

**APPROVED MINUTES OF THE
REDEVELOPMENT COMMISSION
OF GREENSBORO
REGULAR MEETING
JANUARY 6, 2016**

The regular meeting of the Redevelopment Commission of Greensboro (RCG) was held on Wednesday, January 6, 2016, 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, Chairman; Clinton Gravely; Dawn Chaney; Angela Harris; and Charles McQueary. Staff present included Dyan Arkin, Russ Clegg, Cyndi Blue, and Hanna Cockburn. Also present was Tom Carruthers, Attorney for the Commission; City Councilwoman Nancy Hoffmann; and Terry Jones, City Attorney's Office.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

a) November 4, 2015 Regular Meeting

Ms. Chaney moved approval of the November 4, 2015 regular meeting minutes as written, seconded by Mr. Gravely. The Commission voted 5-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Enochs, Harris, Gravely, Chaney, McQueary. Nays: None.)

HERITAGE HOUSE REDEVELOPMENT AREA

a) Acquisition of Real Property

Ms. Cockburn presented members with proposed offers to purchase the condominium units that comprise the Heritage House complex, subject to the adopted redevelopment plan. The redevelopment plans calls for demolition of the building so it can be reused for other purposes. Each of the individual units has been outlined in a table with reference to the owner according to Guilford County tax records and the conditions by which the offer has been drafted. The offers are based on appraisals of each individual unit. The appraisals are based on the value of the units at the time they could still be occupied. If the Commission approves the offers, staff will generate a written Offer to Purchase for each individual property. There are 177 units with close to 70 owners who own anywhere from one to more than a dozen units.

Responding to questions, Ms. Cockburn clarified that letters to be mailed to the owners will include the appraised value of the property, liens and assessments that are issued by the City, and the property taxes that are owed based on what was owned in December, 2015. The final offer allows for these outstanding amounts to be settled prior to the property being acquired by the City. Negotiations will occur on a case-by-case basis.

Ms. Cockburn explained that in six cases the amount owed on liens, assessments, and taxes is more than the value of the property resulting in an offer to purchase the property at zero.

Mr. Gravely moved to acquire the units of Heritage House and make the offers based on the value established through independent appraisal prepared for each unit by McNairy and Associates, seconded by Ms. Harris. The Commission voted 5-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Enochs, Harris, Gravely, Chaney, McQueary. Nays: None.)

PHILLIPS LOMBARDY REDEVELOPMENT AREA:

Dr. Terrance Thomas, 1600 East Market Street, is a Professor at NCA&T University. He explained that there was a disagreement with their original partner which could not be resolved and as a result, the relationship was terminated. He announced that A&T's new partner is Concerned Citizens of Northeast Greensboro. A Memorandum of Understanding, as distributed to Commissioners, was developed and signed by A&T University and Concerned Citizens of Northeast Greensboro. Dr. Thomas commented that prior to this opportunity, they started to work with the City to develop another site on White Street. Plans for the White Street site were in advanced development when this opportunity came up again. He explained that the Phillips Street site is preferable because it is located in the middle of the community and the community is more comfortable with them working on the site. In addition, prior TRC approval is still valid for the Phillips Street site and all resources dedicated to this site are still available. The same site plan will be used along with the same set of parameters that have already been approved. The project is funded for another year and funds are in place to acquire the production units they intend to set up on the site.

Dr. Thomas explained that setting up the production units is only one part of the project. They have been conducting a series of well-received Nutrition Education Workshops in the community. Over 70 participants have been trained and more than 32 workshops have been held. Setting up the production units will reinforce skills that participants have learned in the workshops. They will be ready to set up the production units by mid-February if access is granted to the Phillips Lombardy site.

During discussion it was noted that the lease states activity shall start within 90 days after execution of the lease. In addition, overall goals of the project were put into the lease as an exhibit to reassure the community and the Commission that what is envisioned is going to be implemented.

Robert Davis, 1407 Lord Foxley Drive, stated that Concerned Citizens of Northeast Greensboro has been active in the community since 1998 and they fully embrace this project. They see the project as an opportunity not only to address the food desert problem but to train young people in terms of how to operate the production units.

Mr. McQueary stated that it is a very positive thing to see A&T University working with entities within the City in order to move this project along. Ms. Chaney commented that the educational component is absolutely essential teaching people how to be self-sufficient.

Ms. Harris moved to approve the lease, seconded by Mr. Gravely. The Commission voted 5-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Enochs, Gravely, Harris, McQueary, Chaney. Nays: None.)

WILLOW OAKS REDEVELOPMENT AREA:

a) Transfer of Limited Partner Interest in Alexander Homes, LP

Cyndi Blue, Housing Services, stated that this is a low income tax credit project funded by the City in 1995. The Redevelopment Commission took back a note and Deed of Trust on these properties. The \$27,500 loan from the Commission is still in existence on this property. As the properties age out of their tax credit restrictions the limited partner typically exits the deal. This organization is asking the Commission to allow them to move their interest from a tax credit fund that is closing and put it into an active fund while they negotiate with the current general partner to exit the deal. The Redevelopment Commission request has been separated from the City request and the City has already signed their version of the letter. The request has been brought to the Commission's attention to get approval for the Chairman to sign the letter allowing the transfer of interest. This property is a scattered relocation site located in the Eastside Park and Willow Oaks areas.

Mr. McQueary moved to approve the signature allowing the transfer of limited partner interest in Alexander Homes, seconded by Ms. Chaney. The Commission voted 5-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Enochs, Gravely, Harris, McQueary, Chaney. Nays: None.)

b) Development Proposal for English Street Properties

Ms. Arkin explained that the English Street properties are located within the Morningside-Lincoln Grove Redevelopment Plan Area in the area that is now called Cottage Grove.

Mike Cook, 6043 Lake Brandt Road, was representing the developer, Partnership Homes, Inc. He distributed packets of additional information to Commissioners. The goal of Partnership Homes in the City is to build affordable housing. They would like to develop a pocket neighborhood on the subject site owned by the Redevelopment Commission. The property is located at 2013, 2015, 2017, and 2019 South English Street. The proposed project would conform at RM-18 and not have to make any changes to the current zoning. The current plan shows about 10 units but they would like to be flexible and may consider building a maximum of 14 units. The target market would be low income limited to persons who are at 60 percent adjusted median income or lower.

Mr. Cook has made an offer of \$22,000 for the four lots. They intend to ask for monies from City HOME funds, the North Carolina Housing Finance Agency, SHDP Program, and from local foundations and corporations. In addition, they plan to attempt to get a loan from the Federal Home Loan Bank which they have done successfully in the past.

Referring to the site plan, Mr. Cook indicated that all the units will face an interior courtyard with parking located on the outside of the living area. Responding to questions, he said that these will be small houses ranging from 750 to 1,000 square feet. The homes will have two bedrooms, one bath, and will be affordable and attractive. The exteriors will have different materials and will be painted different colors. The houses will be fairly close together to create a sense of security and each unit will be metered separately for utilities. There will be heavy landscaping with gardens placed in the 25' level buffer area if possible. Partnership Homes will manage the rental housing. A preliminary budget was presented to members showing where the money will be spent.

It was noted that an appraisal of the properties has not yet been done relative to the offer that was made.

Cyndi Blue, Housing Services, reviewed the timing of the request and the process going forward to get to an actual project that the Commission would have the opportunity to consider and approve at a future meeting. She indicated that a Request for Proposals should be issued next week with responses due back in February. She expected a final decision by City Council in April, 2016 although North Carolina Housing Finance Agency typically makes their decisions on applications in June. Mr. Cook commented that they need to move as fast as possible on this project to be able to show the State that they have some control with the property in their application.

Mr. Gravely was supportive of the overall concept of the project. However, the Commission must wait for the appraisal to determine a selling price.

Staff asked the developer to show some kind of engagement from the community to validate that this is a process to get to a development that is supported by the community it will be located in.

Russ Clegg, Planning Department, looked at the redevelopment plan for the area. It does not speak in a lot of detail about this corner of the area but this project does support what is established for multifamily zoning. It does not have as much detailed planning as the Willow Oaks Community to the

south and certainly staff would want to see the development support nearby developments in terms of the quality it provides. Staff will continue to look at the details as the process moves forward.

Mr. Cook asked the Commission for some document that satisfies the City and that shows at some point an option to purchase can be exercised under certain conditions, primarily with the purchase price having been established in the document.

Counsel Carruthers stated that there has not yet been a consensus on the purchase price on the Commission level. The City Council will be approving the Commission's vote to transfer ownership of the property. Therefore, a fully binding option cannot be delivered at tonight's meeting.

Mr. Cook explained that the document could be a late submission into their application packet and then if successful with the requests for funding, at some point they would exercise their option to buy the property.

Counsel Carruthers indicated that it is too early for a resolution to direct staff to draft and execute a sales development agreement pursuant to the documentation supported for 213, 215, 217, and 219 South English Street with Partnership Homes. He asked if there could be some lesser resolution of support for the 2013 South English Street pocket neighborhood as proposed by Partnership Homes, Inc. This would allow the proposed project to move forward a little bit in the process. Mr. Cook felt that a lesser resolution would not satisfy the City or the State and at some point there must be a deadline.

Councilwoman Hoffmann stated that the bottom line was the appraisal so that the Commission would have something to consider. Staff explained the process associated with the sales development agreement and indicated they are not ready to make a recommendation to the Commission at this point. Ms. Blue pointed out that there are two full Commission meetings before Mr. Cook would have to have some sort of firm documentation for both the City and State process. To allow Mr. Cook to move on towards control of the property, Ms. Blue said that a commitment of support along with several steps to be taken, such as getting an appraisal and coming back to the Commission at their next meeting to consider an actual agreement, would be sufficient. Mr. Cook should return next month with a firm idea of what will be built and the budget. At that time the Commission can make a decision about the selling price based on the appraisal.

Counsel Carruthers asked Mr. Cook if he was looking for an endorsement of this concept from the Commission contingent on appropriate price and design to be detailed a month from now at the next meeting. Mr. Cook replied in the affirmative. He reiterated his concern that the State may turn down his application packet in February, 2016 if he does not have control of the property. Ms. Blue commented that Mr. Cook would definitely have to have control prior to finalization of the scoring process for the RFP because he would get penalized if he did not have control of the property.

Ms. Arkin indicated that staff could have a completed appraisal by the February 3, 2016 RCG meeting. By that time staff would have had time to work with the developer to come up with enough information for staff to make a recommendation to the Commission as to what steps to take. Members reiterated the importance of receiving feedback from the neighborhood on the concept of a pocket neighborhood.

Counsel Carruthers stated that upon reassurance from the neighborhood and comfort by the Commission, at the next meeting there could be a resolution from staff to execute a sales agreement pursuant to several parameters, one of which will be price, with more documentation relative to design, materials, and budget.

Chair Enochs stated that the consensus of the Commission is that this project is a good idea. He said that this item will be tabled until the next meeting to enable staff to work with the developer toward some of the issues that have been raised. Ms. Arkin suggested that the developer should have the

financial package in place and there should be some form of community input about the proposed project. Staff will work through these issues and hope to be able to make a recommendation at the next meeting. Chair Enochs said that at the next meeting Mr. Cook will be looking to the Commission for some kind of option giving him time to secure funding.

