaver-Cooke, and frankly, it was not the right building. It was a monolithic slab that contributed very little to the streetscape and they were happy to let that expire. It could have been cultivated and built and SEDG could have walked away, but it did not meet their standards.

Counsel Carruthers stated that he feels everyone in the room has the same goals and wants to head in the same direction; they are just trying to develop a level of comfort to find the right path. Mr. Chapman stated that, realistically, it is going to take between now and December 31st to develop a full-fledged contract with the Arden Group that covers all the contingencies and costs. He reiterated that they are and have been committed and have not charged the City anything for their efforts.

Counsel Andrew Kelly stated he wanted to capture what the City Attorney was saying with respect to the financials and some of the questions from the Commission members. In the Master Development Agreement there is the requirement that before the Commission approves a Purchase Agreement, that there is the necessary documentation as to financial ability as a component developer and what the plan encompasses, how it will be done, and how that fits into the Master Plan. That is what is expected to be brought before the Commission for their consideration to approve or deny. He pointed out that there are not nuts and bolts in the LOI to address some of the concerns. The goal is that this property be developed, and this discussion is not intended to scare the Arden Group away, it is to restate the expectations that are built into the Agreement, which goes back over four years ago.

Counsel Carruthers stated that an offer is on the table, and it is his understanding that this Commission is to provide a year of control over this property while a determination is made as to whether it is within the developer's interest to go forward. If that is the time period, it is potentially unacceptable, so maybe they can discuss other options. If there is a commitment to do a real design study that costs real money and it is going to happen within 30 days, that is going to allow the group to come back to the Commission, then maybe there should be an Offer Agreement until the next Commission meeting to allow them to finish their feasibility study and come back with some real concepts of what they are planning to do. Then SEDG can relay to the Commission that the developer is in hand and the concept and the financing are in hand. He is unsure whether it is in the legal interest of the City to enter into a one-year modification of this Agreement tonight without obligations more than what are in the LOI, and provide a 12-month or 180-day or 90-day period. Mr. Chapman agreed with Counsel Carruthers, but in regard to the Weaver-Cooke situation where the LOI was approved by the Commission, there was very little specificity, at all, and for a variety of reasons that did not go forward. They went through all that process after the LOI was signed. They never got to a purchase agreement even though a draft was submitted. In this particular case, he feels what the Commission is being asked to do is to define the next five months as the period in which they would develop a Purchase Contract that would be completely explicit.

Mr. McQueary stated that he could live with the five months if the Commission were to get a detailed layout of deliverable and measurable things that happen within that five months, so that the Commission knows that progress is being made such that, when they reach the end of the five months, it is a very high probability that the Commission wants to proceed with it. He would not be comfortable with signing a one-page agreement and then in five months see if the Commission is happy with the progress made. The Commission has to know, regularly, that there is progress being made to reach a point where a contract is executable one way or the other.

Ms. Arkin suggested that if there is a way for the Commission to provide support for the Group moving forward, contingent upon monthly updates and a schedule of what they will deliver at each of the Commission meetings between now and December 31st. She feels that the Group would very easily be able to provide that information. That would give the Commission something to measure each month. Mr. McQueary stated he feels that the Commission needs very detailed insight into what is going on

and the measurable happenings that would be taking place to give a comfort level that it is progressing in a satisfactory way.

Mr. Rhodes stated he has no problem with the schedule and that is his job as a person that needs to bring product to the market, to move as quickly as possible.

Mr. Chapman requested that the Commission authorize them to enter into a Letter Of Intent that does not include provisions of the Purchase Agreement. He suggested waiting until the draft of the Purchase Agreement for the Commission to consider those. He stated that what is being discussed is a five-month exclusive through January 1, 2018. There are a lot of things like the impervious surface determination for the Jordan Lake Rule and other things like that they will have to focus on.

Counsel Carruthers asked if the Group is proposing to strike “deposit and description of the Purchase Agreement.” Mr. Chapman responded that what they are really talking about is the exclusive right to negotiate through the end of the year. Mr. Enochs pointed out that they want five months to negotiate, exclusively not to market the product with anyone else.

Counsel Kelly suggested that the Legal Department, within the next 30 days, write up something up, while working with the Arden Group and SEDG and bring it back to the Commission for approval while they are still doing this. Mr. Rhodes stated that he really needs some kind of commitment in order to spend the money on the design workshop. Counsel Carruthers stated that the current discussion is eliminating the purchase price deposit, inspection period, and closing. He asked for an explanation of “expenses.” Where the seller is the Commission and they are responsible for all brokerage commissions, is that left open pending the Purchase Agreement? Mr. Chapman stated that a contract has been signed with Mr. Jackson and whatever they are paid by The Arden Group, they have to deduct his percentage from it and pay him out of their proceeds. Counsel Kelly stated that he would remove “due diligence materials” as that is a contemplating action following entering the Purchase Agreement. Counsel Carruthers stated that his remaining concerns are that there is a disagreement on the length of the current agreement. He thinks the consensus now is that the September 1 date is moving to December 31, with the same 30-60 day right to cure period should it not be performed. His question is, could they also eliminate the right-to-cure? Mr. Chapman said, no, it is very difficult for them to negotiate with people if they think they have the ability to out-wait and get a better deal. It is not in the Commission’s interest to do that. What he thinks is proposed now is eliminating Purchase Price Deposit, Inspection Period, Closing, and Due Diligence Materials. And SEDG is asking for the Commission to give them permission to push the window out until December 31 to produce in the terms previously read that are required under the Master Development Agreement about documentation. Counsel Carruthers stated he just does not want there to be a misunderstanding between the parties that they are expecting a feasibility study with a comprehensive price, what the plan is, what the build-out schedule is, what the financing is, is there a capacity to finance, and the Commission is asked to, in effect, agree that this additional time period is necessary. Counsel Carruthers stated that is what is on the table and the hard decisions are now up to the Commission members. The alternative would be to ask them to produce something before September 1, and it is up to the Commission to determine whether or not this is worthy of consideration under the strength of the relationship with Mr. Chapman and others’ expertise and the company and intent.

