

**APPROVED MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF
THE REDEVELOPMENT COMMISSION OF GREENSBORO
PLAZA LEVEL CONFERENCE ROOM
MELVIN MUNICIPAL OFFICE BUILDING
JANUARY 13, 2011**

The Redevelopment Commission of Greensboro met in a regular session in the Plaza Level Conference Room, Melvin Municipal Office Building, on Thursday January 13th, 2011 at 4:30 PM. Commissioners present were: Chair Jerry Leimenstoll, Cassandra Rogers and Dawn Chaney. Angela Carmichael arrived at 5:16 p.m. Staff included Dyan Arkin and Barbara Harris, representing the Planning and Community Development Department (P&CD). Also present was Jim Blackwood, Esq., attorney for the Commission.

1. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE DECEMBER 9, 2010 REGULAR MEETING:

Ms. Chaney moved to approve the minutes of the December 9, 2010 meeting as amended, seconded by Ms. Rogers. The Commission voted unanimously 3-0 in favor of the motion.

2. ELECTION OF OFFICERS:

Ms. Rogers moved to table the election of officers until further notice, seconded by Ms. Chaney. Counsel Blackwood suggested that the motion be amended to postpone the election of new officers until the next regularly scheduled meeting after the two new members have been appointed. Ms. Rogers accepted the amendment. The Commission voted unanimously 3-0 in favor of the motion.

3. WILLOW OAKS REDEVELOPMENT AREAS -- SEBASTIAN MEDICAL PARK:

Ms. Arkin stated that the presenters of this item have asked that it be continued to the February, 2011 meeting.

4. OTHER BUSINESS:

Ms. Arkin stated that a 2011 Yearly Calendar of meetings has been provided to Commission members for their records. Regularly scheduled meetings will be held at 4:30 p.m. on the 2nd Thursday of each month.

Ms. Arkin referred to the Housing Summit brochure provided to Commission members. She announced that the Housing Summit will be held at the Emerald Event Center and the keynote speaker will be Carol Naughton, Vice-President of Purpose Built Communities in Atlanta, Georgia. She expressed her excitement over the presentation as the Purpose Built Communities model is being explored for Greensboro.

Ms. Harris responded to a question from Chair Leimenstoll and addressed the concern of contaminants at several locations on South Elm Street. She gave an overview of the Department's environmental assessment of the entire area and the contaminants located within the boundaries of the old North State Mill building. As a result of the assessment, North Carolina Department of Environmental and Natural Resources (NCDENR) notified the owner at that time of land use restrictions due to the contaminants. The City conducted an environmental assessment of the West Bragg right-of-way last summer from Eugene Street east to Elm Street for Greenway planning purposes. During the assessment process, consultants encountered an underground tank beneath the sidewalk on the north side of the old North State Mill building. The tank was removed along with as much contaminated soil as possible. Due to the petroleum in the soil, NCDENR advised the present owner, Mr. Eric Robert, that residential use of the building would be restricted. Mr. Robert was advised that the City did not intend to pursue further remediation in the right-of-way due to

previous restrictions already in place on the old North State Mill site and that excavation would threaten the structural integrity of the building. Mr. Robert had been trying to determine a way to accomplish residential development on the site even though he is ineligible for a Brownfields Agreement. Ms. Harris clarified for Chair Leimenstoll that the Department's earlier environmental assessment was done in 2006. After assessment results were in, an offer by the Redevelopment Commission to purchase the property was declined by Mr. Robert. Chair Leimenstoll pointed out that there is mutual interest with Mr. Robert in helping him develop the site relative to the project the Commission is working on. He advised staff to continue to follow-up on the situation.

SOUTH ELM STREET REDEVELOPMENT AREA:

A Community Outreach Schedule was provided to Commissioners. Action Greensboro and Downtown Greensboro, Inc. were helpful with suggestions to facilitate opportunities for outreach to talk about the South Elm Street project. She reminded members of the mission to make the development community, tenant community, and future consumers aware of the project.

Ed Wolverton, 122 North Elm Street, Executive Director of Downtown Greensboro, Inc. said that he sees the project as a logical extension of the Center City business district. This project would allow reshaping of the area, collaboration with adjoining neighborhoods, and extending downtown into a larger footprint.

April Harris, 317 South Elm Street, is the Executive Director of Action Greensboro. She sees the project as the last large piece of the Downtown Master Plan serving as an anchor on the South Elm end. She offered Action Greensboro's help in working with developers, getting the word out on meetings, and being a sounding board.

Ms. Carmichael joined the meeting at 5:16 p.m.

Responding to a request from Ms. Chaney, Ms. Harris and Mr. Wolverton informed members of the six recommended Downtown Development Strategies as follows: (1) Complete the Downtown Greenway, (2) support the knowledge community to create a Downtown University District, (3) create a signature Performing Arts Center, (4) encourage connectivity through a comprehensive Streetscape Program, (5) make historic buildings more marketable, and (6) incentivize mixed-use development.

Chair Leimenstoll stated that the Commission's intent is to use their vision statement as a device to assess future proposals.

Mr. Wolverton pointed out that project financing is the largest obstacle to large scale private development and it may become necessary to break the project down into smaller pieces with multiple developers to increase their ability to acquire financing. Chair Leimenstoll questioned how uniform site management would be possible across the entire area if multiple developers were involved. In addition, Mr. Wolverton stated the importance of maintaining architectural integrity if multiple developers were used. He felt it was realistic that multiple developers could work together with guidance from the Commission.

Ms. Arkin reported that there has been interest in the project from local developers along with significant interest from outside of the Greensboro area.

Chair Leimenstoll stated concern that the public and City Council were not fully aware of the project. Mr. Wolverton supported Community Update Workshops for the public and discussed the role of the Chamber of Commerce and other groups in the project.

Ms. Arkin stated that staff presentations are being planned as part of the community outreach schedule.

PLANNING AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT UPDATE:

Ms. Arkin stated that Housing and Community Development has officially merged with the Planning Department and Local Ordinance Enforcement. Sue Schwartz is the Interim Director of the Planning and Community Development Department.

Commission members discussed the efficiency and function of Development Services, a one-stop shop for developers.

Ms. Harris informed Commission members that Housing and Urban Development (HUD) has announced that the City and the newly merged Planning and Community Development Department are recipients of a \$3.1 million Lead Grant.

REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS UPDATE:

Ms. Arkin has organized an optional pre-submission meeting and site tour for developers Tuesday, January 18, 2011. Ms. Chaney volunteered to join Chair Leimenstoll at the meeting.

Ms. Arkin asked members to think about their preference to alternate members or appoint one Commission member to serve as liaison for outreach. Ms. Chaney volunteered to be present when appropriate. Chair Leimenstoll felt members should have as much contact with the project as possible as the Commission serves as the face of the community for the project. Ms. Rogers volunteered to be present at the presentation to the Neighborhood Congress.