SOUTH ELM STREET REDEVELOPMENT AREA:

(a) Gate City Boulevard Right-of-Way

An additional 10' strip right-of-way was dedicated along the east block of Gate City Boulevard. This was done when working with the Union Square Campus group to make sure there was enough room to do the appropriate type of streetscape. Because the City is moving toward actual construction of the right-of-way, staff is asking the Commission to dedicate a 10' strip of right-of-way on the west block to allow for a wide sidewalk and street trees.

Mr. McQueary moved to accept the proposal to grant a 10' easement for sidewalk and streetscape as presented, seconded by Mr. Gravely. The Commission voted 5-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Enochs, Harris, Gravely, Chaney, McQueary. Nays: None.)

DRAFT ANNUAL REPORT DISTRIBUTION:

Ms. Arkin stated that the draft Annual Report distribution will be delayed.

STAFF UPDATES:

Ms. Cockburn said that members are in receipt of a report on Data Analysis Growth Trends. The report shows the year in review for 2015. She asked members to contact her if they have questions or want additional detailed information.

ADJOURNMENT:

There being no further business before the Group, the meeting adjourned at 6:40 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Sue Schwartz
Planning Director
SS: sm/jd

**APPROVED MINUTES OF THE
REDEVELOPMENT COMMISSION
OF GREENSBORO
REGULAR MEETING
FEBRUARY 3, 2016**

The regular meeting of the Redevelopment Commission of Greensboro (RCG) was held on Wednesday, February 3, 2016, 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, Chairman; Clinton Gravely; Dawn Chaney; Angela Harris; and Charles McQueary. Staff present included Dyan Arkin, Russ Clegg, and Hanna Cockburn. Also present was Tom Carruthers, Attorney for the Commission; and City Councilwomen Nancy Hoffman and Sharon Hightower.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

a) January 6, 2016 Regular Meeting

Ms. Harris moved approval of the January 6, 2016 regular meeting minutes as written, seconded by Ms. Chaney. The Commission voted 5-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Enochs, Harris, Gravely, Chaney, McQueary. Nays: None.)

WILLOW OAKS REDEVELOPMENT AREA:

a) Development Proposal for English Street Properties

Russ Clegg said that staff has looked at Mike Cooke's proposal from Partnership Homes and found it in concurrence with the Morningside/Lincoln Grove redevelopment plan. They have also gotten an appraisal as requested by the Commission placing the market value of the land at \$30,000. If the Commission decides to move forward with Mr. Cooke's plan, Mr. Clegg asked the Commission to consider instructing staff to draft a purchase agreement with Partnership Homes for consideration at the March meeting. In addition, the Commission would be asked to instruct staff to get two additional appraisers to concur with the original appraisal as required by law and to hold a public hearing at the March meeting to consider executing the agreement.

Mr. Clegg described terms of the purchase agreement and said that Mr. Cooke has agreed to the \$30,000 purchase price. The site will include affordable housing and will meet the requirements of the funds used to purchase the property. Regarding site design, the site plan will be submitted to Commission who will approve any changes made to the site plan as well approval of elevations once they are prepared. The offer will expire on March 1, 2018 to give Mr. Cooke the opportunity to go through two funding cycles from the City's HOME Request for Proposals as well as from the North Carolina Housing Finance Agency. Construction will start within six months of closing and transfer of the property and completion of the project will be within 20 months from the beginning of construction. The agreement is subject to City Council approval after the public hearing in March, 2016.

Counsel Carruthers confirmed that this is a private sale and is not subject to upset bid but under the statute when it is made to a not-for-profit for public purpose such as affordable housing pursuant to three appraised values, it is permissible.

Mike Cooke, 6043 Lake Brandt Road, Partnership Homes, addressed questions about financing. They plan to pursue four sources of financing as follows: (1) North Carolina Housing Finance funds in the amount of \$400,000; (2) City of Greensboro HOME Program funds in the amount of \$500,000; (3) Federal Home Loan Bank funds in Atlanta in the amount of \$500,000; and (4) funds from local foundations and corporations in the amount of \$50,000.

Staff noted that the conveyance is contingent on the completion of the financing package. The deed will contain a restrictive covenant that the property will be used for affordable housing.

Mr. Cooke distributed a package of information to members containing a site plan that is a result of meetings with Technical Review Committee staff. This plan is not final but it comports with City staff and departments. Also included in the package is a pro-forma which shows income and expenses for the project. They have settled on building 11 single-family houses and three parking spaces have been added to the site plan. The entrance has been moved off of English Street a little to the south to satisfy Greensboro Department of Transportation (GDOT) requirements.

Copies of project information have been given to Skip Crowe with the Cottage Grove Initiative and the Willow Oaks Neighborhood group. A neighborhood meeting will be scheduled with Willow Oaks. Councilwoman Hightower noted that there were no neighbors present to represent the Cottage Grove Initiative. She informed him that Skip Crowe does not live in the area; however, he is part of the Initiative in addition to other individuals.

Mr. Cooke indicated that he was told to talk to the Cottage Grove Initiative and the Willow Oaks neighborhood when he initially met with City Planning staff. He saw Skip Crowe at a meeting of the Housing Initiative several weeks ago and shared the information with him. He sent information to the Willow Oaks neighborhood group two weeks ago and asked to meet with the whole neighborhood. He was informed through an email that they will let him know when a meeting can be held. Mr. Cooke was told yesterday in a meeting with staff that he could also speak with New Hope Missionary Baptist Church.

Councilwoman Hightower informed Mr. Cooke that although the property is tied to Willow Oaks, there is an active Cottage Grove Initiative community that should be included in the discussions. Staff said they would be happy to pass this contact information on to Mr. Cooke who indicated his intention to engage all of these people. Responding to a question from Councilwoman Hightower, Mr. Cooke said that he has not attended any of the Cottage Grove meetings at Hampton School, but he has been to many Willow Oaks meetings in the past. He said that meetings with both groups will occur, but it has been a matter of timing that a meeting has not occurred yet. Councilwoman Hightower reiterated the importance of fully engaging the community in discussions about the proposed project.

Chair Enochs said that members discussed the necessity of the developer having conversations with the neighborhood about their feelings for this project. The Commission feels that this proposed project is moving very fast. The action being requested tonight is to set a public hearing for March so that community members can voice their opinions before the Commission signs off on the project. Members discussed holding the public hearing at a location in the community rather than at the Melvin Municipal Building.

Mr. Cooke pointed out that his group is a non-profit CHDO that has been in business for 20 years and has interest in good process and engaging the neighborhood. Councilwoman Hightower said that community engagement is critical to any project so that it is successful. Mr. Cooke was in agreement with her comments but denied that he is imposing a schedule on the City. He is trying to meet the City's schedule for funding. Chair Enochs commented that Commission members are just ordinary citizens and it takes time to digest what is going on with proposed projects.

Ms. Arkin said that there is time to meet everyone's needs and to engage the community. She suggested that the focus should be on what needs to happen before the public hearing next month because the hearing is actually to sell the land to the developer. However, the actual conveyance of the land will be contingent on certain things happening. Staff will insure there is a good community interest in the public hearing.

Mr. Cooke has provided dates to the Commission for all of the applications that need to be made. Over the next 30 days he will be preparing the applications for the North Carolina Housing Finance Agency

and the City of Greensboro HOME Funds. In addition, he will be preparing anything that is needed in terms of presentation for community meetings. He will not take any more risk of his funds as a non-profit to go further on the site plan unless it is something the Commission asks for. It is his intention to have a community meeting when the leaders indicate they want to have it.

Councilwoman Hightower stated that she is part of these discussions because she is Chairwoman of the East Greensboro Special Committee. Anything that impacts east Greensboro impacts what the Committee has already put in place and they cannot be excluded from the discussions. She expressed concern over being left out of a conversation in her community.

Mr. Gravely noted that the issue is neighborhood engagement. He is a member of the Cottage Grove Initiative and has not heard anything about setting up a meeting with Skip Crowe. Ms. Arkin indicated that a community gathering can be coordinated between now and the public hearing. Staff is willing to help coordinate the meeting. Councilwoman Hoffmann suggested that Mr. Cooke should coordinate with Councilwoman Hightower and Mr. Gravely to facilitate a community meeting.

Speaking from the audience, Theodore Stevens, community member, said that he would like to attend the meeting.

Ms. Arkin stated that the Commission is being asked to set a public hearing to consider the sale of a particular piece of property, 213-219 South English Street, to Partnership Homes for the purpose of building affordable housing under a set of terms and conditions that are being negotiated and will be finalized by the Commission at the public hearing. The Commission will have the opportunity to make changes to the agreement, hear from the public at that point, and consider whether or not to move forward to committing to this project.

Mr. Gravely moved to set a public hearing for March, 2016, seconded by Mr. McQueary. The Commission voted unanimously 5-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Enochs, Gravely, McQueary, Chaney, Harris. Nays: None.)

Ms. Arkin asked for direction from the Commission on whether the public hearing will be held at the next Commission meeting or at a separate meeting. Members felt the public hearing should be a separate meeting from the regular RCG meeting. Relative to the public hearing, staff will send notices to households located nearby this property and also to the community leaders either directly or through Councilwoman Hightower. Staff plans to poll members on times that will work for a separate public hearing and will notify them once a date has been set. It was decided that Mr. Cooke should work with Councilwoman Hightower, Mr. Gravely, and staff to arrange a community meeting that will be held prior to the public hearing.

b) Conveyance of City-owned Property

Ms. Arkin said that City Council approved the transfer of two parcels, 2120 and 2122 Everitt Street, to the Commission at their October 15, 2015 meeting. The properties were acquired through tax foreclosure. It was not clear how the conveyance process needed to work when the matter was presented to the Commission at their last meeting. Conversations with the Finance Department determined that there are expenditures related to this property which have already been charged to the City's foreclosure account because it was a foreclosure. The Commission is reimbursing that account for these expenditures. Those expenditures could have been from the actual liens that called it into foreclosure or maintenance while the property was being held. She explained that the City will be taking a loss because the appraised value of \$8,500 for the land is not the amount that the City has already put into it. This is an internal transfer of funds and it benefits the redevelopment area because it increases the land available for development. The property is contiguous to property already owned by the Commission.

Staff worked with the both the Finance and Legal Departments and is bringing a request for consideration by the Commission to pay the appraised value of \$8,500 to the City of Greensboro for the acquisition.

Mr. McQueary moved to accept the transfer of property, seconded by Ms. Chaney. The Commission voted unanimously 5-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Enochs, Gravely, McQueary, Chaney, Harris. Nays: None.)

HERITAGE HOUSE REDEVELOPMENT AREA:

a) Acquisition of Real Property

Ms. Cockburn stated that offers to purchase all 176 units of the complex have been distributed by certified mail. Staff has received 81 acceptances and closing on these will begin later this week. As the closings occur, staff will bring back the parcels for acceptance under the Redevelopment Commission's control.