Zack Matheny, Downtown Greensboro, Inc., came forward and feels the Commission is on the right track toward completion of this project. There have not been a lot of people showing interest on this property, which is unfortunate. Part of that is because the south end did not get looked at very much for the last 20 years. It is now getting looked at more, and Mr. Rhodes and his group can do something that is appropriate for this particular area. He and several City people attended at conference on New Urbanism in New Orleans, and they care about planning for the future of the City of Greensboro. That is what Mr. Rhodes, with his expertise, brings to the table. He feels that this is a financially feasible organization with their history in development in other areas.

Counsel Carruthers suggested that the Arden Group conduct a feasibility study and demonstrate to the Commission that they have expended in excess of \$10,000 for that information within the next 60 days. Mr. Rhodes stated he would be happy to make that report at the Commission's October meeting.

Mr. McQueary stated that he would like to see the Legal department work with SEDG to put together what they believe is responsive to this Commission and let the Commission see it and then proceed and move forward. He doesn't know how to agree to something that is currently so loose. Mr. Chapman asked if the Commission would authorize them to submit something to the Commission that is believed to be more responsive sometime next week. Ms. Arkin could notify them if there are other questions or concerns from the Commission members. Counsel Carruthers suggested that either they move toward a Special Meeting or authorize the Chair to authorize SEDG to execute an agreement upon presentation of an Agreement along the lines of what has been discussed today, as being acceptable by all Commission members. It would not be in effect a vote but would be a consensus, and if the Chair felt there was sufficient consensus, he would authorize SEDG to execute the Agreement without a Special Meeting. The Commission members indicated that they would be comfortable with a consensus.

Discussion by Commission Members:

Ms. Chaney stated that she hopes they come through and they build the greatest project known to humans, but what if they don't? What if they get to December 31st, and everyone is back at the table either extending it for six more months, two terms of three months each, or they are off the table? Mr. Enochs pointed out that that language will be taken out and that it was part of the due diligence once the Purchase Agreement is in force, and if they do a Purchase Agreement they will ask for due diligence. Ms. Chaney then stated that she feels they need to have a lot of the strategic plan and the Commission needs to see it because this is an unusual piece of property, but it does not mean that cannot be developed to the top of the value. But on the other hand, she feels the Commission has to understand what the market is in Greensboro, what the price range is for this land and what it would sell for, and those are the kinds of information she feels are critical for the Commission to have. Mr. Rhodes stated that he would submit a strategic plan along with the proposed Purchase Agreement as that seems reasonable.

Chair Enochs stated that what the Commission is agreeing to is a period of exclusive right to Greenline Holdings, LLC for the property until that December 31st date, for the purpose of negotiating a Purchase Agreement that fits with the Master Development Plan and meets the conditions set forth in the Master Development Plan.

Mr. Gravely moved that the Commission authorize the Chair to permit SEDG to sign a Letter of Intent, which will be prepared in accordance with the discussions tonight and distributed to all Commission members for review and to inform the Chair of their opinions and to determine that a consensus is adequate to go forward to allow this to be executed as soon as possible within the next ten days, seconded by Mr. McQueary. The Commission voted unanimously in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Enochs, Gravely, Chaney, Harris, McQueary. Nays: None.)

At this time, Chair Enochs and Mr. McQueary left the meeting. Mr. Gravely was Acting Chair for other matters on the agenda.

107 West Bragg Street, 1201 and 1015 South Eugene Street – Consideration for Marketing (ITEM TABLE UNTIL SEPTEMBER MEETING)

Ms. Arkin asked that this item be tabled until the next meeting as the developer will be bringing a proposal for this property.

Ms. Chaney moved to table this matter to the September meeting seconded by Ms. Harris. The Commission voted unanimously in favor of the motion to continue.

Willow Oaks Redevelopment Area

a) Right-of-way Dedication for Sidewalk Construction – 222,224-226 South English Street (APPROVED)

Ms. Arkin stated that the City of Greensboro is acquiring rights-of-way along South English Street for planned sidewalk improvements. Three RCG-owned lots will be impacted by this construction. The Commission is asked to approve conveyance of approximately 786 square feet of property along South English Street for this use.

Ms. Chaney moved to approve the Sidewalk Construction on English Street, as submitted by staff, seconded by Ms. Harris. The Commission voted unanimously in favor of the motion.

Distribution of 2015-16 RCG Annual Report

Ms. Arkin distributed the Draft 2015-16 RCG Annual Report for the Commission to review. The Draft 2016-17 RCG Annual Report will be distributed by email in August. Commissioners will be asked to consider acceptance of both Annual Reports at the September meeting.

STAFF UPDATES:

Ms. Arkin informed members that the Family Dollar Store on Martin Luther King, Jr. Drive has been sold. She has not heard from the developer any more detail than that. She reiterated that this does not really change anything in regard to the lease and commitment to have a Family Dollar Store there, which runs with the sale of the land. It is a 15-year commitment and, as they are only a year into it, the store should be there for at least another 14 years.

Food Insecurity and Initiatives in Greensboro - Postponed to September meeting

Ms. Arkin stated that because of the lengthy discussion on other matters today, she moved this to the September meeting.

ADDITIONAL BUSINESS:

None.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business before the Group, the meeting was adjourned at 6:35 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Sue Schwartz
Planning Director
SS: jd

**APPROVED MINUTES OF THE
REDEVELOPMENT COMMISSION
OF GREENSBORO
SEPTEMBER 6, 2017**

The regular meeting of the Redevelopment Commission of Greensboro (RCG) was held on Wednesday, September 6, 2017, in the Plaza Level Conference Room of the Melvin Municipal Office Building commencing at 5:00 p.m. The following members were present: Robert Enochs, Chair; Clinton Gravely; Charles McQueary; Dawn Chaney. Staff present included Dyan Arkin and Hanna Cockburn; and Ann Hoffman, City Council Liaison. Also present was Andrew Kelly, Attorney for the Commission, City Legal Department.