WEBSITE OVERVIEW:

Ms. Arkin gave an overview of the website initially designed by Community Retail Catalyst for the South Elm Street Redevelopment project. She pointed out the Learning Lab feature along with the possibility of a webcam located on the corner of South Elm Street. There may also be a short video of the Mayor discussing the importance of the project to the City.

* * * * *

ADJOURN:

There being no further business before the Commission, the meeting adjourned at 6:25 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Sue Schwartz,
Acting Director, Planning and Community Development

SS/sm:jd

**APPROVED MINUTES OF THE SPECIAL MEETING OF
THE REDEVELOPMENT COMMISSION OF GREENSBORO
PLAZA LEVEL CONFERENCE ROOM
MELVIN MUNICIPAL OFFICE BUILDING
FEBRUARY 9, 2011**

The Redevelopment Commission of Greensboro met in a Special session in the Plaza Level Conference Room, Melvin Municipal Office Building, on Thursday February 9, at 3:00 PM. Commissioners present were: Chair Jerry Leimenstoll, Cassandra Rogers and Dawn Chaney. Staff included Dyan Arkin and Fred Boateng, representing the Planning and Community Development Department (PCD). Also present was Jim Blackwood, Esq., attorney for the Commission.

**1. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE NOVEMBER 11, 2010 AND JANUARY 13, 2011
REGULAR MEETINGS**

Chair Leimenstoll stated that he really appreciates the efforts of the Court Reporter in clarifying the minutes.

Ms. Chaney moved to approve the November 11, 2010 minutes as corrected, seconded by Ms. Rogers. The Commission voted unanimously in favor of the motion.

Ms. Rogers moved to approve the minutes of the January 13, 2011 meeting, seconded by Ms. Chaney. The Commission voted unanimously in favor of the motion.

Chair Leimenstoll asked if any members of the GHDP would be at today's meeting. Dyan Arkin stated that she was unsure if any of the members will be at today's meeting. She will follow up with Barbara to see if they can attend the March meeting.

3a) WILLOW OAKS REDEVELOPMENT AREA: SEBASTIAN MEDICAL PARK UPDATE

Ms. Arkin stated that the presenters of this item have requested that it be brought to the Commission at the March 2011 meeting.

3b) Acquisition of 701 Dorgan Avenue

Dyan Arkin stated that this is a 1,095 square foot single family house on a .20-acre lot located in Zone D of the Willow Oaks development site, owned by Debra Martin. The house originally belonged to her parents and was not part of the Phase II acquisitions because it was owner-occupied. In May of 2006, at the owner's request, the Commission authorized an Offer to Purchase for \$77,500. Subsequent to the Offer to Purchase, Ms. Martin's father passed away. At Ms. Martin's mother's request, the Offer was terminated so that she could remain in the house. At this time, both parents have passed away and their daughter, Ms. Martin, has requested that the Commission reconsider purchase of the house.

If purchased, the house will be rehabilitated and redesigned to be compatible with Willow Oaks designs. P&CD staff estimates rehabilitation costs at \$30,975. An appraisal was completed and reviewed in September 2010 establishing Fair Market Value at \$70,000. Purchase and rehabilitation funds already allocated for Willow Oaks are available for this transaction through HOME funds. The Commission is asked to approve an offer of \$70,000 for the property at 701 Dorgan Street.

After a short discussion, Ms. Rogers moved to approve the Offer to Purchase the property at 701 Dorgan in the amount of \$70,000, seconded by Ms. Chaney. The Commission voted unanimously in favor of the motion.

4) SOUTH ELM STREET REDEVELOPMENT AREA:

a) Rezoning Request

Ms. Arkin stated that in November 2008, the Commission approved a staff request to rezone the South Elm Street Redevelopment Plan area from its mix of Residential Multifamily, Central Business, Limited Industrial and General Business zoning designations to a comprehensive zoning designation of Conditional District – Central Business. At that time the privately-owned properties within the redevelopment plan area were also rezoned. The Central Business designation is consistent with the core downtown area, and conditions were established that would allow the Commission to retain control of certain elements of the project such as building placement, parking, front façade, glazing percentages and first floor building height. The parking conditions were included as a stop-gap measure to ensure adequate parking prior to development of a parking structure as shown in the South Elm Street Redevelopment Plan. A list of conditions to the zoning request was provided for review.

Eric Robert, owner of the old flour mill property at 816 South Elm Street, has been rehabilitating the building for a mix of uses and is nearing completion of the project. He has been working for several months with staff from the P&CD Zoning and Development Divisions to come up with a parking plan that meets the zoning conditions as well as his needs. It was determined that eliminating the conditions associated with parking from all properties within the redevelopment plan area would allow Mr. Robert to move forward with his plans for The Mill and bring the redevelopment property more closely into alignment with the downtown Central Business District. Staff from both divisions feels this rezoning is consistent with the intent of the Redevelopment Plan as well as the Central Business District.

The Commission is asked to authorize staff to move forward with the rezoning of the property within the South Elm Street Redevelopment Plan area.

Ms. Rogers asked what Mr. Robert plans to do with the mill? Dyan Arkin stated that Mr. Robert would be the one to answer that question. She then called Mr. Robert and invited him to come to the meeting.

At this time, the Commission moved on to other business while waiting for Fred Boateng and Eric Robert to arrive for the meeting.

Fred Boateng, Zoning Officer, arrived for the meeting. He explained that Mr. Robert had concerns about his inability to meet the parking requirements and some of the conditions on the site. He has asked for some relief for those conditions. Staff has had a meeting and it was decided to rezone the property to be able to meet the conditions. In the CB zoning district there are no parking requirements, but based on the fact that site is not close to existing parking facilities, they decided to put those conditions on it, but it looks like it is not working for him. Secondly, properties like his, which are in the historic district, they do not have to provide any parking. Giving him that relief will be within the spirit of the zoning laws. He was able to provide 32 out of 34 parking spaces.

Eric Robert, 816 S. Elm Street, arrived for the meeting and in response to questions by the Commission, stated that the plans were to have a small bakery and coffee shop and a bistro restaurant. The idea was to create the destination of everything that we do not have in Greensboro yet, including a lot of outdoor and very urban space. That strategy has changed because it relied on a lot of other entities to come in and there is still a stigma attached to that side of the city. So as of now, the idea is to create an event space to hold small parties, weddings, wedding receptions, which will help create income for the property. It is now time to put it into service so the idea is to go ahead and create this event space because it is very unique and very special as it has its own parking, its own garden, and he is very excited about it. Once there is additional development around it, it can become what it should be. It will be a place where you can go with your family or walk with your dog. It is community driven in a sense that it enriches the offerings. As a wedding center it cannot go all the way, but it can also be gallery

space. A lot of other things can be brought into it, like the arts, making it fun for the people to interact with because it is so unique. It provides another choice for people wanting something different and unique for a wedding or reception or gathering. He would also love to have outdoor movies, outdoor mini-concerts going on throughout the day and bringing life to the site. He is not sure of the exact plan at this time, but that is the general idea. He feels it would bring a lot of life to the city. He would also like to have art shows and openings and introduce new artists and possibly have some studios in there.