SOUTH ELM STREET REDEVELOPMENT AREA:

(a) Developer's Annual Report

Bob Chapman, 447 Arlington Street, South Elm Development Group (SEDG), introduced individuals associated with the project who were present in the audience. Commissioners recognized Muriel East, recent NC Design School graduate; Bob Isner and Evon Smith, SEDG partners; Sidney Gray, neighbor; and John Merrill, Union Square Campus (USC), Inc.

Mr. Chapman distributed and presented the developer's Annual Report. He reviewed the Master Plan that was approved by the Commission and described the USC building currently under construction along with plans for a hotel and mixed-use retail and housing on the site. He noted that the Downtown Greenway has almost finalized plans for the extension on the Bragg Street side. The Greenway will be a plus for the project and will define the area. The Gray family plans to develop on the frontage they own on the Greenway. A cell tower company located in the area of a proposed parking deck still has six years left on their lease and a solution being discussed is to place the cell tower antennas on the deck. Meetings have been held with the City Manager about how to finance these decks and design configurations are being discussed. Mr. Chapman stated that the biggest challenge going forward is parking. Their goal for 2016 is to finalize a long-term parking plan that works for everyone concerned.

Mr. Chapman said that half of the bottom third of the western parcel was subject to a title cloud due to a purported issue that Norfolk Southern Railroad had a claim on the property. Following research into the matter, it was determined that Norfolk Southern Railroad no longer has a claim on the parcel. A quit-claim deed will be finalized in the near future.

The total expenditure of the developer to date is \$782,863 and MWBE (Minority and Women-owned Business Enterprise) activity is exceeding their targeted goal on the Union Square Campus. Details were provided in a printout distributed to members.

John Merrill, 7406 Summerwind Court, Summerfield, North Carolina, is the project manager for the Union Square Campus development. He described progress being made in Building 1 that is still on track to be completed in late June, 2016. They plan to meet next week to discuss setting up a meeting in March or April with the four user groups and the neighborhood to provide hardhat tours of the site. They will also respond to questions from the neighborhood about how area students might be able to map into the programs that will be offered there.

Mr. Chapman said that SEDG will be back before the Commission at the April, 2016 meeting with revisions to the plan which will take into account the evolution of the project.

(b) Bragg Street Right-of-Way

Referring to a map, Ms. Arkin described properties to be recombined as needed for the Downtown Greenway as right-of-way. Once the land has been combined, the portion that is needed for the Greenway can be conveyed back to the City. The survey work has begun and the Legal Department is working on the deed to go along with this.

Staff is asking the Commission to consider this recombination of parcels and to consider approving dedication of the strip that is required for the Greenway to the City of Greensboro for the use of building the Greenway. They are also asking the Commission to authorize the Chair to execute the appropriate documents including the recombination plat and the deed for the conveyance of the property.

Responding to questions, Ms. Arkin said that design work is almost complete for this and it is anticipated that the project will be bid and construction will begin sometime in the late spring. Staff is working with Downtown Greenway on stormwater coordination and railway issues are beginning to be resolved.

Ms. Chaney moved approval of the request as stated by staff, seconded by Ms. Harris. The Commission voted unanimously 5-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Enochs, Gravely, McQueary, Chaney, Harris. Nays: None.)

DRAFT ANNUAL REPORT DISTRIBUTION:

The Annual Report for the Redevelopment Commission of Greensboro was distributed to members reflecting activities that were done in the fiscal year 2014-15. These are last year's activities along with new information about what is anticipated and ongoing for the current fiscal year which began July 1, 2015. She asked Commissioners to review the document over the next few weeks so that revisions or approval can be made at the next meeting. Once approved by the Commission, copies of the Annual Report will go to City Council and the City Manager to become part of the public record.

REDEVELOPMENT COMMISSION BUSINESS ITEMS:

(a) Substitution of Trustee

Counsel Carruthers explained that there needs to be a motion to empower Sue Schwartz or her designees, or preferably the RCG Chair, to assign substitution trustees if necessary. This would be an ongoing process in the future to put an appropriate trustee in place of former counsel.

Mr. Gravely moved to accept the request as presented, seconded by Ms. Chaney. The Commission voted unanimously 5-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Enochs, Gravely, McQueary, Chaney, Harris. Nays: None.)

(b) Banking Transaction Procedures

Staff presented a draft set of procedures at the November, 2015 meeting for document management associated with banking transactions. At that time the Commission agreed that a new signature card could be signed. The procedures are included in the packet distributed to Commissioners. Staff asked the Commission to consider adopting the procedures so there would be no questions about any kind of impropriety if a transaction had to be done.

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

STAFF UPDATES:

Ms. Arkin said that staff is still working with the developer of the Family Dollar on Martin Luther King, Jr. Drive to move forward following dismissal of the earlier appeal to Superior Court.

Ms. Arkin reported that the North Carolina Department of Environment Quality (NCDEQ) requires an update each year on whether or not the City is in compliance with the restrictions that are in the Brownfields Agreement. This is an agreement that the Commission has with the state of North Carolina. She said that there is compliance and staff has been in contact with the project manager at NCDEQ to talk through the process. The document of compliance has been reviewed by Elizabeth Link, Project Manager for the Brownfields Program, with the City of Greensboro.

Staff will send the document out to members for their review so they can express their concurrence by email.

ADJOURNMENT:

There being no further business before the Group, the meeting adjourned at 6:57 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Sue Schwartz
Planning Director
SS: sm/jd

**APPROVED MINUTES OF THE
REDEVELOPMENT COMMISSION
OF GREENSBORO
SPECIAL MEETING
MARCH 3, 2016**

The special meeting of the Redevelopment Commission of Greensboro (RCG) was held on Thursday, March 3, 2016, at the New Hope Missionary Baptist Church, W.M. Richmond Multi-Purpose Center, commencing at 5:39 p.m. The following members were present: Robert Enochs, Chairman; Clinton Gravely; Dawn Chaney; and Angela Harris. Staff present included Dyan Arkin, Russ Clegg, and Hanna Cockburn. Also present was Jennifer Schneier, City Attorney's Office.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

a) February 3, 2016 Regular Meeting

Mr. Gravely moved approval of the February 3, 2016 regular meeting minutes as written, seconded by Ms. Chaney. The Commission voted 4-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Enochs, Harris, Gravely, Chaney. Nays: None.)

APPROVAL OF REDEVELOPMENT COMMISSION ANNUAL REPORT

Members are in receipt of the final version of the Redevelopment Commission Annual Report. Ms. Arkin pointed out and explained differences between the original draft that members were given to review and the reprinted final version. If approved by the Commission, copies of the Annual Report will be distributed to City Council and the City Manager's Office and made public on the website.

Ms. Chaney moved approval of the Redevelopment Commission Annual Report for 2014-15, seconded by Ms. Harris. The Commission voted 4-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Enochs, Harris, Gravely, Chaney. Nays: None.)

BROWNFIELDS AGREEMENT LAND USE RESTRICTIONS UPDATE

Ms. Arkin said that the annual update for the Brownfields Agreement for the South Elm project was emailed to RCG members for their review. Commission members emailed their responses to staff and indicated their approval for Chair Enochs to sign the document. The Commission may affirm that this action was taken by email so that it can be part of the permanent minutes.

Ms. Harris moved to affirm that it was approved through email by Commissioners for Chair Enochs to sign the document so that staff can submit the Brownfields Agreement Land Use Restrictions Update. The motion was seconded by Mr. Gravely. The Commission voted 4-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Enochs, Harris, Gravely, Chaney. Nays: None.)

STAFF UPDATES

Ms. Cockburn stated that the acquisitions for Heritage House are continuing on a voluntary basis and 93 offers have been accepted for 93 units. Staff will be sending out an additional letter to all of the remaining units reminding them the offer is still valid and that they have a limited amount of time before other actions may occur. The next avenue forward after this would be to either file for eminent domain in Superior Court or to go through the Minimum Housing procedure and demolish the building. She explained that acquiring some of remaining units may be difficult and future actions by the Commission may be required.

Responding to questions, Ms. Cockburn said that the estimated demolition cost is just over \$2 million which includes repairs to the Meridian Center where the building attaches so that the building can be made whole. They will bid the demolition at the necessary time.

Ms. Cockburn informed members that Historic Preservation staff will be conducting a Historic Tax Credit Workshop in the first week of April, 2016. Representatives from the State Historic Preservation Office will be present to talk about the new tax credits and how to effectively apply for those for projects. Staff will email additional information when details become available.

WILLOW OAKS REDEVELOPMENT AREA

- **Public Hearing on Development Proposal for English Street Properties**

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

Mr. Clegg provided a brief overview of the development proposal for the English Street properties. In January, 2016, Mike Cooke, Partnership Homes, came to the Redevelopment Commission with a basic concept and sketch plan for the proposed development of English Street properties. The Commission asked Mr. Cooke to further develop the proposal and for staff to secure an appraisal to begin the process of seeking public input before considering disposition of the properties to Mr. Cooke. Mr. Cooke came back to the Commission in February with a more developed set of plans and staff informed members that an appraisal placed the value of the property at \$30,000. There were very basic terms for a sales agreement, a motion was made to hold a Public Hearing at the next meeting, and members agreed that more community input was necessary.

Mr. Clegg indicated that a community meeting was held last week at New Hope Missionary Baptist Church. The general consensus of the community was that they were not looking to have more apartments built in the neighborhood. The community appreciated work that had been done to rehab apartments that were already there; however, they were looking for home ownership and single-family homes.

Relative to the terms of the agreement, the property will be conveyed at no less than the fair market value. One appraiser has placed the property value at \$30,000 and staff is in process of acquiring two additional appraisals. The plan will be built as per the site plan drawing and any changes will need to be approved by the Redevelopment Commission. The developer will also submit elevations to be approved prior to construction. The agreement to purchase property will expire in March, 2018 if by that time there has not been a closing. The construction must start within six months of the closing and must be completed within 20 months.

Mike Cooke, President of Partnership Homes, Inc., provided a brief history of Partnership Homes. He introduced Bob Kelly, Chairman of the Partnership Homes Board, who was present in the audience. Partnership Homes attempts to build new, energy efficient, safe and attractive housing that is affordable. They own and maintain all the properties that they have built.

Mr. Cooke explained that they approached City staff before Christmas seeking a property that could be developed as a pocket neighborhood. A pocket neighborhood is a group of small, energy efficient single-family houses that are arranged around a central green common area with a parking lot off to the side. This type of neighborhood provides amenities such as gathering space, walkways, playgrounds, community gardens, etc. The property will be heavily landscaped and will be very attractive.

During discussions with the City, property located at 213, 215, 217, and 219 South English Street was identified as suitable for a pocket neighborhood. Working with Borum-Wade Engineers, he presented a rough sketch of the proposed project to the Commission at their January, 2016 meeting. The project will be funded by three sources. These sources are a City HOME loan, a North Carolina Housing Finance Agency Supported Development Program loan, and a Federal Home Loan Bank grant.