Vice Chair Gravely welcomed everyone to the meeting. He stated that Mr. Enochs will arrive later for the meeting.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

a) August 2, 2017 (APPROVED)

Mr. McQueary moved approval of the August 2, 2017 meeting minutes as written, seconded by Mr. Gravely. The Commission voted 4-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Enochs, Gravely, McQueary, Chaney. Nays: None.)

SOUTH ELM STREET REDEVELOPMENT AREA

(a) Eugene Street Brownfields Agreement Application

Dyan Arkin distributed a final draft of an Application for a Brownfields Agreement for the Commission-owned property along Eugene Street on either side of Bragg Street. There is an existing Brownfields Application that was put in several years ago for one portion of this property. The packet has a map that is not easy to read, but does show the property site. The smaller property had a Brownfields Application put in on it in December of 2010, after approval by the Commission. That parcel was part of the St. James II Housing Complex, as was the larger parcel surrounding it at 1201. There used to be a coal gasification plant there, the apartment building was demolished and because of those issues that area was found to be contaminated. That lot has been vacant since that time. The other lots became vacant in 2004 and there was a City loan on it and the RGC too that property back in lieu of foreclosing on that loan. There is some soil contamination but is not as contaminated as the small property, known as the Biller Property for the previous owners. It makes the most sense to look it as a complete development parcel. Even those it is still three properties, those two are being added to the Application. The Commission members are asked to look over the draft for the next couple of weeks and it will come before the Commission at the October meeting for action. A couple of questions have been asked of NCDEQ to see if there are certain things that they need from the Commission and should be added to the Application. She has not heard back from them yet and the Commission will be made aware of any changes at the next meeting.

Chair Enochs arrived at 5:08 p.m. for the remainder of the meeting.

In response to a question posed by Mr. McQueary concerning the process, Dyan Arkin stated that the Brownfields Application is the first step in moving towards a Brownfields Agreement with the State of North Carolina. There has been assessment of the land and there may be a need for more, depending on what DEQ asks the Commission to do. Staff will look at a development plan for that development, right now it is just based on what could happen at that property and there are no concrete plans for that

land at this point. Staff will look at remediation and probably look at Grant funding to do that remediation, if it is indicated. Ms. Chaney asked if the railroad trestle would have any bearing on development of the property. Dyan Arkin responded that the trestle would only have a bearing as there is an easement on the west side of the trestle. Staff would look at that more closely and probably work with them to negotiate release of whatever land the railroad is no longer using. Because this actually used to be a location where the trains would stop and there was coal that was on-board, they have much more right-of-way staked out there than what they are currently using. There has been one success on the other side of the trestle for getting them to negotiate a smaller right-of-way with the City and it is hoped staff can build off that success and get a portion of this land back. It takes a long time to get the Brownfields Agreement so they have been talking about doing it for a while and there were some transition on ownership of the land, which was complicated. A portion of this was right-of-way that was intended for and extension of Bragg Street when the RCG had originally purchased it many, many years ago. Then the City released that dedication and it came back to the RCG but no one realized that it was the RCG property again, so another deed was used to transfer it back to RCG.

Ms. Chaney suggested that if this could be made as one project, it might be timelier to do it that way, particularly with apartments and that kind of housing this would be a tremendous project for this area. Dyan Arkin stated that would be the goal. The Greenway through there is currently under construction and when that is completed, RCG has already approved an easement over the Greenway, so the City will maintain it.

Chair Enochs stated that Vice Chair Gravely would have to sign the document as he will not be able to attend the October meeting and sign it.

Distribution of 2015-16 RCG Annual Report

Ms. Arkin stated that the 2015-16 RCG Annual Report is being distributed for the Commission to review. The Draft 2016-17 RCG Annual Report is also being distributed. Commissioners are asked to consider and approve the 2015-16 Annual Report, and consider the 2016-17 at the October meeting.

Mr. Gravely moved to approve the 2015-16 Annual Report, seconded by Ms. Chaney. The Commission voted 4-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Enochs, Gravely, McQueary, Chaney. Nays: None.)

STAFF UPDATES:

Ms. Arkin informed Commission members that she had intended to invite some folks on the Fresh Food Initiatives in Greensboro, but there were conflicts with their scheduling and they asked if they could come at the October meeting.

The Willow Oaks Redevelopment area revisions to the Redevelopment Plan were approved by the Planning Board and will be considered at the September 19, 2017 City Council meeting. She attended the South Elm Street Redevelopment Area design workshop for the Arden Group this morning. It was held at the Arden Group offices in Winston-Salem and they had the South Elm Development Group was there, three of the four partners were there. The owner of the Arden Group, Stewart Parks, was there and milt Rhodes, who attended RCGs last meeting. They are working with Lambert Architecture out of Winston-Salem so a couple of folks from their offices were there also. Several City staff went early and talked about process and how things work when they get to the point where they want to have something approved, how that comes through RCG and then ultimately goes through the plan review process that any development plan would go through. Staff from Water Resources Department and GDOT also joined the meeting and talked about some of the technical issues about the property. The Arden Group was going to start on a design process that is going to take

three days and staff should have updates at the end of that and information to pass along. They seemed very excited about working on it and the architects and engineers were very upbeat and very positive. They are focusing on “for sale” units on this property and are looking at a townhome style unit. They talked some about the affordable housing requirements that go along with this property and they seemed comfortable with all of the different possibilities, obligations and restrictions and requirements and opportunities that go along with working with a piece of property that is, right now, under public control. She remains optimistic about this project moving forward as they seem very committed to working through any issues or details. They plan to attend the October meeting to make an update at that time.

Mr. McQueary asked if, at the October meeting, the RCG could get an indication of what sort of information will be given along the way. He feels it is important for RCG to be as involved and informed as possible during this process.

ADDITIONAL BUSINESS:

Mr. McQueary asked if there is any new information on Heritage House and what is going on with that? Counsel Kelly stated that there really isn't much going on with Heritage House right now. Ads were placed in the Peacemaker for service and there is some development with the commercial aspect of that property, but it is not what the City was trying to acquire. So there is nothing yet to report. He will keep the Commission apprised of any new developments.