Ms. Arkin asked how parking will be handled until there is a significant parking plan for the whole area. She asked Mr. Robert if he saw a problem with that.

Mr. Robert stated that they are trying to work with this site and the others that are close to resolve any problems. He can provide a portion of the parking and he wants to make it pretty. He stated that physically there will never be enough space. He is fearful that the city is going to condemn this property and he would not be able to fulfill this dream. He is willing to do his part, but he cannot do it all alone. He feels he has done what he can in regard to the parking issue. He assured the Commission that he is not going to put in anything that would be detrimental to the neighborhood. He is trying to bring it along. He assured the Commission that he is trying to do the right thing. He is still trying to get open, meet all the codes and requirements and make sure it is done right. He has agreed not to have dumpsters facing Elm Street, agreed not to have a sexually oriented business, agreed not to have a car repair shop or car sales or storage of any kind, and his intent is not to have a night club on the property, although he may have a jazz band or something like that from time to time. He agreed to what he thought makes sense for a good neighborhood.

Mr. Boateng stated that staff supports this request.

Ms. Rogers moved to approve authorization of staff to move forward with the rezoning of the property within the South Elm Street Redevelopment Plan area, seconded by Mr. Leimenstoll. The Commission voted unanimously in favor of the motion.

4c) Community Engagement Plan Update

Ms. Arkin stated that an updated copy of the Engagement Plan was distributed to each member. There are several meetings where she would like to have a Commission member attend with her. She asked if anyone would be able to come to the Neighborhood Congress. She stated that the 21st is the Ole Asheboro Neighborhood meeting; the 23rd at 3:30 there is the Central Gateway Business Alliance meeting, which is the old Lee Street Merchants Association meeting. Ms. Chaney stated that she would let her know later if she is able to attend any of these meetings.

4b) Request for Proposals Update

Ms. Arkin stated that there have been three meetings with developers and others have shown interest. She stated there have been about 15 phone calls from folks who have started putting together teams and putting together ideas and some have mentioned that, because of the holiday season, they really didn't get started until mid-January. Therefore, she asked if the Commission wanted to consider postponing the deadline.

After some discussion, Ms. Chaney moved to change the RFP deadline to March 31, 2011, seconded by Ms. Rogers. The Commission voted unanimously in favor of the motion.

Other Business:

a) Housing Summit 2011 Reminder

Ms. Arkin stated that the 2011 Housing Summit will be February 16th at the Emerald Event Center. The keynote speaker is a dynamic speaker and she really encouraged the members to attend.

b) Invitation to Hold April RCG Meeting at Shiloh Baptist Enrichment Center

Ms. Arkin stated that the Commission sold 809-817 Bilbro Street to Shiloh Baptist Church in 1996 for the construction of a 5,520 square foot enrichment center next door to the existing church. Construction was intended to begin within five years and to be completed within seven years of the initial closing date. Several extensions were granted, but construction of the enrichment center has been completed and Clinton Gravely has invited the Commission to hold its April meeting in the building.

After some discussion it was decided to hold the April meeting at the Shiloh Baptist Church enrichment center at 5:00 p.m.

c) Request for Permanent Change to RCG Regular Meeting Time and/or Date

It was suggested and discussed that the RCG hold their meetings on the 2nd Wednesday of each month at 5:00 p.m., which seems to be convenient for Commission members. Ms. Arkin will check scheduling of the room and staff availability and get back to them.

After some discussion and clarification by Counsel Blackwood regarding the by-laws, it was determined that the wording in the by-laws would be amended to more easily allow future changes of meeting times and days by vote of the Commissioners.

Ms. Arkin stated that she has looked at the calendar for the Plaza Level Conference Room availability and she would have to coordinate that with a proposed meeting date and time. A final time and day would have to be determined later.

Ms. Rogers moved to amend the wording in the by-laws to allow the changes for meeting days and/or times, seconded by Ms. Chaney. The Commission voted unanimously in favor of the motion.

* * * * *

There being no further business before the Commission, the meeting adjourned at 5:08 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Sue Schwartz,
Interim Director - Planning & Community Development

SS/jd

**APPROVED MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF
THE REDEVELOPMENT COMMISSION OF GREENSBORO
PLAZA LEVEL CONFERENCE ROOM
MELVIN MUNICIPAL OFFICE BUILDING
MARCH 9, 2011**

The Redevelopment Commission of Greensboro met in a special session in the Plaza Level Conference Room, Melvin Municipal Office Building, on Wednesday, March 9, 2011 at 5:04 p.m. Commissioners present were: Chair Jerry Leimenstoll, Dawn Chaney, and Cassandra Rogers. Staff included Dyan Arkin, and Barbara Harris, representing the Planning and Community Development Department. Also present was Jim Blackwood, Esq., attorney for the Commission and Mike Williams, City Attorney.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF FEBRUARY 9, 2011 SPECIAL MEETING:

Ms. Chaney moved to approve the minutes of the February 9, 2011 special meeting as revised, seconded by Ms. Rogers. The Commission voted in favor of the motion.

OTHER BUSINESS:

- **Invitation to Hold April RCG Meeting at Shiloh Baptist Enrichment Center**

Clinton Gravely, 601 Calvin Drive, was present representing Shiloh Baptist Church. He thanked the Commission for working with the church in regard to the property they acquired. Mr. Gravely invited the Commission to hold their April, 2011 meeting at the Enrichment Center. He described the facility, representing Phase I of the project, and indicated that plans for Phase II include a gymnasium and a chapel. Commissioners agreed to hold their next meeting at the new facility.

- **Introduction of New Staff Member**

Ms. Arkin introduced Chancer McLaughlin, the new Planner/Project Manager for the City of Greensboro. Mr. McLaughlin will take over responsibility for the Ole Asheboro, Arlington Park, Gorrell Street, and Phillips-Lombardy redevelopment areas.

BYLAWS AMENDMENT AND CHANGE OF REGULAR MEETING DATE AND TIME:

Counsel Blackwood summarized the bylaws amendment. The amendment would change the annual meeting to the January regular monthly meeting and allow for a resolution to change the specific time and day of regular monthly meetings.

Ms. Rogers moved to adopt the amendments, seconded by Ms. Chaney. The Commission voted unanimously in favor of the motion.

Ms. Rogers moved to adopt a resolution setting the monthly meeting date to the second Wednesday of the month at 5:00 p.m. The Commission voted unanimously in favor of the motion.

WILLOW OAKS REDEVELOPMENT AREA:

- **Sebastian Medical Park**

Ms. Arkin reported that the Sebastian Medical Park proposal will be presented at next month's meeting.

- **Update on Activities in Phases II and III**

Ms. Arkin plans to invite the single family housing builder and the lead developer of the project to participate in a full presentation on Willow Oaks at the May Redevelopment Commission meeting.

Ms. Arkin updated members on Phase II of the Willow Oaks development. There are still several single family houses that have not sold in Phase II, the main component of the project. The builder has opted not to start any more houses and instead is encouraging individuals to consider houses that are already built.