Mr. Cooke addressed comments made by the neighborhood at last week's community meeting. The neighborhood indicated they would like a single-family ownership project. Partnership Homes believes in home ownership and they are trying to achieve this in Ole Asheboro and other neighborhoods. He stated his opinion that there are some problems with putting single-family dwellings on this site and within the general neighborhood. The property abuts an industrial site which is typically not a site where single-family is built because it causes potential owners to worry about future home values. The property is currently zoned Multifamily and has that designation because of where it is located. It is located in a buffer between other multifamily and single-family dwellings and a truly industrial site. In addition, it is almost impossible to build an attractive, quality, energy efficient home and be able to price it at a point where it is affordable in the neighborhood.

George I. Allison, Pastor at New Hope Missionary Baptist Church, 306 South English Street, addressed Mr. Cooke's comments on the cost of building and pointed out if something affordable can be built to rent, then something can be built and sold for ownership that is affordable. He said that there are people present at this meeting who own their homes and therefore, it is not impossible to own a home in this neighborhood. In addition, he pointed out that buffer zones are in place to shield homes from the industrial site. There is no reason why single-family dwellings cannot be built next door to multifamily units and he said there is at least one person present this evening who lives in a nearby development where both types of dwellings are present. He said that economic development starts with basic home ownership and that is how the neighborhood wants to improve their properties and community. In promoting the concept of "One Greensboro", there must be home ownership in this community as well.

Verna Torain, 2323 Apache Street, is President of the Cottage Grove Neighborhood Association. She was speaking on behalf of the Cottage Grove neighborhood. They would like to see home ownership in the neighborhood because there are already enough apartments and rental properties. She owns her home on Apache Street that is located adjacent to commercial property.

Councilwoman Sharon Hightower, 6 Bells Court, is a neighborhood resident. She said that although Partnership Homes has done some good projects, the proposed project is not one that they want right now in the neighborhood. East Greensboro lacks amenities and is saturated with apartments. She pointed out that affordable housing has many meanings but does not necessarily mean low-income housing. She felt that change will not come to the neighborhood until there is a change in housing types. She commented on the low \$30,000 appraised land value for the proposed project located on 1.7 acres of land. Housing values will never increase as long as the land is cheap. She asked the Redevelopment Commission to seriously consider how they will accept this proposal. Mr. Cooke has not changed the mindset of his proposal after listening to comments that were made at the community meeting. She commented that New Hope Church has had revival on the subject land for many years and yet, nobody offered the land to them for purchase. She felt that this meeting could serve as a lesson to all to learn how to collaborate, dialogue, and work together with respect.

Chair Enochs asked Councilwoman Hightower if it would be acceptable if the proposed project was developed in the same layout for sale rather than for rent. She said one or two bedroom homes do not serve a family and family needs must be met. She pointed out that one and two bedroom dwellings do not have a good resale value. She was supportive of a developer coming with a good proposal for adequate housing, even townhomes, that is not too dense. She expressed concern with a pocket neighborhood offering parking offsite which does not serve the elderly and disabled.

Ms. Harris asked about percentages for rental versus home ownership for this area. Councilwoman Hightower said that the neighborhood is 47 percent rental versus 40 percent home ownership.

Shirley Vanstory, 4308 Belfield Drive, asked that no more apartments be built in the neighborhood. She commented that she could find no information online relative to the subject properties being for sale. She sees signs where land is for sale; however, there were only three properties for sale by the City when she went online. In addition, the Church was never given the opportunity to purchase the subject properties. She noted improvements that have been made in other zip codes and she asked the City of Greensboro to fulfill its promise to redevelopment east Greensboro. To redevelop east Greensboro, there can be no more apartments. There is not a lot of diversity in east Greensboro and the community would like to welcome others into the neighborhood who

would like to live there. She reiterated that the neighborhood wants home ownership to draw residents into the area.

Geneva Headen, South English Street, commented on the large number of apartments on the street and her desire to see more single-family houses. More amenities are needed in the community and she felt the area was in need of a facelift.

Patricia MacFoy, 4401 Belfield Drive, is the Executive Director of New Hope Community Development Group. She expressed disappointment that Mr. Cooke did not contact community members following the community meeting on Monday night to ask what they wanted in their neighborhood. She expected Mr. Cooke to come to tonight's meeting with some different conversations. She stated that affordable, quality homes can be built in this neighborhood where there is plenty of available land. Something needs to be done to bring economic development into the community so that more people can buy affordable, quality homes that can be built in this neighborhood. She suggested Mr. Cooke talk to the people of the community to find out what they want before bringing in a proposal. Neighbors want affordable houses and amenities like other neighborhoods have. Ms. MacFoy said that the proposed one and two bedroom apartments would work for someone just passing through or for student housing; however, it does not work for a family.

Responding to a question from Ms. Harris, Ms. MacFoy described the function of the New Hope Community Development Group. They are a community advocacy group that is separate from the Church. They are the outreach arm for the community and they partner with other organizations within the community. Their purpose is economic development, education, and community resources. They talk to the community about predatory lending, how to buy affordable housing, etc. In addition, they partner with Mustard Seed Community Health Center and the Greensboro Housing Coalition. Ms. MacFoy indicated that they have done over 200 surveys to needs and wants of the people in the community.

Ms. Chaney asked Ms. MacFoy for a copy of the survey data to distribute to Commissioners. This will allow Commission members to review data from residents that specifically represents the needs of the neighborhood.

Bob Kelly, 707 Pebble Drive, said that Partnership Homes acquired six units on South English Street about five years ago. The renovation was completed two and a half years ago and six families were moved into the units and are still residing there. They just finished renovating 16 two-bedroom, one-bath units on Everitt Street and there have been over 60 applications to rent those units. He stated there is a need for rental units in this area. He said the proposed units that will be rented are houses, not apartments. His hope is that these units can be converted from rental to ownership at some point. Partnership Homes does not want to own apartments forever; rather, they would like the units to develop into home ownership. Relative to the proposed project, he indicated that support services will be available to assist families with whatever needs they have in budgeting, improving credit, and life skills. Mr. Kelly addressed the size of the proposed units and explained that the funding they would like to use specifically designates for one-bedroom units but there may be some latitude in the composition of the units on the site plan.

There being no other speakers, Ms. Chaney moved to close the Public Hearing, seconded by Mr. Gravely. The Commission voted 4-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Enochs, Harris, Gravely, Chaney. Nays: None.)

Ms. Chaney commented that she liked the feedback received from the neighborhood reflecting a united effort. She felt that the Redevelopment Commission should find a way to let everyone in the neighborhood know what is available for sale and how those properties can be purchased from the Commission. Properties owned by the Commission are sold at a lower price than what they would be on the open market to facilitate development of the land so there can be a return on the investment for the City.

Ms. Harris stated she was sympathetic to the idea of home ownership and understood the concerns of the neighborhood. She felt the Redevelopment Commission should do a better job to let communities know what properties are available to be sold. One good way to do this might be to let the neighborhood churches know what is for sale in their community and let that information trickle down to the congregation and the community as a whole.

Ms. Harris asked if the community was willing to leave the subject property vacant versus having apartments or rentals in that space. Pastor Allison stated that if it is the will of the City through the Redevelopment Commission to have this property developed, the church family and the Community Development Group will work toward actually purchasing and developing the property for home ownership. If the City says it is the Church's option to buy the property and leave it vacant, then they will buy the property and continue to use it as they have done in the past for various outreach functions. They have no problem going ahead to purchase the property and development it if the City says it must be developed.

Mr. Gravely expressed regret that the comments and concerns voiced tonight were not heard earlier in this process. It is the aim of the Commission, as well as the City, to develop available land. The Commission will take all comments and information into consideration when they take a vote.

Chair Enochs felt that the consensus of the Redevelopment Commission is to table a vote on this matter until the April, 2016 meeting.

Counsel Schneier pointed out there is still critical information needed by the Commission to be able to evaluate the best decision. Chair Enochs noted that the Commission needs to see the remaining two appraisals along with the information from the community survey.

Ms. Harris moved to table this matter until the April, 2016 Redevelopment Commission meeting, seconded by Ms. Chaney. The Commission voted 4-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Enochs, Harris, Gravely, Chaney. Nays: None.)

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business before the Group, the meeting adjourned at 7:12 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Sue Schwartz
Planning Director
SS: sm/jd

**MINUTES OF THE
REDEVELOPMENT COMMISSION
OF GREENSBORO
SPECIAL MEETING
APRIL 7, 2016**

The special meeting of the Redevelopment Commission of Greensboro (RCG) was held on Thursday, April 7, 2016, 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; Dawn Chaney; Charles McQueary and Angela Harris. Staff present included Dyan Arkin, Russ Clegg, and Hanna Cockburn. Also present was Tom Carruthers, Attorney for the Commission, and City Councilwoman, Sharon Hightower.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

a) March 3, 2016 Regular Meeting

Ms. Harris moved approval of the March 3, 2016 regular meeting minutes as written, seconded by Mr. McQueary. The Commission voted 3-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Gravely, McQueary, Harris. Nays: None.)

Ms. Arkin asked Commissioners to consider the removal of Item 4 from the agenda. The item does not need to be heard by the Commission at this evening's meeting.

Mr. McQueary moved to remove Item 4 from the agenda as recommended by staff, seconded by Ms. Harris. The Commission voted 3-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Gravely, McQueary, Harris. Nays: None.)

WILLOW OAKS REDEVELOPMENT AREA

It was noted that the public hearing portion of the deliberation for the proposed project was closed at the last meeting.

Mr. McQueary commented that the proposed concept sounded like a good idea when it was presented to the Commission two months ago. He was not present at the last meeting held with families who live in the area. He noted there was strong objection at the last meeting to the path he felt made sense and he asked for more pros and cons relative to the matter before he could vote on the proposal. He commented it is an important consideration to support projects that benefit the City and its tax base; however, the most important consideration is to support projects that add quality to communities.

Acting Chair Gravely commented that there was a lot of opposition at the last meeting to the project that was proposed as single-family, two-bedroom dwellings that are to be rented and not sold. Mr. McQueary asked if there was any sense of the percentage of people living in the area who would be affected by this who were in opposition to the proposal. Acting Chair Gravely stated that people at the meeting speaking for the neighborhood were in opposition to the proposal. Ms. Arkin estimated there were probably 20 people at the last meeting but she has had no offline communication as to whether or not they represented the full community.

Counsel Carruthers said that Jennifer Schneier, City of Greensboro Attorney's Office, was present at the meeting. She requested that research be done into the redevelopment plan for this area of the City since that is the guiding principle for the Commission. One of the stated goals in the plan was to encourage and increase home ownership. He noted that when the plan was developed in 2000, approximately 24 percent of housing within the redevelopment boundary was owner occupied as

compared to 54 percent on average in the City. Further research indicated that in 2015, projections of the area showed home ownership dropping to a little over 20 percent as a result of the economic decline.

Counsel Carruthers asked Mr. McQueary if he felt comfortable making a decision on this matter based on what he read in the minutes of the last meeting. Mr. McQueary stated that he was comfortable making a decision on the proposal. He also indicated his high respect for the comments and opinions of the two other Commissioners who were present at the last meeting.