Ms. Chaney reported that the “tiny houses” issue has come back up where there are so many of the housing needs that are being looked at and those kinds of houses would meet that need. She asked if there is a possibility that some RCG land can be used for that use. She feels that would be a great opportunity to fill that need, especially using the land that is just sitting there vacant. Counsel Kelly stated that in regard to the LDO, amendments were made to address what was considered to be suitable development standards for the “tiny houses”. Dyan Arkin stated that the Commission can give staff some direction on. Hanna Cockburn stated that there is a request that RCG finish adopting the Plan that covers this area before moving forward Chair Enochs stated that RCG is calling them “tiny houses” but actually they are not “tiny houses”, they are just small structures, rather than typical larger homes. This matter will be addressed again at the October meeting. Hanna Cockburn stated that staff has had conversations with representatives from Community Development Corporation but they have not yet moved forward with any serious clients. They have expressed an interest in purchasing the land and doing a single family development at some time but that has not moved forward.

ABSENCES:

The absence of Ms. Harris was acknowledged as excused.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business before the Commission, the meeting adjourned at 5:359p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Sue Schwartz
Planning Director
SS/jd

**MINUTES OF THE
REDEVELOPMENT COMMISSION
OF GREENSBORO
October 4, 2017**

The regular meeting of the Redevelopment Commission of Greensboro (RCG) was held on Wednesday, October 4, 2017, 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; Charles McQueary; Dawn Chaney; and Angela Harris. Staff present included Dyan Arkin, Hanna Cockburn, and Russ Clegg. Also present was Andrew Kelly, Attorney for the Commission, City Legal Department, and Barbara Harris, Assistant City Manager.

Vice Chair Gravely welcomed everyone to the meeting. He stated that Mr. Enochs will not be at today's meeting.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

a) September 6, 2017 (APPROVED)

Mr. McQueary moved approval of the September 6, 2017 meeting minutes as written, seconded by Ms. Chaney. The Commission voted 4-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Gravely, McQueary, Harris and Chaney. Nays: None.)

SOUTH ELM STREET REDEVELOPMENT AREA

(a) Developers' Update on Component Development West of South Elm Street

Dyan Arkin stated that she had spoken to the commission at the last meeting about the series of design sessions that the developers had done and that everyone was very positive.

Bob Chapman, 447 Arlington Street, Greensboro, stated that he was very enthusiastic about cultivating a relationship with the Arden Group. A three-day workshop in Winston-Salem was held in the Arden Group's office, and the first day the City of Greensboro was very well represented. Everyone's common objectives were talked about to determine the highest and best use for that parcel. Nothing is ready to be released publicly because they are doing market studies and testing the market before finalizing the program for development.

Milt Rhodes, 1134 Parish Street, Greensboro stated that the workshop was very solid. The feasibility study is being completed. A full presentation of the economic analysis should be ready by the November meeting.

Mr. Gravely asked if after the November meeting there would be a timetable, and Mr. Rhodes stated that was his deadline for completing the economic side of it.

Mr. McQueary asked what has been seen that was most desirable and also what has caused concerns. Mr. Rhodes stated that the first morning working with the City staff to get caught up was most helpful. The number one thing that needs to be resolved in the preliminary plan is looking at how the South Elm streetscape improvements would play into the frontage on the South Elm block face.

Ms. Chaney asked if any thought had been given to what are the different proposals that may or may not come on the east side of Gate City Blvd. at the corner, when maybe the second phase of Union Square will develop or it may not. Mr. Rhodes stated that the interface on the east side was talked

about and how important volume, massing, and architectural scale is. Mr. Chapman stated that there is a fairly substantial sized public square set aside. There is an agreement with USCI to have a public plaza on their side of the street and there may be public spaces on both sides of the street.

Mr. McQueary asked if there is an open communication between Union Square Phase II Group and what Mr. Chapman is doing, so that thoughts and ideas could be shared, and Mr. Rhodes stated that they have been very open and there have been dozens of conversations.

Ms. Chaney asked if there was a number of actual residential units that would be placed there, and Mr. Rhodes stated that they did six scenarios that range from somewhere in the low 40's to the upper 50's in the number of units. Mr. Chapman stated that this was all based on whether there would have to be a parking structure, which is the primary issue.

Mr. Gravely asked if they were still working within the original requirements for housing, and Mr. Chapman stated that the Master Plan would have to be amended.

(b) Eugene Street Brownfields Agreement Application

Dyan Arkin stated that the Brownfields Agreement application that had been distributed at the last meeting in draft form had not substantially changed. The Brownfields application is actually an amendment to an existing application which now covers the properties three parcels, which will be recombined at some point to become a single development parcel. There was a coal gasification plant and there is some coal dust in this area; however, the majority of it can be remediated at a very low cost for potential residential or mixed use. The only major contamination lies in one corner which could be capped or used for a parking structure.

Mr. McQueary asked if remediation has to be done if an area is to be paved over, and Ms. Arkin stated that it did not.

Mr. Gravely asked if there had been housing on all three of the tracts at any time, and Ms. Arkin stated that all three had housing on them at one time.

Ms. Chaney asked if there was any way to go from one location to the other location in spite of the rail tracks, and Ms. Arkin stated that you could not develop a building on both sides of the railroad tracks. Hannah Cockburn stated that the Housing Authority owns a parcel to the north which is improved with a maintenance building.

Ms. Chaney stated that she thinks the area owned by the Housing Authority should be improved in conjunction with the South Elm Street improvements.

Ms. Chaney moved to accept the proposal for the Brownfield and allow the City to proceed with that level of development, seconded by Ms. Harris. Motion was approved 4-0.

Ms. Arkin stated that initially the North Carolina Department of Environmental Quality (NCDEQ) was okay with using the Environmental Management Plan associated with the South Elm Redevelopment site for the Greenway area also. However, DEQ switched project managers, and the new manager is not comfortable with this and required a separate Environmental Management Plan for the construction of the Greenway. In order to keep construction going, Ms. Arkin asked that the Commission authorize the execution of the new document.