Two lots remain to be built on by Habitat and it is expected that construction will begin in the spring.

The Village Center, the commercial retail component, will be located across from the new Community Center. The predevelopment process for the Village Center should begin in six to eight months.

Ms. Arkin stated that the area toward Dewitt Street down McConnell Road is considered Phase III of Willow Oaks. The other piece of Phase III is the English Street Corridor running from McConnell Road north toward the railroad tracks. The Purpose Built Communities initiative is being explored as a model for redevelopment in that area. She indicated that there is a lot of activity focused on making Hampton School a model school of choice and individuals are looking at multifamily housing strategies to create a denser mixed-income area with retail projects to follow.

Ms. Chaney asked staff to provide the Commission with an opportunity to tour Willow Oaks to see how all the development pieces will come together. In addition, she requested a pictorial map to be used as a reference during the tour and afterward at the Commission meeting. Ms. Arkin responded that redevelopment maps will be available for members and she will check into having the May meeting at the Willow Oaks Community Center. Chair Leimenstoll commented on the importance of always having visuals available for Commissioners at meetings in the form of maps or photographs.

SOUTH ELM STREET REDEVELOPMENT AREA

- **Request for Proposals Update**

Responses to the Request for Proposals (RFP) are due March 31, 2011. Ms. Arkin indicated there had been a lot of interest from groups including H.J. Russell and Company, Atlanta, GA; Kenneth Reiter, Charlotte; Duany Plater-Zyberk, Charlotte; Jim Kirby, Charlotte; Traditional Neighborhood Development Partners, Durham; and a local coalition of participants that included Weaver Cooke Construction and Sustainable Community Solutions.

At the request of different developers, staff has added additional documents to the website that were not part of the original package such as topographic base maps and older projections of the project's possible value.

In response to a question from Ms. Chaney, Ms. Arkin addressed questions being asked by potential developers regarding the project. A lot of the questions have to do with the City's participation and intention. Ms. Chaney felt the Commission should have information to be able to respond to questions.

Chair Leimenstoll pointed out that John Linn may be brought back to help create a filter to evaluate proposals with respect to the Commission's Mission Statement.

Ms. Chaney asked for clarification on the City's financial role in the project. Ms. Arkin stated that the primary commitment to financially participate in the project is the budget included in the Redevelopment Plan. The budget includes \$2 million dollars toward a parking structure along with

additional funds in the amount of \$1.25 million. The value of the land to the City for this particular project is \$3 million, representing the payback amount for a Section 108 HUD loan.

Ms. Harris added that \$3.5 million of Certificates of Participation are included in the Redevelopment Plan budget to cover all infrastructure including a parking garage, if there is one. Other commitments in the Redevelopment Plan budget include \$790,000 in HOME program funds for affordable housing subsidies that will go to the developer. In addition, there are also other commitments of CDBG funding and Powell Bill funding already set aside. Staff has begun conversations with the City Manager's Office and the Finance Department regarding the process to work with the Certificates of Participation.

Ms. Arkin stated that other questions being asked by developers involve the Mill building and the possibility of it being a component of the project in some way. There have been several questions regarding the land south of the project and possible consideration to include it in future phases.

Ms. Harris commented that questions have been raised concerning land in the middle of the east block that the City does not own along with questions about the cell tower. The cell tower lease runs until 2022, and the City does not have the option to terminate the lease prior to that date.

Ms. Harris stated that there may be a need for staff to perform an initial threshold review to be sure each developer has been responsive to the RFP, followed by a technical review. She asked if members would be interested in meeting together to create a screening tool, using the Commission's vision, with measurable objective standards to review each proposal. Members agreed this would be a good idea but felt it might take several meetings to develop the screening tool.

- **Community Engagement Plan Update**

Ms. Arkin stated that Ms. Chaney has committed to attend the Central Gateway Business Alliance meeting on March 23, 2011. Chair Leimenstoll volunteered to attend the Warnersville Community meeting on March 14, 2011, and Ms. Rogers indicated she would attend the American Society for Public Administrators meeting on March 24, 2011. Members will address the vision of the Redevelopment Commission along with the importance of the project.

- **Marketing Update**

Ms. Arkin reviewed the presentation prepared for community meetings and provided final examples of three signs that will be placed on the site. Members gave their feedback on the signs and suggested preferable locations to place the signs.

ELECTION OF OFFICERS:

Counsel Blackwood explained that currently there is a vacancy for Vice-Chairman on the Commission. If the Chairman is not available to sign a document approved by the Commission, a Vice-Chairman's signature would be needed.

Ms. Chaney moved to nominate Ms. Rogers for Vice-Chairman of the Redevelopment Commission, seconded by Chair Leimenstoll. The Commission voted unanimously in favor of the motion.

ADDITIONAL BUSINESS:

No additional business can be added to a Special Meeting.

ADJOURN:

Ms. Rogers moved to adjourn the meeting, seconded by Ms. Chaney. The Commission voted unanimously in favor of the motion.

There being no further business before the Commission the meeting was adjourned at 6:37 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Sue Schwartz,
Interim Director, Planning & Community Development

SS/sm:jd

**APPROVED MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF
THE REDEVELOPMENT COMMISSION OF GREENSBORO
MADISON ROOM
THE LEARNING CENTER
APRIL 25, 2011**

The Redevelopment Commission of Greensboro met in a special session in the Madison Room of the Learning Center, 1001 4th Street, Greensboro, North Carolina, on Monday, April 25, 2011 at 9:36 a.m. Commissioners present were: Chair Cassandra Rogers, Dawn Chaney, Clinton Gravely, and Robert Enochs. Staff included Dyan Arkin and Andy Scott. Also present was Jim Blackwood, Esq., attorney for the Commission and Mike Williams, City Attorney.

Chair Rogers welcomed those in attendance.

Members of DPZ Charlotte introduced themselves to the Commission. Representing the DPZ Charlotte team was Tom Low, architect and planner; Guy Perlman, landscape architect; and Jim Kirby, architect with GreenThinc Architecture.

**WORK SESSION ON DEVELOPMENT PROPOSALS FOR THE SOUTH ELM STREET
REDEVELOPMENT PROJECT**

DPZ Presentation:

Mr. Low gave an overview of several projects that DPZ Charlotte has done for the City of Greensboro. Their first project was the rebuilding of Morningside Homes in Willow Oaks through the HOPE VI Program. In addition, DPZ worked on the Southside Project with the developer, and more recently in the Ole Asheboro and Aycock neighborhoods.

Mr. Low pointed out that the South Elm Street Master Plan was written in 2006 based on the old economy. DPZ felt that the 2006 Master Plan would not work in today's economy. Another difference from the 2006 climate is the current trend toward implementing projects on a smaller scale with development over time. There is also a renewed interest in environmental issues and sustainability. DPZ incorporates sustainability and green infrastructure components into their work, and they would like to use the South Elm Street Redevelopment Project as a model project. They are recommending a Design Planning Workshop prior to selecting a developer due to the difference in conditions and priorities between 2006 and 2011 for the purpose of updating the Master Plan.