Ms. Harris moved to the reject the proposal, seconded by Mr. McQueary. The Commission voted 3-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Gravely, Harris, McQueary. Nays: None.)

The Commission directed staff to prepare a Request for Proposals (RFP) for this piece of property for lower to moderate income home ownership. Staff committed to work on the RFP and possibly have it available at the next meeting.

Mr. McQueary asked that there be broader communication within the community relative to options for people who live in the area who would like to become a bidder for this particular parcel of land.

Councilwoman Sharon Hightower thanked the Commission for listening to the community and neighborhood.

SOUTH ELM STREET REDEVELOPMENT AREA

a) Temporary Parking Lot Design and Construction

Ms. Arkin stated that funds were approved by City Council on March 15, 2016 for 250 spaces of surface parking. The cost estimate approved for the temporary surface parking lot was \$775,000. Staff anticipates that the actual cost may come in lower than the estimate.

Ms. Chaney joined the meeting at 5:15 p.m.

Staff is asking the Commission to consider final approval of the configuration of the temporary surface parking lot to move forward to construction. The Reimbursement Agreement that is in place with Union Square Campus, Inc. is on City Council's agenda for the consideration of an amendment that would add the addition of streetscape and this parking structure to the contract. This work would be done in conjunction with the completion of their building, as time is of the essence. Some parking facilities must be available for Union Square Campus when they open in June, 2016.

Acting Chair Gravely asked how long the temporary lot will be used. Ms. Arkin said it was estimated that the lot would not be used longer than a year. It is dependent on another component of the Union Square project being developed. The Master Contractor has until the end of this calendar year to bring forward a second component for development. If the second development is a component that will increase the tax base to help provide for the parking structure, then a permanent solution will be entertained.

Ms. Chaney commented that the City owns land on Bragg Street under the underpass all the way up to Eugene Street. The land is clear and flat and permanent parking could be put there for the entire Union Square Campus after Phase II is completed and hopefully even on the west side of Elm Street. This is not an entire solution for parking but at least it would not have to be taken away after a year's time. She expressed concern spending money for a temporary lot. It was noted that the temporary lot would have to be removed when Union Campus begins construction on the Phase II component. Ms. Arkin said the developer's intention is that when a component developer comes in to build a structure, the use will

support some type of structured parking. Ms. Chaney was concerned that the whole project should not be held up due to a lack of parking for students.

Counsel Carruthers stated that the proposed solution is not a perfect one. City Council was aware of all the possible factors when the expenditure was approved. There is a heightened sense of getting this done in such a way that all the partners of the City can agree. The City Council and City Managers are aware that this is what Union Square wants at this moment and that they are willing to agree.

Ms. Arkin presented an illustrative plan of a temporary parking configuration with 250 spaces. A strong effort was made to make the area facing Gate City Boulevard a lot more pedestrian and visually friendly. She noted that there will be changes made to the area around the cell tower and she described plans for landscaping the lot that will include a screen along South Elm Street. The plan was drawn as if it was to be paved for purposes of the cost estimate. However, they are looking at paving only the section where handicap parking is available. There will be paving along the south part of the lot to insure good access for emergency and service vehicles. The remainder of the lot will probably be gravel with wheel stops. She indicated that drainage issues have been addressed and a lighting plan has been drawn up.

Mr. McQueary moved to approve the design and construction of the temporary lot, seconded by Ms. Harris. The Commission voted 4-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Gravely, Chaney, Harris, McQueary. Nays: None.)

STAFF UPDATES

Ms. Cockburn informed members that as of today, staff has received offers to purchase that have been accepted for 131 units and just over 90 of those offers have closed. They will eventually own a majority share of closed properties which will allow the Commission to make a determination about how to move forward with the HOA-owned units. The Homeowner's Association has no legal standing and they have no representative according to the Secretary of State. The HOA owns approximately 15 or 16 units. The HOA units are not included in the total of 131 units.

Ms. Arkin stated that staff is working with the bank to bring the Commission's bank account back into working status. The Commission approved doing a new signature card for the account three months ago; however, the account is inactive because there has been no activity on it. Signature cards will be presented to the Chair once the issue has been resolved.

Mr. McQueary asked the staff to prepare an operating plan on how neighborhoods are to be notified when vacant land is available so that situations like English Street can be avoided in the future. Ms. Harris commented that the City could notify churches located in the area who in turn can inform neighbors that property is available for purchase in their community. Mr. McQueary felt that a record should be available to show that proper and detailed notification was made to members of the community who could be affected by property for sale for development. Ms. Arkin acknowledged the Commission's direction to staff to prepare the operating plan and anticipated that it could be presented at either the May or June, 2016 meeting. Commissioners discussed placing signage at properties for sale by the Redevelopment Commission. In addition, a sign could also be used at the property to advertise the 10-day upset bid process.

Ms. Arkin asked the Commission to agree to allow Vice-Chair Gravely to sign paperwork to get that into the minutes as an approved action at the next meeting. She explained that the paperwork is from the Finance Department and pertains to the contract for auditing. The financial statements for the Redevelopment Commission, the ABC Commission and the Transit Authority are now included with the City's financial statements. These statements are all audited at the same time to give a complete audit.

Mr. McQueary moved that it is the consensus of the Commission that permission is given to Vice-Chair Gravely to sign the paperwork and then it will be ratified at the next meeting. The motion was seconded

by Mr. Harris. The Commission voted 4-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Gravely, Chaney, Harris, McQueary. Nays: None.)

ADJOURNMENT

Ms. Chaney moved to adjourn the meeting, seconded by Ms. Harris. The Commission voted 4-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Gravely, Chaney, Harris, McQueary. Nays: None.)

There being no further business before the Group, the meeting adjourned at 5:45 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Sue Schwartz
Planning Director
SS: sm/jd

**MINUTES OF THE
REDEVELOPMENT COMMISSION
OF GREENSBORO
REGULAR MEETING
MAY 4, 2016**

The regularly scheduled meeting of the Greensboro Redevelopment Commission was held on Wednesday, May 4, 2016. Members present were: Clinton Gravely, Acting Chair; Charles McQueary; Dawn Chaney; and Angela Harris. Staff present were: Dyan Arkin, Russ Clegg, Hanna Cockburn and Tom Carruthers, City Attorney's Office.

Vice Chair Gravely called the meeting to order at 5:00 p.m.

Approval of the Minutes

- a) April 7, 2016 Special Meeting (**APPROVED**)

Mr. McQueary moved to approve the minutes of the April 7, 2016 meeting, as written, seconded by Ms. Chaney. The Commission voted unanimously in favor of the motion.

Ole Asheboro Redevelopment Area

- a) Conveyance of 614 (Near) Douglas Street to GHDP - The Ole Asheboro Redevelopment Plan, as amended, provides for the Ole Asheboro Single Family Lot Initiative, a program to develop homes for ownership by low-to-moderate-income households on publicly-acquired, scattered sites in the neighborhood. (**APPROVED**)

Hanna Cockburn stated that maps being shown indicate the location of the property in question. On May 2, 2016, the Greensboro Housing Development Partnership (GHDP) entered into a development agreement with Community Housing Solutions (CHS) for the construction of a single family residence at 616 Douglas Street. In order to provide sufficient street frontage to site a new home on this lot, CHS has proposed to purchase the RCG-owned, non-buildable parcel at 614-Near Douglas Street. This conveyance is authorized under NCGS 160A-514(1-3) Conveyance for Public Purposes which allows the Commission to convey real property for affordable housing at private sale in accordance with a redevelopment plan.

In January 2016, GHDP approved CHS as a builder in this program and at their meeting on the past Monday, agreed to sell two (2) lots to them, including 616 Douglas Street. Sale of this parcel is contingent on the acquisition of 614-Near Douglas Street. Adding just that small amount of street frontage to the lot allows for a house with off-street parking. GHDP is requesting that 614-Near Douglas Street be transferred to them, so it can be combined with 616 Douglas Street. The same standards and requirements associated with the previously transferred parcel, including the requirement that the site be developed for single family use and owner-occupied will be continued on this parcel as well. It will be subject to a combination deed and plat so it will be, by all appearances, one lot. They are requesting that this transfer occur at

no cost to GHDP. It is in the public's interest to undertake this activity, which was identified in the Redevelopment Plan. CHS is paying \$8,400 for the adjacent lot.

The Commission will be asked to approve the transfer of 616-Near Douglas Street to GHDP, contingent on City Council approval, and subject to the following conditions:

- The lot shall be combined with the adjacent parcel at 616 Douglas Street; and
- Use restricted to single family residential uses.

Gene Brown, Executive Director of Community Housing Solutions, 1014 S. Aycock Street, stated that they have a plan for a single-story, 3 bedroom, 2 bath house with about 1,548 square feet. They work with Tight Lines Design, which specializes in making efficient floor plans for smaller lots. The sliver of land requested would allow for a driveway to be placed on the property. The plans for the proposed house will comply with all the restrictions of this neighborhood.

Mr. McQueary asked if the property just to the south would be considered land-locked. Hanna Cockburn stated that it appears to be. Staff has not done any research to that end. Mr. McQueary stated that he has concerns that at some point in the future the person that owns that property could demand that they be permitted to drive from Douglas Street across the subject property. Hanna Cockburn stated that from the work staff has done on both the subject properties, they cannot find any easement encumbrances.

After a short discussion, Ms. Chaney moved to approve the transfer of 614-Near Douglas Street, with the conditions as explained by staff and subject to City Council approval, seconded by Mr. McQueary. The Commission voted unanimously in favor of the motion.

Gene Brown stated that the properties at 203 and 205 Gillespie Street were previously before the Commission and homes were relocated and rehabbed. 203 was sold about a year ago and 205 was sold just last week. The person that purchased 203 a year ago was a friend and co-worker with the person that purchased 205 Gillespie. They are hoping to close on June 10th.

RCG Business Items:

- a) At the April meeting, the Commission agreed to allow Vice Chair Gravely to sign a document from the Finance Department, which pertains to the contract for auditing. The Commission will be asked to ratify their decision.

The Commission voted unanimously in favor of this item.

Staff Updates:

a) Willow Oaks

Russ Clegg stated that there is a Request for Proposals (RFP) for technical assistance in the Willow Oaks area to help staff understand the context of Willow Oaks with the changes in the housing market and the experience of having that project built out for a few years. Staff has looked over the different governing documents and in the Plan for Willow Oaks; there are a lot of

different documents because of the specificity of some of the design and because of the number of partners involved. The project started back in the late 1990s as a Hope VI project to revive Morningside Homes and turn that into a more urban space. The Redevelopment Plan was adopted in 2000 and a master developer was selected for the project and development began shortly thereafter.

Development slowed toward the latter part of that decade and the central part, which was the original Hope VI grant, was closed out by the Greensboro Housing Authority and the responsibility of the development was transferred to Greensboro Housing Development Partnership (GHDP). Subsequently, the agreement with the master developer was terminated, so at this point in time there is no master developer for the rest of the project. The Housing Authority still owns some properties that they lease, but for the most part they are not engaged in actual development at this point.