Mr. McQueary moved to accept the proposal as made by Ms. Arkin to execute a separate Environmental Management Plan for the Greenway, seconded by Ms. Chaney. The Commission voted 4-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Enochs, Gravely, McQueary, Chaney. Nays: None.)

(c) Consideration of Pop-Up Parking

Ms. Arkin stated that Downtown Greensboro Inc. requested consideration to put approximately fifty-three parking places on the site at the corner of South Elm and West Gate City Boulevard temporarily until the development there began. The Commission and staff want to be supportive of adjacent development. Staff looked at the proposal from a planning and project management perspective and shared a few points with the Commission. Development of this property is ultimately subject to the master development agreement with the South Elm Development Group, and the proposed development is not fully planned at this point. The ultimate goal is to have the property developed under the redevelopment plan, and nothing should be considered that could jeopardize these long-term goals. Temporary parking can be considered as long as it doesn't interfere with the Commission's work.

Jodee Ruppel of DGI, 2402 Burnette Drive, Greensboro, stated that parking is already stretched in this area with all the projects going on. She is asking for consideration of pop-up parking to help support the businesses along South Elm Street.

Mr. Gravely asked if the parking would be paved or gravel, and Mr. Zimmerman, 3412 Old Onslow Road, Greensboro, stated that it would be gravel.

Mr. McQueary asked if the parking is highly successful and the spots are full all the time, what will happen once development occurred, and Ms. Arkin stated that permanent parking could be part of the final development of the area.

Mr. Chapman stated that parking downtown is not the highest and best use. They are always looked at that as something that is temporary use or future higher and better use.

Mr. Zimmerman stated that his development is right across the street and he hopes to bring about 200 plus people to that building and there will not be enough parking. He thinks this is a small investment to do something temporary until longer term parking can be figured out.

Ms. Chaney asked what if the new developer came in and the parking is not finalized and Mr. Zimmerman stated that he would hope the temp parking would continue until another proposal is made.

Mr. Chapman stated that he strongly believes in on-street parking for Gate City Boulevard and that it should be made more pedestrian friendly.

Ms. Arkin asked if the parking would stay at the existing level grade, and Mr. Zimmerman stated that it would.

Mr. Gravely asked if the lot would be marked for parking spaces, and Mr. Zimmerman stated that there would be concrete stops placed in the lot. Ms. Arkin stated the concrete stops would be common sense markings.

Mr. McQueary asked what would happen during heavy rain and if the gravel lot would hold up under those conditions, and Mr. Zimmerman stated that the gravel would absorb that. Ms. Arkin stated that the stops would help with erosion and if not something else would be put into place, but the bigger question is if the lot would interfere with the construction intended for the area.

Mr. Gravely and Ms. Arkin asked if the Commission had enough information to act on the application.

Ms. Harris stated that if the Commission decided to allow this temporary use parking, the City's Engineering Department would ensure that it meets all City requirements and doesn't interfere with the planned streetscape.

Mr. McQueary asked what specifically they were being asked to approve, and Mr. Kelly stated that the Commission was being asked to approve up to 53 temporary parking spaces on Redevelopment property.

Mr. McQueary moved to proceed with the planning effort and approve the temporary pop-up parking, seconded by Ms. Chaney. The Commission voted 4-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Enochs, Gravely, McQueary, Chaney. Nays: None.)

RCG Annual Reports

Distribution of 2016-17 RCG Annual Report

Ms. Arkin stated that the 2016-17 RCG Annual Report had been distributed at the last meeting for the Commission to review.

Mr. Gravely moved to approve the 2016-17 Annual Report, seconded by Ms. Chaney. The Commission voted 4-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Enochs, Gravely, McQueary, Chaney. Nays: None.)

STAFF UPDATES:

Ms. Arkin informed Commission members that an emailed invitation and a flyer had been distributed to the Commission members about Community planning month and a speech by Dan Parolek. Also the Fresh Food Initiative had another scheduling conflict and would be postponed again until November. Lastly, the Willow Oaks Redevelopment area revisions to the redevelopment plan were approved by the City Council at the September 19th City Council Meeting. On October 5th at 9 am there will be a webinar presented by LOCUS, which is the Developers Group of Smart Growth America, highlighting properties in the City of Greensboro.

ADDITIONAL BUSINESS:

A. 741 S. Elm St.

Ms. Arkin stated Sidney Gray had asked to speak to the Commission about the property located at 741 South Elm Street, which the Commission provided to the Gray family, dba Grays on the Greenway, as part of a property exchange. In the construction of the temporary parking area and the associated storm water facilities that were necessary, the elevation of the Redevelopment Commission property was raised several feet, which resulted in an increased grade change at the property line. The Gray family is not happy with the results of the construction and seek resolution.

Counsel Kelly stated that the Grays are represented in respect to this property by Bill Benjamin. Counsel Kelly has spoken with Mr. Benjamin and visited the property and also had the property staked. Counsel Kelly encouraged the Commission members to visit the property and see first-hand the concerns. There is contemplation of a lane to go through from Elm to Arlington and that it would basically absorb four feet of the Grays on the Greenway property and the majority of this twenty-foot

lane would be absorbed by Redevelopment Commission property and what needs to be identified is a reasonable interim solution to the current grade change and encroachments to the property.

Sidney Gray of 4224 Starmount Drive, Greensboro, stated that he encourages Commission members to come to the property and see the twenty-foot slope which hurts the marketability of the land. One of his concerns not being sure what the City means by temporary. Another is that the drainage has been changed on his land without him being consulted. Also that, because of the grade change, the twenty-foot lane that is proposed may not be able to give access to his land.

B. Willow Oaks

Russ Clegg provided background information to the Commission about the Willow Oaks redevelopment area and proposed land sale at 1605-1607-1609 McConnell Road and encouraged the members to have questions ready for the November meeting.

Brian Ammons, 1715 Sherwood Street, Greensboro, stated that the surrounding area is predominantly student housing for A&T University. Mr. Ammons expressed the desire to finish his project, which is contiguous to the Commission-owned properties, by obtaining the three lots, which would then give him the ability to build the whole corner and add a fourth building.

Ms. Chaney asked if the upper floors would be student housing, and Mr. Ammons stated that it would be for students and that the first floor would be a fitness center along with a leasing office.