There are five developers on the DPZ team that are interested in doing the project; however, they all agree that replanning must occur before they can commit to the project. Mr. Low stated that in essence, DPZ is bringing five development proposals to the table. He cited the advantages of multiple developers as follows:

- 1) Risk is spread out with multiple developers and investors.
- 2) If the plan permits it, the project can be done in stages.
- 3) From a design point of view, multiple creative people produce a project with an authentic character.

The team determined the best way to re-envision this site and address infrastructure, energy, urban planning, neighborhood design, and community interaction would be to sponsor a Designer Planning Workshop. All interested developers would be invited to come in and meet with the Redevelopment Commission and the community and actually replan a vision based on the current economy and environmental issues.

Mr. Gravely asked Mr. Low to review the five developers on the DPZ team. The developers are Hubert Construction and Real Estate Services (HCRS, Inc.), Celebration Associates and three regional flagship developers that work out of the Charlotte office.

HCRS, Inc. is currently working on the redevelopment of an old warehouse project. They have done many single-family homes and multi-unit neighborhood developments in addition to the adaptive reuse of the Turner Station in West Charlotte.

Celebration Associates is known for developing the new town of Celebration for Disney in Orlando, Florida. They also have a new development in Fort Mill, South Carolina called Baxter Village.

Projects from the three flagship developers include the wellness community of Cheshire in Black Mountain, North Carolina, the new infill neighborhood called Vermillion in Huntersville, North Carolina, and the village of Haversham in Beaufort, South Carolina.

Mr. Kirby, GreenThinc, provided members with an overview of his company. GreenThinc, located in Charlotte, North Carolina, does green building consulting. Mr. Kirby does work with the Charlotte Housing Authority and worked with HCRS, Inc. on Turner Station. He will be working with Lincoln County personnel on what municipalities can do to move toward energy efficiency and possible job creation through infrastructure needs.

Mr. Low gave an overview of their proposal booklet along with a sample Master Plan created to jumpstart the process. He made the following points about their Master Plan design:

- One block was turned into four with neighborhood square, corners, and connectivity.
- Public space was created.
- Greenway was extended.
- Attractive destinations were created.
- Lee Street is seen as a multi-modal road.
- The project is incremental.
- There is strategic development of parking spaces.
- There is creation of civic buildings, anchor retail, shop fronts, apartments and townhouses, urban villas, and student housing through incremental development.
- There is sustainability with green infrastructure placement.
- It introduces other modes of transportation.

Responding to a question from Ms. Chaney, Mr. Low confirmed that the five developers have the financial backing to commit to something of this nature because it is a smaller scale, incremental project. When asked about the level of financial participation by the City of Greensboro, he responded that DPZ would discuss the City's role following the revisioning process.

Mr. Low answered additional questions and commented on streetscape, elevations for potential hotel and retail space, funding sources, and the importance of this project to the City of Greensboro.

ADJOURN:

There being no further business before the Commission the meeting was adjourned at 10:53 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Sue Schwartz,
Acting Director, Planning and Community Development

SS/sm:jd

**APPROVED MINUTES OF THE SPECIAL MEETING OF
THE REDEVELOPMENT COMMISSION OF GREENSBORO
MADISON ROOM
THE LEARNING CENTER
APRIL 25, 2011**

The Redevelopment Commission of Greensboro met in a special session in the Madison Room of the Learning Center, 1001 4th Street, Greensboro, North Carolina, on Monday, April 25, 2011 at 2:30 p.m. Commissioners present were: Chair Cassandra Rogers, Dawn Chaney, Clinton Gravely, and Robert Enochs. Staff included Dyan Arkin and Andy Scott. Also present was Jim Blackwood, Esq., attorney for the Commission; Mike Williams, City Attorney; and Councilwoman Bellamy-Small.

Chair Rogers welcomed those in attendance.

Members of South Elm Development Group, LLC introduced themselves to the Board. Representatives included Mr. Bob Chapman, 410 West Gear Street in Durham, North Carolina; Mr. Seth Harry, Washington, DC; and Mr. Bob Isner, 447 Arlington Street, Greensboro, North Carolina.

WORK SESSION ON DEVELOPMENT PROPOSALS FOR THE SOUTH ELM STREET REDEVELOPMENT PROJECT

South Elm Development Group Presentation:

Mr. Chapman described the process to do a residual value analysis to determine the cost of building improvements and their worth after being built. He walked the Commission through elements of the project based on parameters in the Request for Proposals (RFP) and made the following points:

- 1.7 acres would be “for sale” residential with 26 units of stand-alone townhouses.
- 3.4 acres of “for rent” residential.
- 1.6 acres for retail.
- .25 acre for offices.
- The average rent for apartments would be \$.93 per square foot per month.
- The estimated rent for retail would be \$16.00 per square foot per year, renter pays all costs.
- The estimated office rent would be a full service rate.
- The average footage for the 168 residential apartments is 635 square feet.
- 95,000 square feet of retail space.
- 15,000 square feet of office space.
- The cost of building apartments is \$89.00 per square foot not counting land cost or developer profit.
- The cost of building offices is \$110 per square foot, totally inclusive.
- The total residual value for the land under the “for sale” residential is \$515,000.
- 390 units would be needed for a parking structure.
- The cost to build parking structures would be \$4.6 million.
- The total residual value for the property is \$5.4 million of which \$3 million would be paid to the City for the land and \$2.4 million would be the return on development contribution to profit and overhead.
- The total project cost based on square footage prices is \$37.7 million dollars for the program South Elm Development Group has in mind.
- Sources of funds: \$5.6 million coming from a 221(d)4 loan based on the assumption that the Market Study is acceptable to HUD; for the 25% of units set aside with income restriction, low income housing tax credits of \$2 million; and the sale of tax exempt multifamily housing bonds of \$1.8 million.

- Residential sales projecting net of the land cost at \$3.5 million; retail at \$12.5 million.
- South Elm Development Group would like to have an Identity of Interest with the City of Greensboro to allow payment of the buildings as they are built.
- Developer's fee is \$2.4 million.
- Developer's equity is \$1.4 million.
- Developer is proposing a Certificate of Participation to fill the gap of \$2.67 million dollars.

Mr. Chapman reviewed projects that South Elm Development Group members have been involved with and he described their use of new urbanism. He stated that the project could include a flagship hotel, international restaurants and shops; have on-street parking; have a canopy of shade trees; be biker friendly; and have connectivity to the surrounding neighborhood areas including local colleges.

Mr. Harry discussed incremental urbanism and its role in the development of a strategy toward the development of the site. He referred to a diagrammatic concept plan generated for the South Elm Street site. The notion is to create something of sufficient critical mass to help encourage pedestrian connectivity across Lee Street, to provide a sense of place, and to provide a quality environment to encourage people to come there. He stated that connectivity is an essential part of their plan. Connectivity could effectively be leveraged to add value to the surrounding neighborhoods.