When the properties were transferred to GHDP there were a lot of governance documents transferred to them also that explained how properties get transferred, the legal way that all that is structured. Currently, the plan for the area shows the remaining vacant parcels platted primarily for single family detached houses with some other lots identified for townhomes and twin-homes. There is also flexible space that may be used for commercial at some point in time.

The RFP for technical assistance focuses on whether the building program is the right mix of housing given the changes in the housing market. It also focuses on the greater redevelopment area, where development of properties owned by the Redevelopment Commission need to work in concert with Willow Oaks. The RFP also asks for responses from professionals who can make recommendations on outreach to the development community to make sure the right partners are involved as it moves forward. The ability to communicate marketing, design and other concepts to the neighborhood is critical. The residents will be very involved in the process to look at the plans and reevaluate any changes that need to be made. The RFP proposals are due back on May 20th. It is hoped that there will be a good response, so a decision can be made in July.

Additional Business:

Hanna Cockburn gave an update on the Heritage House. As of today staff has received 133 positive responses to offers to purchase and they expect one more this week. Legal staff is working with a couple of owners who have existing mortgages on their property that are larger than the value as determined by the appraisers. Staff is continuing to work on this issue.

There being no further business before the Commission, the meeting adjourned at 5:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Sue Schwartz
Planning Director
SS: sm/jd

**MINUTES OF THE
REDEVELOPMENT COMMISSION
OF GREENSBORO
JUNE 1, 2016**

The regular meeting of the Redevelopment Commission of Greensboro (RCG) was held on Wednesday, June 1, 2016, 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; Charles McQueary and Angela Harris. Staff present included Dyan Arkin and Hanna Cockburn. Also present was Tom Carruthers, Attorney for the Commission, and City Councilwoman, Nancy Hoffmann.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

a) May 4, 2016

Ms. Chaney moved approval of the May 4, 2016 meeting minutes as written, seconded by Mr. Gravely. The Commission voted 4-0-1 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Gravely, Chaney, McQueary, Harris. Nays: None. Abstain: Enochs.) Mr. Enochs was absent at the May, 2016 meeting and abstained from the vote.

SOUTH ELM STREET REDEVELOPMENT AREA:

a) Consideration of Revisions to Cell Tower Lease

Ms. Arkin described the location of the cell tower in relation to the South Elm redevelopment site. Gate City Boulevard is located to the north and Bragg Street is to the south of the cell tower site. The fenced area of the cell tower was originally intended to be 30 feet behind the curb line but the fence was actually put right up to the sidewalk. In order to make the temporary parking work and to do the streetscape along Arlington Street, the front fence line needs to be moved back to where it was originally supposed to be. The new entry point will be on the south side of the parking lot instead of the Arlington Street entrance.

Ms. Arkin explained that the cell tower was put in the wrong place and the description does not match the actual location of the fence. The only thing this lease agreement is intended to do is to change the description of the section of the parcel being leased.

Counsel Carruthers commented that he felt comfortable with the modification of the lease premises which corrects the fenced areas as described by staff. However, he expressed concern with the confidentiality language in paragraph 4 that is in violation of the public records law. In addition, he expressed concern with language in paragraph 9 regarding securitization rights of the tenant. The language has the Redevelopment Commission consenting to the exercise of its rights to securitize the lease through its fixtures. In essence, the Commission would be voluntarily giving up landlord rights to the degree that someone has installed fixtures on the tower. This is not in the best interest of the City and is not required by law for a cell tower.

Counsel Carruthers requested that the Commission approve the lease but exclude approval of paragraphs 4 and 9 and request that this be executed in substantial conformity therewith. Another option would be to go back to the tenant to redraw the lease with language that is acceptable to the Commission.

Chair Enochs indicated his preference for staff to bring back a lease for consideration at the next meeting with paragraphs 4 and 9 eliminated. He was uncomfortable changing paragraph 4 or having any type of confidentiality unless estopped by law. Mr. McQueary was in agreement with Chair Enochs.

Ms. Arkin said that staff will communicate with the tenant and bring back a revised lease at the next meeting.

STAFF UPDATES:

a) Heritage House

Ms. Cockburn informed the Commission that 145 of 177 units have been submitted as offers to purchase. The remaining 32 units are held in 14 different ownerships, including the HOA (Homeowner's Association). A final letter was mailed last month to each of the remaining owners encouraging them to accept the voluntary offer to purchase. Staff will present a strategy to the Commission at the next meeting for the acquisition of the remaining units.

b) Strategies for RCG-Owned Land

Ms. Cockburn presented signage that will be placed on existing land owned by the Redevelopment Commission. The signs contain a phone number and a quick response scan code that will take the user to a City landing page. The page will describe all the different ways property can be acquired from the City. The landing page accessed by the scan code is a consolidated site to purchase property from any entity within the City and will include information about City-owned property through foreclosure, access right-of-way, as well as other programs offered by the City. In addition, she previewed an interactive website that is accessible from the City landing page. The site features information about the lots and includes a link to contact the City property manager.

ADDITIONAL BUSINESS:

At the request of Mr. McQueary, Ms. Arkin provided a brief update on the South Elm Street redevelopment project. The anticipated completion date for construction of the Union Square Campus building is June 20, 2016. School staff will begin to occupy the building in July to get ready for the students who will come in August. Permits have been secured for streetscape work and the temporary parking lot. The projected time frame for completion of the parking lot is the second week of July with completion of the streetscape following shortly thereafter. She commented that the master developer is currently in conversation with two multifamily development groups who have expressed interest in the site.

Deeds for the transfer of property with the railroad have been finalized. The master development team will provide an update of the project to the Commission at the July or August meeting.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business before the Group, the meeting adjourned at 5:42 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Sue Schwartz
Planning Director
SS: sm/jd

**MINUTES OF THE
REDEVELOPMENT COMMISSION
OF GREENSBORO
JULY 6, 2016**

The regular meeting of the Redevelopment Commission of Greensboro (RCG) was held on Wednesday, July 6, 2016, 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; Charles McQueary; and Angela Harris. Staff present was Dyan Arkin. Also present was Tom Carruthers, Attorney for the Commission, and City Councilwoman, Nancy Hoffmann.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

a) June 1, 2016

Mr. Gravely moved approval of the June 1, 2016 meeting minutes as written, seconded by Ms. Harris. The Commission voted 5-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Enochs, Gravely, Chaney, McQueary, Harris. Nays: None.)

SOUTH ELM STREET REDEVELOPMENT AREA:

a) Consideration of Revisions to Cell Tower Lease

At the last meeting the Commission asked staff to contact the cell tower tenant to discuss several revisions to the lease. Ms. Arkin presented a revised cell tower lease to the Commission reflecting the removal of Paragraphs 4 and 9. The items removed were a confidentiality clause and a clause giving the tenant a vested property right if they were to spend money putting equipment on the tower. The tenant agreed to remove these items and the revisions were approved by the Legal Department.

Ms. Arkin asked the Commission to consider executing the lease amendment and authorizing the Chair to sign the amendment and associated documents.

Mr. McQueary moved to accept the cell tower lease as presented by staff, seconded by Mr. Gravely. The Commission voted 5-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Enochs, Gravely, Chaney, McQueary, Harris. Nays: None.)

HERITAGE HOUSE REDEVELOPMENT AREA:

(a) Consideration of Use of Eminent Domain to Acquire Remaining Units

Chair Enochs noted that no Heritage House property owners were present for this agenda item.

Counsel Carruthers explained that condemnation is the legal ability of an entity with eminent domain rights, which the City has. This authority arose because the Commission took the lead and determined this area to be blighted due to the humanitarian and structural crisis occurring at the building. The Commission authorized staff to acquire as many of these individual units as possible using a consistent format. All of the acquisitions should be completed within 12 months and he added that they anticipate the first complaint to be filed within 30 days. The City has retained their rights under the Minimum Housing Authority; however, they are seeking to go through the process in the most equitable way possible.

Responding to questions, Counsel Carruthers stated that 28 units remain unsold with 15 of these units being owned by the Homeowner's Association (HOA). The HOA is defunct but it can be reformed. He

felt it was appropriate to wait until all the units have been acquired to reform it and then they can decide whether to foreclose upon it or condemn it. If there are fees still owed to the City separate from what is owed to the individual units, it may be appropriate to foreclose.

Councilwoman Hoffman asked about the timeframe for completing the process. Counsel Carruthers anticipated that all the lawsuits should be filed within 90 days if the Commission determines the City should go forward. He was hopeful that the lawsuits would be resolved within 6 months to 1 year. Because this is a court action, an appeal and subsequent delay is always a possibility; however, demolition would not necessarily be delayed. The City is prepared to spend a substantial sum of money to remove the hazardous building as it stands today.

Ms. Arkin clarified that the Commission is being asked to approve a resolution authorizing acquisition of the remaining 29 units to eminent domain proceedings under Article 3 of NSGS 40A.

Ms. Chaney moved to request the City to follow the procedures according to what they have legally designed for the Heritage House building, seconded by Mr. McQueary. The Commission voted 5-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Enochs, Gravely, Chaney, McQueary, Harris. Nays: None.)

STAFF UPDATES:

Ms. Arkin provided an update on the South Elm redevelopment project. The Union Square Campus building is 90 percent complete. However, the site is lagging behind a little bit due to weather and other delays. The Union Square Campus is on schedule for their August 5, 2016 opening. The move-in date for staff and faculty is July 18, 2016. The grand opening is scheduled for Friday, August 5, 2016 at 11:00 a.m.

Mr. Gravely asked staff for an update on the for sale signs that were placed on City owned property. Ms. Arkin said that the majority of signs have been up for two weeks but there has been no response yet from the public. The website that lists the properties that are for sale is www.greensboro-nc.gov/forsale. The website is still being worked on but it gives a good explanation of the different ways the properties can be purchased from the City of Greensboro. There is a link to a GIS based map on the website to get additional information on properties owned by the Redevelopment Commission and by Greensboro Housing Development Partnership.

Chair Enochs asked staff to keep this item on the list of monthly updates.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business before the Group, the meeting adjourned at 5:40 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Sue Schwartz
Planning Director
SS: sm/jd

**APPROVED MINUTES OF THE
REDEVELOPMENT COMMISSION
OF GREENSBORO
SEPTEMBER 7, 2016**

The regular meeting of the Redevelopment Commission of Greensboro (RCG) was held on Wednesday, September 7, 2016, 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; Charles McQueary; and Angela Harris. Staff present included Dyan Arkin and Hanna Cockburn. Also present was Tom Carruthers, Attorney for the Commission; Terri Jones and Andrew Kelly, City Attorney's Office; Alex Fisher, Intern; and City Councilwoman, Nancy Hoffmann.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

a) July 6, 2016

Mr. Gravely moved approval of the July 6, 2016 meeting minutes as written, seconded by Mr. McQueary. The Commission voted 5-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Enochs, Gravely, Chaney, McQueary, Harris. Nays: None.)