Mr. McQueary asked if A&T University has any position on his project, and Mr. Ammons stated that the University is short on student housing, so they would be in favor. The apartments would be 1-bedroom units which no one else is providing in terms of student housing.

Ms. Chaney asked what the square footage of the first floor is, and Mr. Ammons stated that it would be approximately 12,000 square feet at most and would contain a study lounge, and there would be parking in the rear. Mr. Ammons stated that he would bring his formal proposal to the November meeting.

ABSENCES:

The absence of Mr. Enochs was acknowledged as excused.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business before the Commission, the meeting adjourned at 6:29 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Sue Schwartz
Planning Director
SS/gm;jd

**APPROVED MINUTES OF THE
REDEVELOPMENT COMMISSION
OF GREENSBORO
NOVEMBER 1, 2017**

The regular meeting of the Redevelopment Commission of Greensboro (RCG) was held on Wednesday, November 1, 2017, 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; Charles McQueary; Dawn Chaney. Staff present included Dyan Arkin, Hanna Cockburn and Russ Clegg. Also present was Andrew Kelly, Attorney for the Commission, City Legal Department.

Vice Chair Gravely welcomed everyone to the meeting.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

a) October 4, 2017 (APPROVED)

Mr. McQueary moved approval of the October 4, 2017 meeting minutes as written, seconded by Ms. Chaney. The Commission voted 3-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Gravely, McQueary and Chaney. Nays: None.)

WILLOW OAKS DEVELOPMENT AREA

(2a) Developers' Update on Component Development West of South Elm Street

Russ Clegg stated that the properties under consideration are 1605, 1607 and 1609 McConnell Road. The buyer has agreed to purchase at the appraised value of \$39,500. The sales/development agreement stipulates that prior to closing the Purchaser shall submit and have approved by the Commission or its designee detailed site plans, façade elevations and proof of financial support to complete the project. If the RCG agrees to the Development/Sales Agreement, the next step in the process is for the Greensboro City Council to consider approving the sale. The item is tentatively scheduled for the November 14th City Council meeting.

Mr. Gravely asked how many acres were in the tract and Mr. Clegg stated that it was a little over one acre.

Mr. McQueary asked when the appraisal was last done, and Mr. Clegg stated that it was appraised September 15th of this year.

Richard Ammons, 2517 Fairview Street, Greensboro stated that he is trying to continue with the current development and the buildings will be identical to the current ones in the area which is student housing.

Mr. Gravely asked if the construction would be started within the sixty-day timeline and Mr. Ammons stated that time is of the essence but the Commission is in control.

Ms. Chaney asked how many one bedrooms and what the commercial space will be and Mr. Ammons stated that there will be between sixteen and twenty one-bedroom units.

Andrew Kelly stated that in the Commission's consideration in the agreement, the Board is being asked to determine that the sale or transfer of the parcel will not be prejudicial to the sale of other parts of the redevelopment area and will not be prejudicial to the realization of the redevelopment plan approved by the governing body.

Ms. Chaney moved to accept the proposal as made by Mr. Kelly to sell the parcel under the guidelines, seconded by Mr. McQueary. The Commission voted 3-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Gravely, Chaney, McQueary. Nays: None.)

(3b) 741 S. Elm Street

Dyan Arkin stated that Sidney Gray, Grays on the Greenway, has expressed concerns about impact on property located at 741 South Elm Street from the construction of a temporary parking area between South Elm and Arlington Streets. During the construction of the temporary parking area and associated construction, the elevation of the Redevelopment Commission property located North of the Gray's property was raised several feet, which resulted in a grade change from the property line south onto the Gray's property.

Sidney Gray, 4224 Starmount Drive, Greensboro stated that the problem is that when the parking lot was built, the elevation encroached upon his land about twenty-four feet which has made the land unmarketable and he is asking for a rental/lease agreement for the land. In addition to the encroachment onto the property, water has been re-diverted onto his land by the Storm Water Facilities for the parking area. The construction has also made it nearly impossible for the Gray's to access their land. Mr. Gray is asking the Commission what exactly does "temporary parking" mean and has been asking for about a year without answer.

Ms. Arkin stated that the driveway access was not designed or constructed appropriately and was not able to be used as fire access. It is scheduled to be re-constructed during Phase II of the infrastructure and streetscape along South Elm. Over the last few weeks the area has been surveyed again and details have been provided of the information they found to the City engineers and the design firm working on Phase II design. They have been asked to come up with a list of options addressing the concerns of the Gray's and for an estimate of the potential costs.

Nancy Hoffmann asked what is the time frame for Phase II and Ms. Arkin stated that the design is scheduled to be completed in February and if all goes as planned, construction will begin late spring or early summer of 2018 with approximately six-month construction time.

Mr. McQueary asked if Mr. Gray would have input into the revision of the planning and Ms. Arkin stated that he would be able to.

Ms. Hoffman asked if it was the City's intent to address the problems and Ms. Arkin stated that she was not sure if they would be addressed as part of the streetscape but some resolution will be sought.

Mr. McQueary asked how the encroachment happened without coming to light before now and Ms. Arkin stated that there were several issues that arose at the same time and to maximize parking spaces there was confusion about the resulting slope. Changes were anticipated and were scheduled for the second phase of construction.

Andrew Kelly stated that there have been a series of development agreements and there is currently a development agreement between Grays on the Greenway and the South Elm Development Group that directly relates to the property in question.

Mr. Gravely asked if the Engineering Department was involved in addressing the problems and Mr. Kelly stated that they were.

Ms. Chaney asked if there was a rental agreement in place and Mr. Kelly stated that there was not.

Mr. Gray asked if he could get a copy of the recording of the meeting so he could hear everything that was said and Ms. Arkin stated that she would speak with him after the meeting.