Mr. Chapman pointed out the commitment South Elm Development Group is making to minority owned businesses. Their desire is to have a higher percentage of historically underutilized businesses than in the past on other projects. In addition, he listed strategies the Group plans to use including networking, advertising, breaking down work into elements that are economically feasible, have a 10-day prior to opening notification, have a program to provide equipment and capital, lines of credit, joint pay agreements for loans, assisting on obtaining good pricing, negotiating joint partnership arrangements with minority owned business to increase opportunities, and provide quick-pay agreements to enable minority contractors to meet cash flow.

In response to questions, South Elm Development Group described their concept for a green and public space, parking decks, projected elevations for apartments and a hotel, and building a development in the current economic climate.

Mr. Isner stated his opinion that South Elm Development Group would provide a natural extension for what is happening in the south side of town. He felt the density being proposed is important for the City of Greensboro and would create walkability in the community. The Group sees this development as a catalyst for redevelopment and reinvestment south of Lee Street.

ADJOURN:

There being no further business before the Commission the meeting was adjourned at 3:58 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Sue Schwartz,
Acting Director, Planning and Community Development

SS/sm:jd

**APPROVED MINUTES OF THE SPECIAL MEETING OF
THE REDEVELOPMENT COMMISSION OF GREENSBORO
LAKE TOWNSEND ROOM
KITCHEN OPERATIONS CENTER
APRIL 26, 2011**

The Redevelopment Commission of Greensboro met in a special session at the Kitchen Operations Center – Lake Townsend Room at 2602 South Elm-Eugene Street in Greensboro, North Carolina, on Tuesday, April 26, 2011 at 9:35 a.m. Commissioners present were: Chair Cassandra Rogers, Dawn Chaney, Clinton Gravely, and Robert Enochs. Staff included Dyan Arkin, Andy Scott, and Chancer McLaughlin. Also present was Jim Blackwood, Esq., attorney for the Commission.

Chair Rogers welcomed those in attendance.

Members of the South Elm Street Redevelopment team introduced themselves to the Commission. Representatives present included Judy Seigel; Landex Corporation; “CC” Lambert and Evon Smith, Sustainable Community Solutions; Wendy Hopkins and Wayne Deal, Weaver Cooke Construction; and Eric Knutson, architect.

WORK SESSION ON DEVELOPMENT PROPOSALS FOR THE SOUTH ELM STREET REDEVELOPMENT PROJECT

South Elm Street Redevelopment Partners Presentation:

Ms. Siegel reviewed the background and qualifications of the South Elm Street Redevelopment Partners and explained their shared vision for the South Elm Street project. An overview of numerous projects was given that included work on developments in Winston-Salem, North Carolina; Brownfield sites; Willow Oaks; the Civil Rights Museum; American Tobacco in Durham, North Carolina; and sustainable developments such as the Proximity Hotel.

South Elm Street Redevelopment Partners indicated that they would like to develop a project that is a dynamic, walkable, pedestrian friendly, mixed-income, mixed-use community with potential for retail, a grocery, and a pharmacy. Although they have developed a specific set of concepts, they see the development of a vision for the area as a process based on feedback from the Commission and residents of the community.

Mr. Knutson gave an overview of one of their concepts for phased development as follows:

- **Phase I:**
 1. Create an outdoor public area to anchor South Elm Street.
 2. Split South Elm Street into two 1-way paths to be more pedestrian friendly.
 3. Extend new road that connects to Arlington Street to create better linkage with the Ole Asheboro neighborhood.
 4. Create a highly visible destination retail base on Lee Street that draws from the region.
 5. Build two-story loft apartments with garage on a townhouse scale.

- **Phase II:**
 1. Move across South Elm Street and create similar retail and parking fronting on Lee Street.
 2. Create a housing development that incorporates institutional uses such as arts, university office space, research, or educational space.

- **Phase III:**
 1. Move south with more retail shops on ground floor and office space above.

- **Phase IV:**
 1. Retail shops on ground floor with senior housing above.
 2. A Wellness Center would be available for use by visitors, residents, and neighbors.
 3. Townhouses that are higher density on the north and lower density on the south.
 4. In the future, the site to the south could include streetscapes with more housing, groceries, and restaurants. The Group envisions the project not only occurring in the two-block area, but expanding toward the south as the project grows.

Over the four-phase development, between \$70 and \$90 million dollars will be invested.

In response to a question from Mr. Gravely, Ms. Smith stated that the first step to implement the phased development is to identify and bring together the stakeholders. While community participation is being brought together, the Master Plan process would begin and funding structure would be identified.

Mr. Gravely asked about the level of financial commitment expected from the City. Ms. Smith responded that as they begin working together, there will be discussions on the role the City can play. She said that South Elm Street Redevelopment Partners has the ability to advance capital to begin the process. Mr. Lambert stated that a non-profit foundation out of Raleigh, North Carolina has committed to subsidize the process for the Master Plan.

ADJOURN:

There being no further business before the Commission the meeting was adjourned at 11:03 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Sue Schwartz,
Acting Director, Planning and Community Development

SS/sm:jd

**APPROVED MINUTES OF THE SPECIAL MEETING OF
THE REDEVELOPMENT COMMISSION OF GREENSBORO
MADISON ROOM
THE LEARNING CENTER
APRIL 26, 2011**

The Redevelopment Commission of Greensboro met in a special session in the Madison Room of the Learning Center, 1001 4th Street, Greensboro, North Carolina, on Monday, April 25, 2011 at 2:31 p.m. Commissioners present were: Chair Cassandra Rogers, Dawn Chaney, Clinton Gravely, and Robert Enochs. Staff included Dyan Arkin, Andy Scott, and Chancer McLaughlin. Also present was Jim Blackwood, Esq., attorney for the Commission; and Mike Williams, City Attorney.

Chair Rogers welcomed those in attendance.

Members of the Belmont Sayre team introduced themselves to the Commission. Representatives included Kenneth Reiter, President of Belmont Sayre; Donald Van Ollefen, Design Collective; Karl Schlachter, McCormack, Baron, and Salazar; John Gallagher, Aptus Management; and Scott Niebauer, Samet Corporation.

**WORK SESSION ON DEVELOPMENT PROPOSALS FOR THE SOUTH ELM STREET
REDEVELOPMENT PROJECT**

Belmont Sayre Presentation:

Mr. Reiter gave an overview of Belmont Sayre's approach to projects, how the team works together, and specifics of the proposal.

Mr. Schlachter described a predevelopment activity process and the planning process that is expected to take six months. The team is familiar with Brownfield sites and he described their project in Raleigh, North Carolina at the Contemporary Museum.

Mr. Schlachter pointed out the larger impacts from this project including job creation, both temporary and permanent; creating wage income; work force housing; tax base creation; green building design; working with minority business enterprises; creation of mixed uses; and the creation of diverse transportation methods.

Mr. Schlachter indicated that they did not see mid-rise, high-rise, or single family development in the project area; instead, they felt it should be a continuation of the present South Elm Street style.