SOUTH ELM STREET REDEVELOPMENT AREA:

a) Development Status and Updates

Bob Chapman, South Elm Development Group (SEDG) was present to update Commissioners on the South Elm Street Redevelopment area. He introduced Maggie Quan, Realtor with Trademark Properties, Raleigh, North Carolina. Ms. Quan has been assigned to the Greensboro area, assuming SEDG signs a listing with Trademark Properties.

Mr. Chapman presented a PowerPoint presentation on the Union Square Campus (USC) located at the corner of Arlington Street and Gate City Boulevard. Shared parking with New Zion Church is working out well and the campus fits in nicely with the adjacent park. He felt that USC would be a huge success and said they are saving the best site for their next building.

Mr. Chapman reviewed the Master Plan for the project and indicated that Ms. Arkin is working on a streetscape plan that will provide for more trees in that area. The Master Developer Agreement was executed in June, 2013 and negotiations were finalized with the Gray families for a property swap in November, 2013, making it possible for USC to be built. Green Development and Design Standards were approved by the Commission in November, 2013 and the Declaration of Covenants, Conditions, and Restrictions (CCRs) were recorded in April, 2015. Infrastructure agreements with the City of Greensboro are ongoing.

The Master Plan for USC was approved on February 3, 2014. It required a minimum investment of \$50 million dollars over the course of the Master Development Agreement (MDA). Mr. Chapman projects an investment of approximately \$86 million until the project is complete. Including USC Phase I, 74 percent of the \$50 million dollar investment has been achieved at this point.

There were Brownfields issues associated with the site and a Brownfields Agreement was reached on October 1, 2014 with the Department of Environment Protection Agency in Raleigh, North Carolina. The hot spots have been retested and look good.

Mr. Chapman explained that there is a timeline in the MDA that requires SEDG to present the Commission with a proposed agreement with a component developer for the first portion of the property

to be developed. This was accomplished on February 3, 2015 when SEDG was competitively determined to be the component developer for Phase I and subsequently secured the anchor development. As directed in the MDA, he said that six months from the completion of the development of the first portion of the property, SEDG is to commence the sale and development of the second portion of the property. It is his belief that this was done already when the City entered into a five-year option with USC for a second development. It is not a requirement that they develop and if another entity would like to purchase the property, an upset bid process could take place with USC. The option with USC runs through the year 2020 and represents the second part of the requirement. The third requirement would be that the sale and development of the third portion of the property should commence six months after the development of the second portion. This requirement was completed at the time a letter of intent was signed with Weaver Cooke/Weaver-Kirkland for the development of 120 units of multifamily housing on the top half of the west side of South Elm Street. The letter of intent said this was contingent on the resolution of railroad right-of-way issues which was achieved through a quitclaim deed from Norfolk Southern Railroad to RCG, recorded on August 1, 2016, providing clear title to the site. There is also a requirement that there will be a minimum of \$10 million investment within three years of the sale of the first property component. This was achieved on August 5, 2016, the date the building was opened.

Mr. Chapman stated that the marketing and phasing plans are ongoing and there has been monitoring of the site along with inspections. No flaws were found during the inspections.

The Master Developer Agreement is for 12 years, to be completed by June 12, 2025. He would like to have the project completed before this date and to that end, SEDG plans to ask Weaver Cooke to bow out, as their Letter of Intent has expired. Following resolution of this matter, they would like to sign a listing agreement with Trademark Properties to be able to take advantage of their relationships with high quality multifamily developers in North Carolina.

Responding to questions, Mr. Chapman said that 57 permanent jobs have been created at USC. When asked to comment on the Weaver Cooke situation, he said that they were originally talking about building 204 apartments and a requirement was that the City put in a substantial amount of money for a parking structure. A number of meetings were held and the City was unable to commit to a permanent parking structure. Weaver Cooke came back with a second idea which was to build 120 units in terms of student housing or using tax credits, with 96 surface parking spaces and an additional \$2 million from the City as a gift. There has been no substantial communication and SEDG would like to let Weaver Cooke know that the time has come for action. He hopes to determine what Weaver Cooke plans to do sometime within the week. He would like to have a listing agreement with Trademark Properties for the site.

Relative to the preferred housing for Phase II, Ms. Chaney commented that the current demand in housing is from young professionals and students.

Maggie Quan, Trademark Properties, commented on Trademark's qualifications and nationwide connections for multifamily development. They would use their networking channels to promote downtown Greensboro and USC to create a bidding war among developers for a vision of a young professional multifamily development.

Mr. Chapman clarified that Trademark Properties would receive a commission from the land sales portion as a broker. They would function as the seller's agent and would market the land.

Mr. Chapman was asked for a timeframe for a potential contract for Phase II development. He felt a contract should be in place by next spring. Ms. Chaney commented that it was critical for development to begin as soon as possible. After a listing agreement is signed, Mr. Chapman will ask Marcus Jackson, Trademark Properties, to prepare an estimated timeframe for development of Phase II.

Counsel Carruthers said that the Commission is very interested in SEDG's plan for the near term future and will probably be asking for legal opinions regarding when Phase II can be demanded by the Commission. They feel strongly that Weaver Cooke's letter may not be a qualifier and he plans to give thought to the options for Phase II of Union Square. He was inclined to encourage the Commission to consider an Offer to Purchase but he has reservations about a mere option for Phase II of Union Square meeting the definition. As a way forward for everybody, it would be advantageous to have some real working interest in an apartment development or other type of development.

Mr. Chapman indicated that SEDG feels the option meets the definition because it ties up the property. They also feel that the west side of South Elm Street was unmarketable until they secured the recorded quitclaim deed. In addition, they were very surprised the issue came up because it was not disclosed in the RFP (Request for Proposals). He felt there might be a less desirable outcome if this was rushed rather than if they took the time to do it right. They have invested about \$677,000 of real money and sweat equity into this project, not to mention their time. The reason they wanted a 12-year buildout contract was because there are real estate cycles and they don't think either side should deal with technicalities. He felt SEDG has been doing more than anyone else could have done and they are pleased with where they are now. They strongly believe that taking the land off the market for Phase II would fulfill their requirements to have a second developer for a second separate portion of the property.

Counsel Carruthers felt that it was good for the Commission to hear his concerns along with Mr. Chapman's comments. He felt that bringing in a national organization is something that meets the goals of everyone at this point and the Commission is looking forward to the next report on this project.

STAFF UPDATES:

Ms. Arkin stated that members are in receipt of an update on Heritage House, as distributed in their packets of information.

Members are also in receipt of a memo from Russ Clegg about the Willow Oaks Plan update. She invited Commissioners to attend any of the public meetings associated with the Plan update. Mr. Clegg will provide a more in depth update at an upcoming meeting.

Ms. Chaney asked staff for an update on their efforts to sell lots that are owned by the City. Ms. Cockburn said that "for sale" signs have been placed on properties held by the Commission and GHDP (Greensboro Housing Development Partnership). A number of calls were received as a result of the signs. She reported that GHDP has sold two lots in the Ole Asheboro neighborhood to Community Housing Solutions. They will be building single-family homes that will be marketed to home owners.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business before the Group, the meeting adjourned at 6:02 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Sue Schwartz
Planning Director
SS: sm/jd

**MINUTES OF THE
REDEVELOPMENT COMMISSION
OF GREENSBORO
DECEMBER 7, 2016**

The regular meeting of the Redevelopment Commission of Greensboro (RCG) was held on Wednesday, December 7, 2016, 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; Charles McQueary; and Angela Harris. Staff present included Dyan Arkin, Hanna Cockburn, Cynthia Blue, and Russ Clegg. Also present was Andrew Kelly, Attorney for the Commission; and City Councilwoman, Nancy Hoffmann.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

a) SEPTEMBER 7, 2016

Mr. Gravely moved approval of the September 7, 2016 meeting minutes as written, seconded by Ms. Harris. The Commission voted 5-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Enochs, Gravely, Chaney, McQueary, Harris. Nays: None.)

Dyan Arkin introduced Andrew Kelly, a new Attorney for the Redevelopment Commission. Mr. Kelly is with the City Attorney's Office.

COLLEGE HILL REDEVELOPMENT AREA

a) 609 South Mendenhall Street

James Keith, 303 South Mendenhall Street, was representing the College Hill Neighborhood Association (CHNA). He said that a vacant property was deeded to CHNA many years ago and part of the deed requires RCG approval in order to sell the property. The property has become a maintenance problem because it is widely overgrown. Although the lot is very small, a residence can be built on the site. An individual has expressed interest in the lot and plans to work with the Greensboro Planning Department to develop plans for a home based on historically accurate floor plans that would fit within the variance on the lot. As part of the sale restrictions, the buyer has agreed that this will be a single-family, owner-occupied residence only. The buyer is working on a formal Certificate of Appropriateness application with the Historic Preservation Commission. The property was posted for sale for 14 days and only the proposed buyer submitted an offer to purchase the lot. Mr. Keith said that CHNA unanimously supports this request. College Hill will get an infill of currently overgrown property and increase their tax base.

Mr. McQueary moved to approve the sale of 609 South Mendenhall Street, seconded by Ms. Harris. The Commission voted 5-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Enochs, Gravely, Chaney, McQueary, Harris. Nays: None.)

BENJAMIN BENSON REDEVELOPMENT AREA

a) Raymond S. King Apartments

Cynthia Blue, Manager of Housing Services for Neighborhood Development, provided background information on the Raymond S. King Apartments and described challenges with the property. She indicated the best resolution is to clear the title through the deed in lieu of foreclosure process, sell it,

and move forward. The Redevelopment Commission's interest in the land is that they originally bought the land and sold it to Project Homestead as part of a development deal. The Commission took back a \$24,000 note in deed of trust that is junior to the City's note in deed of trust. As part of this deed in lieu of foreclosure process, the Commission's cooperation is needed to remove that secondary lien.

Responding to questions, Ms. Blue said that there are 22 units in the Raymond S. King Apartments. City Council has already agreed to this process.

Ms. Chaney moved to accept the deed in lieu of foreclosure to satisfy the outstanding note and deed of trust on this property, seconded by Mr. McQueary. The Commission voted 5-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Enochs, Gravely, Chaney, McQueary, Harris. Nays: None.)

Ms. Blue confirmed for Chair Enochs that this property will now go on the City's new property website of properties for sale and there will be public outreach as well. Several open houses will be scheduled during the month of January, 2017. She indicated that several interested developers have already contacted the City about this property. The units are all vacant and the appraised value of the property is \$275,000.

EASTSIDE PARK REDEVELOPMENT AREA

a) 218 Gant Street – Loan Default Notification

Ms. Arkin said that the Commission approved the subdivision of property located at 220 Gant Street that was owned by the Commission. It was subdivided into three sections and then sold to three contiguous property owners who were required to then combine it with their property so it could not be used as anything other than a portion of these single-family houses. At the time, 218 Gant Street was owned by Homeowners Model Experiment Inc. (HME) and they were under a lease-to-purchase agreement with the tenant. The lease-to-purchase agreement did not happen. The Commission provided \$4,000 deferred loans to each owner to be forgiven after a period of five years as long as the property remained owner-occupied. Since this property is not owner-occupied, staff is asking the Commission to consider authorizing the legal department and staff to work together to send a notice of default to HME for the \$4,000 loan on the property at 218 Gant Street. If the owner does not intend to have an owner-occupant in the house within the next few weeks, then they will be asked to pay the \$4,000.