(4) Food Insecurity and Access Initiatives in Greensboro

Dyan Arkin stated that according to the USDA, food insecurity is defined as a lack of consistent access to enough food for an active, healthy life. In 2014, the Greensboro/High Point area ranked first on a nationwide Food Research & Access Center Gallup Healthways Wellbeing Poll indicating that the area had the highest number of respondents per capita who reported that they had difficulties in securing food. This rating served as a call to action for the City and many non-profit, faith-based and community groups who sought to address this community-wide issue. A Community Food Task Force was formed to work in conjunction with the Guilford Food Council and other organizations to develop collaborative strategies to increase food access and reduce hunger and food insecurity in Greensboro.

Phil Fleishman, Community Recreation Services Manager, provided an overview of food-related challenges in Greensboro and information about strategies employed by the City and other partners to increase food access which include land use and food production, education and skill enhancement program implementation, federal support of local initiatives and agency collaboration. A pamphlet was also provided with more information on the subject.

Mr. McQueary asked if food desserts included urban areas and Mr. Fleishman stated that this definition is specific to urban areas.

Mr. Gravely asked how the Parks and Recreation Department was involved with the Greensboro Curb Market and the Co-op and Hannah Cockburn stated that the property was purchased by the City to site a new branch library and the City was involved with assisting with the redevelopment of the property and ensuring that the Co-op had a location to move into when the shopping center was redeveloped. The City has also collaborated with them and the Redevelopment Commission in the Urban Farm location on Phillips Avenue.

Mr. McQueary asked how much Guilford College was involved with the initiative and Mr. Fleishman stated that they are very involved in the efforts and that they have a Sustainable Foods Major along with farming operations. NCA&T has also been involved with the initiative.

Mr. McQueary asked if there were any other pieces of land that would fit into the initiative and Ms. Arkin stated that she hasn't been involved with anything formal but if properties were available it would have come up. Ms. Cockburn stated that when they are approached for land they offer any of the redevelopment properties that are not in use for temporary use.

Mr. McQueary moved that the Commission go into closed session to discuss matters relating to the relocation or expansion of industries or other businesses including potential economic development incentive that may be offered in negotiations pursuant to NCGS 143-318.11 paragraph A-4 to preserve the attorney client privilege between the attorney and the Commission to consult with its attorney concerning pending litigation and to give instructions in the handling and settlement of a claim pursuant to NCGS 143-318.11 A-3, seconded by Ms. Chaney. The Commission voted 3-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Gravely, Chaney, McQueary. Nays: None.)

(The Commission went into closed session for discussions from 6:14 until 6:48 p.m.)

ADDITIONAL BUSINESS:

Ms. Chaney suggested that the Commission Members visit the Gray's building to see it first-hand so that the members would have a better understanding and the other members agreed.

Mr. Kelly stated that the photos of water being pumped were of City owned land.

Ms. Arkin stated that she left a flyer for the upcoming speaker series.

ABSENCES:

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

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business before the Commission, the meeting adjourned at 6:55 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Sue Schwartz
Planning Director
SS/gm;jd

**MINUTES OF THE
REDEVELOPMENT COMMISSION
OF GREENSBORO
DECEMBER 6, 2017**

The regular meeting of the Redevelopment Commission of Greensboro (RCG) was held on Wednesday, December 6, 2017, 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; Clinton Gravely; Charles McQueary; Dawn Chaney. Staff present included Dyan Arkin and Hanna Cockburn. Also present was Andrew Kelly, Attorney for the Commission, City Legal Department.

Chair Enochs welcomed everyone to the meeting.

Counsel Andrew Kelly reported that there was a request from the public regarding the Gray property, requesting that particular changes be made to the minutes and including that an entire unedited recording of the presentation be made available. In particular, the discussion after his presentation be included in the minutes. The standard of practice is that staff does general accounting of the minutes and the only time they are provided, as a general practice, is for verbatim accountings, as if there is an action taken; who is at the meeting; how they voted; et cetera, and the specific action that is taken by the Board.

Chair Enochs stated that he was not in attendance at that particular meeting so he would not weigh in nor would be vote on those minutes.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

a) Minutes of the November 1, 2017 meeting. (APPROVED)

Ms. Chaney moved approval of the November 1, 2017 meeting minutes as written, seconded by Mr. Gravely. The Commission voted 3-0-1 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Gravely, McQueary and Chaney. Nays: None. Abstained: Enochs.)

South Elm Street Redevelopment Area

(2a) Developers' Update on Component Development West of South Elm Street

Dyan Arkin stated that in January, the Master Developer for the South Elm Redevelopment Area intends to ask the Commission to consider sale of the west block, which is approximately 3 acres, for residential and commercial development by The Arden Group. Should the Commission agree to the sale under the terms of a Sale/Development Agreement, it will go to City Council for their final approval, most likely in February. As soon as details of the agreement are finalized, a copy will be provided to Commissioners for their review. The agreement does not commit public funds. Separate agreements will be done if public assistance for the project is requested.

The Master Development Agreement defines the process for the Master Developer to procure component developers and component builders and submit proposals for development to the Commission. They have been working with staff and the Arden Group to finalize terms and conditions for the sale and development of this property. The executed Letter of Intent allows the Arden Group and exclusive right to work towards an Agreement for the sale and development of this property through the end of 2017.

A draft of the Agreement has been received and Counselor Kelly and Ms. Arkin have reviewed it and spoken several times with the development group. Everyone is not quite on the same page yet, and rather than putting out information that may be changed through the process, staff would like to talk about some specific things that will be in the Agreement and some of the details.

Limitation of Agreement – No Public Funding – This Agreement does not commit any public funds. Separate agreements will be done if public assistance for the project is requested. The Master Developer's responsibilities are defined in the MDA. The Commission has approved what they were required to do during the predevelopment phase: design and green standards, a master plan, the CCRs.

Where we are now: they are responsible for procuring component developers and bringing fully vetted proposals to the Commission for consideration. Proposals must include terms and conditions for sale of land, the development program (what will be built), verification that the component developer has the financial capacity to complete the development. Once the Commission accepts a proposal, they will monitor progress and compliance and assure that the intentions of the Redevelopment and Master Plans are met. The document will lay out the duties and responsibilities of each of the entities. As it stands now, it is a three-party Agreement, and that is one of the things that is under discussion, whether it will be a three-party Agreement or two separate Agreements – one between the Redevelopment Commission and the component developer, and then one between the Master Developer and the component developer. That needs to be clarified on which is the best way to do that.