Mr. Van Ollenfen addressed the design aspect of the mixed-used project as he referred to prepared illustrations of the area. He described the creation of a gateway focus point moving into retail space, restaurants, and two and three-story town homes with enclosed parking areas.

Mr. Schlachter discussed reaching out to stakeholders and creating a development that would serve as a catalyst for investment and expansion to strengthen neighboring communities.

Mr. Reiter addressed public financing and requested support in helping with:

- a. cost of pre-development activities
- b. additional acquisition of key parcels
- c. site infrastructure financing
- d. bringing community and neighborhood together
- e. City and Redevelopment Commission support of the project in general

Mr. Scott discussed Samet Corporation's role in the project. He pointed out that Samet Corporation recently finished work on Union Hill Elementary School in High Point, North Carolina and achieved a 35% minority participation rate on the project. He described their efforts to educate contractors in the bidding process.

Mr. Reiter reviewed representative projects, referred to in their proposal, that are of similar scale to the South Elm Street Redevelopment project.

Chair Rogers asked if the predevelopment planning was a standard procedure in their process. Mr. Reiter replied that McCormack, Baron, and Salazar used pre-development planning with the Rolling Hills project in Durham, North Carolina. Although they mentioned others, it was the only project in North Carolina where the process was used.

In response to questions, the Belmont Sayre team discussed financing used in previous projects.

ADJOURN:

There being no further business before the Commission the meeting was adjourned at 3:50 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Sue Schwartz,
Acting Director, Planning and Community Development

SS/sm:jd

**APPROVED MINUTES OF THE SPECIAL MEETING OF
THE REDEVELOPMENT COMMISSION OF GREENSBORO
PLAZA LEVEL CONFERENCE ROOM
MELVIN MUNICIPAL OFFICE BUILDING
MAY 2, 2011**

The Redevelopment Commission of Greensboro met in a special session at the Melvin Municipal Office Building – Plaza Level Conference Room at 300 West Washington Street, Greensboro, North Carolina, on Monday, May 2, 2011 at 6:33 p.m. Commissioners present were: Vice-Chair Dawn Chaney, Robert Enochs, and Clinton Gravely. Staff included Dyan Arkin, Chancer McLaughlin, and Barbara Harris, representing the Planning & Community Development Department. Also present was Andy Scott and Jim Blackwood, Esq., attorney for the Commission.

Vice-Chair Chaney welcomed those in attendance.

Members of the Russell New Urban Development team introduced themselves. Representatives included Mr. H. Jerome Russell, President of Russell New Urban Development, LLC; Edrick J. Harris, H.J. Russell & Company; Michael T. Lentz, Wakefield Beasley & Associates; Jody Efid, ESPA Architects & Planners; and Christina Nguyen, ESPA Architects & Planners.

**WORK SESSION ON DEVELOPMENT PROPOSALS FOR THE SOUTH ELM STREET
REDEVELOPMENT PROJECT**

Russell New Urban Development Presentation:

Mr. Russell gave background on the company, one of the largest African American real estate construction firms in the nation. They are a full service firm employing over 2,000 individuals doing business across the United States. He explained that they manage and facilitate real estate transactions, due diligence, and master planning. They obtain the financing for development and construction projects. They have experience with financial institutions putting together complex transactions. Russell New Urban Development is also a licensed contractor in North Carolina and a property management firm.

Russell New Urban Development has focused on higher education projects in North Carolina. They have done work on the campuses of NC Central, UNC-Charlotte, UNC-Chapel Hill, NC State, and Fayetteville State.

The team reviewed their finished projects, as submitted in the proposal, which they felt were similar to the South Elm Street Redevelopment Project.

Mr. Harris summarized the financial aspects of the projects. For Phase I approximately \$30 million will be required to jumpstart the project. The structure is as follows:

- \$22 million on loan from a private bank.
- The bank will probably require \$3 million in equity.
- \$4.5 million requested in proceeds from the City.
- \$1.5 million from other sources.
- Upon the close of the project, \$500,000 would be paid to the City to begin paying down the balance of what is owed on the property.
- Russell New Urban Development would be the Master Developer and facilitator for the retail component.
- Once debt obligation has been met, the City would generate additional revenue from the project.

In response to questions, the team made the following points:

- Mr. Russell felt that multi-family infill apartments have the best chance of getting money and construction could be expected to begin in late 2012.
- Phase I, small retail space, is driven by the 196 proposed multifamily units.
- Phase I is anticipated to be completed in 2014.
- Of the \$4.5 million estimated for City participation, Mr. Harris included \$3 million per the RFP with the gap filled by CDBG and green funds. He viewed the component more as governmental participation versus City participation.
- Mr. Russell felt that a potential anchor tenant would be any retailer that would be compatible with a mixed-use setting such as this one. Most retailers want a dense, urban setting.
- Mr. Edrick felt that the community should have input into the type of retailer that is chosen.
- Mr. Russell said that to accomplish what the plan has on the site, the site itself is the biggest limitation.
- All of the residential units proposed would be rental; there are no individually owned units.
- In Phase I, approximately four acres of the seven-acre tract will be used.

ADJOURN:

There being no further business before the Commission the meeting was adjourned at 7:20 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Sue Schwartz,
Acting Director, Planning and Community Development

SS/sm:jd

**APPROVED MINUTES OF THE
REDEVELOPMENT COMMISSION
OF GREENSBORO
REGULAR MEETING
MAY 11, 2011**

The regular meeting of the Redevelopment Commission of Greensboro was held on Wednesday, May 11, 2011 in the Plaza Level Conference Room of the Melvin Municipal Office Building, commencing at 5:07 p.m. The following members were present: Chair Cassandra Rogers, Dawn Chaney, Clinton Gravely, and Robert Enochs. Staff present included Dyan Arkin, Chancer McLaughlin, and Barbara Harris. Also present was Jim Blackwood, Attorney for the Commission.

REQUEST FOR DPZ TELEPHONIC CONFERENCE:

Chair Rogers stated that DPZ requested a telephonic session with the Commission during today's meeting. Ms. Arkin indicated that DPZ could not be present and made a late request to be conferenced into the meeting.

Since staff did not have time to set up the proper electronic equipment due to the short notice, Ms. Chaney felt the telephonic session should be postponed to another time.

Ms. Chaney moved not to include DPZ in a telephonic session at today's meeting, seconded by Mr. Gravely. The Commission voted unanimously 3-0 in favor of the motion.

APPROVAL OF APRIL 13, 2011 MEETING MINUTES:

Mr. Gravely moved to approve the April 13, 2011 meeting minutes as written, seconded by Ms. Chaney. The Commission voted unanimously 3-0 in favor of the motion.

At the request of Mr. Gravely, Ms. Arkin explained that a Certificate of Completion is routinely granted to completed projects. A Certificate of Completion was not addressed during last month's meeting at Shiloh Baptist Church. Ms. Arkin clarified that staff will issue the Certificate and it will be noted in next month's meeting minutes.

Mr. Enochs joined the meeting at 5:13 p.m.