All attempts by Ms. Arkin to contact HME by phone and email have been unsuccessful at this point. Therefore, the next step would be to send a notice of default by certified mail to have them respond. Staff will bring this matter back to the Commission in January or February, 2017.

Responding to questions, Ms. Arkin said that the property is currently occupied by the same woman who was renting it at the time the property was subdivided. The owner has been receiving income from the property during this time period.

Mr. Gravely moved to authorize the legal department to send the loan default notification, seconded by Mr. McQueary. The Commission voted 5-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Enochs, Gravely, Chaney, McQueary, Harris. Nays: None.)

Chair Enochs asked for an update on this matter at the January or February, 2017 meeting.

ARLINGTON PARK REDEVELOPMENT AREA

a) 1402-1404 Plymouth Street – Sidewalk Easements

Ms. Arkin said that the sidewalks along 1402-1404 Plymouth Street are part of the City's standard sidewalk program. There is no reference in the RCG minutes that this matter has ever been brought before the Commission and therefore, staff is asking approval for the Chair to sign the deed to create a permanent slope easement where the sidewalk will actually be located and to allow for a construction easement during the process of construction.

Mr. McQueary moved approval of the sidewalk easements as presented, seconded by Mr. Gravely. The Commission voted 5-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Enochs, Gravely, Chaney, McQueary, Harris. Nays: None.)

STAFF UPDATES

a) Willow Oaks Redevelopment Area

Russ Clegg updated members on the Willow Oaks Neighborhood and Morningside Homes Redevelopment Area. Mr. Clegg provided an overview in May, 2016 on the Willow Oaks neighborhood and at that time, staff was working on the process to hire consultants to update the redevelopment plan. Since then consultants have been hired and three sets of public meetings have occurred. The original redevelopment plan was done in 2000; however, changes in the economy and housing market have halted construction. In 2010 development significantly shifted to the Redevelopment Commission when the HOPE VI project was completed and GHA (Greensboro Housing Authority) stopped their principal participation on that part of the project. In 2013, the City's agreement with the developer ended.

Mr. Clegg described the area and said there are a lot of tax credit projects in the area that are about to expire. There is an area in the original plan that calls for commercial development. An RFP (Request for Proposals) was put out several years ago to generate interest but there were no responses. Staff is currently rethinking how this area can be used. The area is a community focus but may not work for retail.

Mr. Clegg stated that there is a redevelopment plan and also a traditional neighborhood plan which is the zoning for that area. There is a charrette book, a plan book and design guidelines among other documents. Simplification of these documents is a key piece in the redevelopment plan update. In addition, loosening up the specificity of the site plan would make the area more attractive for development.

Key issues that have come out of the public meetings include the need for additional parking and a lack of functional green space in the neighborhood. Good comments from the meetings show that the residents really like the neighborhood and there is a strong spirit of neighborhood pride in the construction quality and upkeep.

Mr. Clegg said that traffic patterns, lot size and layout have been a challenge. There are bigger houses intended for families that are on small lots and some apartments are sized that really do not meet the market where it is now. Additionally, this is a tight urban neighborhood that does not have a lot of amenities to offset the lack of backyards and parking.

Mr. Clegg presented pictures and details of the upcoming draft plan based on the different areas that are involved. They are considering the whole area and how the different pieces will fit together.

The next steps begin with a draft at the end of December, 2016 that will be released and public meetings are scheduled for January 23 and January 24, 2017. Staff is also working with consultants to build neighboring and home owner capacity to be as strong as possible moving forward.

Chair Enochs asked about the lot referenced earlier that was originally designated for some kind of commercial property. Mr. Clegg said that they are trying to repurpose the lot for things that are needed in the area that are not available such as green space and a community center.

Beth McKee Huger, 408 Woodlawn Avenue, referenced an area on the map that is around the east side of English Street and asked if consultants are looking at this area. There is a large amount of community engagement in that area and the residents are excited about doing things. She asked about plans for this area to see how community engagement can help move projects along. Mr. Clegg said that the consultants are cognizant of the need to work together and recommendations in that area will be much more conceptual and general and not as specific. Ms. Huger said that there are some tax credit projects that are expiring as well as some other rental properties that really need some attention and they do not want to be working at cross purposes with the Redevelopment Commission as they try to figure out what to do about those properties. Mr. Clegg encouraged residents in this area to come to the public meetings to give their input. Ms. Arkin indicated that staff has been talking about moving into some sort of process for further strategic planning for that area when the update process is over as part of their work plan for 2017. The update process might result in some recommendations of what could happen in that area and then move forward into some sort of a more specific planning process with the Cottage Grove community rather than in the Willow Oaks area. Ms. Arkin suggested that Ms. Huger move ahead with specific initiatives they are looking at and then those will be part of the planning that goes forward. The more the community can do in the meantime will result in more tools and pieces to work moving forward. Ideas from the community will drive what the City does next. The City would like to engage with that community as early as possible in 2017 once this update is a more complete product that can be used as a tool to move forward.

b) City of Greensboro PROPERTIES FOR SALE Web Page

Hanna Cockburn gave members a brief demonstration of the Properties for Sale website that has been up and running for a while now. This is a synthesis of property that the City, RCG, and GHDP (Greensboro Housing Development Partnership) owns and sells. Staff contacts and lists of property are available from different departments. They have prepared a map called the Lots of Opportunity as referenced on the For Sale signs that are placed on the properties. A QR code links the user with the site that shows who owns the property and which redevelop area the property is located in. When the user clicks on the desired property, relevant information is given including tax parcel number, street address, owner, size, zoning, and which redevelop plan applies to the site. Staff is hoping that this website will help generate more interest in these properties. The website has already generated many phone calls about the properties. Members were given business cards for distribution that reference the web page and gives a phone number for the City Property Manager.

c) Heritage House Redevelopment Area

Ms. Cockburn said that the number of units acquired by the City has not changed since the last update. There are 150 units that have been voluntarily sold out of the total 177 units. All materials needed to go to court to acquire the remaining units are being prepared by the legal staff. The acquisitions have been on behalf of the City and in the next several months, staff will present a consolidated deed to transfer the units to the Commission.

d) South Elm Street Redevelopment Area

Ms. Arkin said that they are moving towards completion of the first phase of the infrastructure which was Arlington Street and the south side of Gate City Boulevard, the Arlington Street intersection, and the South Elm and Gate City Boulevard intersection. There have been some recent changes in where

the line between Phase I and Phase II is drawn. There were conflicts at the end of Phase I work including a fiber optic conflict along the west block of Gate City Boulevard and an existing storm pipe conflict on the corner of South Elm Street and Gate City Boulevard. Instead of trying to get everything done and stretching this project out into the spring, Planning staff, GDOT (Greensboro Department of Transportation) and Water Resources have decided to shift a few of those items that were to be done at the end of Phase I into Phase II under a separate contract. Staff personnel have already started talking about the logistics of Phase II. There is a design for the streetscape of Phase II but it will have to be reviewed because of new information that has come up. Although it has changed a little bit, the area right around the USC building that is in place now will be completed within the next few weeks. Paving and handicapped ramps on all eight corners will be completed as part of Phase I.

Responding to questions, Ms. Arkin said that the City of Greensboro's commitment is to provide the infrastructure and the streetscape. The direct costs are not SEDG's (South Elm Development Group) costs. She explained that SEDG wanted a slower completion of the west block and their preference was that South Elm Street not be done at this time. This associated work actually fits with doing the South Elm Street phase better than it fit with the first phase which was really about getting USC (Union Square Campus) into a position where their corner of the site was finished. There is no indication that this has any impact on what SEDG is doing.

The agreement with SEDG is based on completion of the USC building which is now complete. The date of August 5, 2016, was used as the completion date which puts SEDG into February, 2017 before they are required to bring a second component to the Commission for consideration. They have expressed they can bring the second component before February, 2017. Staff is hoping not to get into a legal argument about it because there could be some discussion about what "finished" actually means for the first project.

Councilwoman Hoffmann asked would happen if SEDG does not bring a second component in February, 2017. Counsel Kelly said that SEDG thinks they have already complied with the second portion because of the option that was given for Phase II. Ms. Arkin explained that SEDG has been told that February is when the City thinks their six-month period is up when they are supposed to be bringing something to the Commission for the next phase of the project. South Elm Development Group has stated that they can do that and they have not stated that they needed to come back and ask for any relief. They are actively marketing the site for other developers through Trademark Properties. The marketing package will be shown to the Commission at their January, 2017 meeting.

Ms. Chaney wanted to make sure that when a new developer is brought in, there are no stormwater issues on the west side like there were on the Arlington and Gate City Boulevard side for Phase I because nothing can be built that has stormwater on it. Ms. Arkin stated that there are no permanent lines on the site itself although there are several abandoned lines there that will be removed once they get into the site. Ms. Chaney said that she was just being cautious because there is stormwater under land in Greensboro that we are not aware of.

Contingency plans were discussed should presentation of a second component by SEDG not come to fruition by the February, 2017 date. Staff is looking closely at possible options and will have a more structured contingency plan to present at the January, 2017 meeting.

It was noted that the February, 2017 RCG meeting is scheduled for February 1, 2017. The date corresponding to five months after August 5, 2016 is February 5, 2017 when presentation of a second component developer is due. Chair Enochs suggested moving the February 1, 2017 meeting until February 8, 2017 to be able to meet after the February 5, 2017 drop date. Members will consider changing the meeting date at their January 4, 2017 meeting.

Mr. McQueary suggested asking SEDG for their recommendation should they not be ready in February, 2017 with a second component developer. Counsel Kelly commented that SEDG has said they are very optimistic that the Commission would not have to worry about this possibility. However, the underlying contention was that they had already met their requirements for Phase II. Therefore, their solution is that they have already complied. Mr. McQueary felt that the Commission should know their position in response to SEDG's contention. Counsel Kelly indicated that they are working on developing a response.

ADDITIONAL BUSINESS

Ms. Arkin said that in 1989 there was a piece of property in the Ole Asheboro area that applied for and received a rehabilitation loan. Staff learned that the RCG used to be the oversight group for the rehabilitation program. Although the loan has long since been satisfied, there was a more recent insurance claim on the property and the insurance check was cut in the name of the property owner and the Redevelopment Commission. Because it was a City loan, the City attempted to sign off and waive any interest in the claim but the State refused to accept that. They felt RCG had to waive their interest in it. Ms. Arkin asked the Commission to consider allowing Chair Enochs to go ahead and sign the waiver and allow the State to release the insurance claim back to the property owner. The claim arose from damage to the roof and is in the amount of \$6,147.52.

Ms. Chaney moved to allow Chair Enochs to sign the waiver, seconded by Mr. Gravely. The Commission voted 5-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Enochs, Gravely, Chaney, McQueary, Harris. Nays: None.)

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business before the Group, the meeting adjourned at 6:28 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Sue Schwartz
Planning Director
SS: sm/jd