The Commission is responsible for approval of plans and specifications, monitoring compliance with federal requirements associated with the funding sources used to purchase and remediate the land, and issuing certificates of completion of improvements when construction of a portion of the project is complete.

The component developer is responsible for all aspects of development, including marketing, sale or rental of units and commercial space, compliance with federal and other requirements that will be spelled out in this Agreement, and for financing the project.

The Sale/Development Agreement lays out what needs to be done prior to closing and conveyance of the land. The Commission must approve all the items you see listed before moving ahead with the sale of the land. One of the areas still under discussion is how the compensation to the commission and to the master developer will be structured. The per-acre sales price set by the Commission for sale of the land to SEDG is \$428,694. The Master Developer can negotiate a final sale price. The difference between the Commission's price and the final sale price is the Master Developer's compensation. When the land for the Union Square Campus was conveyed to USCI, an amendment to the MDA provided SEDG with a credit equivalent to the per-acre price for the land conveyed.

The final section addresses what constitutes default or breach of the agreement and what recourse the parties have if that happens. It spells out under what conditions the agreement can be terminated and when the Commission has the right to retake possession of the property. As a reminder, the Commission will consider the final document at the January meeting and if the Commission chooses to move forward and accept the document and terms and conditions of the sale of the land, it goes to City Council for final approval.

In response to questions, Counsel Kelly stated that the nature of this particular type of project is more complicated than what has been seen in the past and maybe the roadmap needs to adjust accordingly. Ms. Arkin stated that a lot of progress has been made but there is still some to be made. Mr. McQueary stated that he hopes to make this as simple a process as possible and not complicate it unnecessarily. Ms. Chaney stated that everything needs to be spelled out, explicitly, for the Master Developer and the Component Developer so that there is no disagreement three months down the road and then it comes

back to the Commission. There needs to be a feasible relationship between the two developers for the Commission to say that they are going to support the project.

Bob Chapman, South Elm Development Group (SEDG), 447 Arlington Street, stated that Bob Isner (SEDG), as is Milt Rhodes from the Arden Group, a/k/a Greenline Holdings, and SEDG is completely thrilled with Greenline's approach. There was a design workshop in Winston-Salem and they brought Seth Harry in, who is one of the partners, and is the talent architect and design guru in their group. They also brought in Lou Oliver, and everyone is very much on-board. There has been a shift from trying to build predominantly rental housing toward for-sale housing. There are some specifics that are difficult to achieve, particularly the federal low income requirements for for-sale housing and complexity of those, but they are getting very good feedback from the City about how that can be addressed, and they are confident that they can provide something that is economically feasible, which is the main thing. He asked that the Commission consider changing the January meeting date to a week later, as he is going to be out of the country on the 2nd of January, not be back until the 5th. Ms. Arkin stated that the Commission could address that request later in the meeting. He stated that they are looking for something that will contribute to the common good and, more than anything else, that they can be proud of and they are just so happy that Milt's group is local and that they are completely sympathetic to all of the issues they are facing. Stuart Parks is the managing member of the Parks family that owns the Arden Group' and he was a town planner for many years in the City of New York. And he is very familiar with walkable urbanism and MWBE and all the other components that are to be focused on in this endeavor. They have spoken with John Merrill, Union Square Campus Inc., about Union Square Campus's Phase II intentions, and unless he has other news tonight, they have asked Marcus Jackson to go ahead and begin the process of marketing the property at the southeast corner of Gate City Boulevard and South Elm Street and are focusing on a hotel for that location. They still think it should be Union Square Building II, if they want to do that. They will probably not be able to make that decision in the next year or two.

Milt Rhodes, 11 Brookstown Avenue, Winston-Salem, representing the Arden Group, stated that he is happy the attorneys are talking about the purchase agreement to get the necessary direction needed to be able to proceed with the purchase. Having those professionals work out the details will guide the Arden Group in the right direction that should be followed, as there are many moving parts to be considered.

Dabney Sanders, Action Greensboro, stated she is anxious to see the plans and the discussions sound promising.

Mr. McQueary requested that if anything develops within the next month, that the Commissioners be notified of any ripples that may occur so that they will be aware of any issues before the January meeting.

After a short discussion, the Commission felt that the January meeting should be changed and be held January 10th at 5:00 p.m. Mr. McQueary moved to approve the meeting date change, seconded by Mr. Gravely. The motion was approved by unanimous vote. Notices will be sent to all Commission members.

Staff Updates

Dyan Arkin reminded Commission members that January would be the Annual Meeting for the Commission and officers for the Commission would be voted on. She urged members to think about any changes they may wish to make. She also noted that the 2018 calendar of meeting dates has been provided and the July meeting is scheduled for July 4th, so she asked that the Commission vote on a change to July 11th, 2018.

Mr. Enochs moved that the January meeting be held on the 10th, 2018, and the July meeting be held on the 11th, 2018, seconded by Ms. Chaney. The Commission voted unanimously in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Enochs, Gravely, McQueary and Chaney. Nays: None.)

ADDITIONAL BUSINESS:

Dyan Arkin stated that at last month's meeting, Sidney Gray, representing Grays on the Greenway, had come before the Commission in regard to an issue with the family property. Several Commission members visited the site to look at the concerns that Mr. Gray expressed. Staff will continue exploring possible opportunities for resolution and take every opportunity to address the concerns raised. There are a variety of ways that the issues can be addressed. It is possible that the pond and the sand filter may be reconfigured, the retaining wall issues will be addressed with Water Resources as well as GDOT and the Real Estate Department will be involved in discussions. Staff will continue to keep the Commission apprised of these discussions.

ABSENCES:

The absence of Ms. Harris was acknowledged as excused.

SPECIAL NOTE - The regularly scheduled January meeting will be cancelled, and a special meeting will be held January 10th at 5:00 p.m.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business before the Commission, the meeting adjourned at 5:36 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Sue Schwartz
Planning Director
SS/jd