SOUTH ELM STREET REDEVELOPMENT AREA:

Ms. Arkin gave an update on the status of proposals and presentations. The five respondents to the Request for Proposals, issued December 15, 2010, have given presentations over the past several weeks to the Commission allowing members the opportunity to ask questions and fully understand the proposals.

In order for the Commission to determine whether or not the proposals should continue in the evaluation process, Ms. Arkin gave the following overview on each of the five proposals:

(1) **DPZ** - The proposal listed a development entity and described an approach to identifying a development program; however, there were missing elements in the proposal. Staff deemed the proposal unresponsive and it did not meet threshold requirements.

(2) South Elm Development Group - The proposal provided all required elements although there was not a clear listing of current projects. The proposal was deemed responsive.

(3) South Elm Street Redevelopment Partners - The proposal provided all requested items in the RFP except for the developmental cost area that could require public financing. The proposal was deemed to meet the threshold requirements of the RFP.

(4) Belmont Sayre - The proposal provided the majority of requested information. Some of the components were not provided; however, they had a thorough explanation of why the pieces were not provided. The proposal met the intent of the RFP by giving a planning and development process. It was deemed to be nonconforming rather than nonresponsive.

(5) HJ Russell - The proposal met all the requirements of the RFP. They described approach, urban design perspective, and attached financial certificates.

Ms. Arkin discussed the difference between a nonresponsive proposal and nonconforming proposal.

Ms. Arkin explained that the DPZ proposal involved a redo of the Master Plan design based on their "light imprint" philosophy. They presented a series of overlaid sketches showing their intent for the process in terms of the final product; however, they did not address how to do the development. Therefore, the project was deemed nonresponsive to the RFP.

The Belmont Sayre proposal had an initial replanning process but they explained how they would arrive at a final development.

The DPZ and Belmont Sayre proposals were both initially focused on a fee-based replanning process. The other three responsive proposals included the necessary processes to make the project feasible in their development component. The primary difference between the DPZ project and the Belmont Sayre project is that the latter went on to describe how the project would be developed. They gave the full description of how to get from the RFP to a developed piece of land. Although the DPZ proposal had a creative approach to the replanning piece, they did not have a plan to get to the final development.

Members commented that they did not feel DPZ provided any concrete plans beyond the proposed workshop. Mr. Enochs was not in favor of continuing the DPZ proposal in the evaluation process.

Mr. Gravely agreed with Mr. Enochs and asked staff if a point system would be used to evaluate the proposals. Ms. Arkin commented that DPZ could not be considered under the RFP because they are not responsive to it. She asked the Commission to consider the merit of DPZ's ideas and determine if they want the proposal to continue in the evaluation process.

Although Ms. Chaney respected DPZ's interest in the RFP, she did not feel the proposal could be considered on the same basis as the others.

Counsel Blackwood clarified that unless the Commission wanted to move forward exploring the DPZ recommendation, no motion was required to remove them from the evaluation process. The Commission decided not to consider the DMZ proposal and they moved on to the next proposal for consideration.

There was further discussion among members regarding the proposal from Belmont Sayre. Although the proposal is nonconforming, they have a fee-based planning process. Their proposal showed how they plan to get to the finished development project. Ms. Arkin stated that Belmont Sayre has met the intent of the RFP without necessarily responding to every component of it. She asked Commissioners if they would like to consider the Belmont Sayre proposal under the same set of criteria and continue them as part of the evaluation process.

Responding to a request from Mr. Gravely, Ms. Arkin described the two-tiered evaluation process.

Mr. Enochs stated that he felt the Belmont Sayre proposal was in the same category of not meeting criteria as the DPZ proposal. He was not in favor of supporting them in the pool of proposals to be evaluated. Commissioners agreed with Mr. Enochs not to entertain the Belmont Sayre proposal.

Referring to a handout distributed to members, Ms. Arkin reviewed the schedule for evaluation of proposals.

Mr. John Linn, 5009 High Point Road, was present to help facilitate a conversation among members in preparation for the interview and site visit stage of the evaluation process relative to the vision statement of the Commission.

Mr. Linn asked members to communicate their thoughts on the presentations they heard in terms of what caught their attention.

Chair Rogers commented that she was impressed that South Elm Street Redevelopment Partners planned to educate participants in the project. She felt that their education component was a good fit with the economic development component in the Commission's vision statement.

Ms. Chaney liked the proposal that addressed combining south of Lee Street with north of Lee Street. She felt it was critical to combine Elm Street from north to south for walking traffic. She also pointed out that one of the respondents was hesitant to respond to the question addressing limitations.

Mr. Enochs agreed that the respondent who recognized the importance of unity stood out among the group.

Mr. Enoch was concerned with the level of apartment living as opposed to for-sale units. He would like to see more affordable town homes. Other points of concern included the lack of comment regarding City contribution and financing.

Members commented that education, sustainability, ownership, and environmentally friendly green building were points from presentations that addressed the "21st century economic develop" component of the Commission's vision statement.

Mr. Linn asked members to complete an exercise before the next meeting. Referring to a handout, he asked members to cite specific examples from proposals that verify criteria from the vision statement. This exercise will be used to help members come to a consensus on measurable criteria that represents the vision of the Commission.

The Commission discussed possible dates to hold another work session. They tentatively choose May 25, 2011 at 5:00 p.m. to meet. Ms. Arkin will contact members regarding availability of the Plaza Conference Room.

Ms. Chaney left the meeting at 6:30 p.m.

OTHER BUSINESS:

Ms. Arkin stated that an update on Willow Oaks will be provided at the next meeting. Members discussed the possibility of holding the meeting at the Willow Oaks Community Center.

ADJOURNMENT:

Mr. Enoch moved to adjourn the meeting, seconded by Mr. Gravely. The Commission voted unanimously in favor of the motion.

There being no further business before the Group, the meeting adjourned at 6:32 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Sue Schwartz,
Acting Director, Planning and Community Development

SS/sm:jd

**APPROVED SPECIAL MEETING
OF THE
GREENSBORO REDEVELOPMENT COMMISSION
MAY 25, 2011**

A Special Meeting of the Redevelopment Commission was held on Wednesday May 25, 2011, in the 3rd Floor GDOT Conference Room. Melvin Municipal Office Building, Greensboro, North Carolina. Commission members present were: Chair Cassandra Rogers, Dawn Chambers, Clinton Gravely' and Robert Enochs. Staff present was Dyan Arkin, Barbara Harris and Chancer McLaughlin. Also present were Jim Blackwood, Esq., counsel for the Commission and John Linn.

Chair Rogers opened the meeting and welcomed everyone in attendance. She then turned the meeting over to staff for discussions on the South Elm Street Development.

John Linn stated that this meeting is for the Commission members to work once again with their Vision Statement in terms of how it relates, specifically both to the proposals the members have at hand and how the members think individually and as a group about the intersection of the two. There are three proposals that are being considered and moving forward with. The members were asked to look at all five proposals and try and break them down to make a final determination.

With the help of a large proposal board, the members were able to have their ideas and priorities placed on the board for viewing. Mr. Linn then moved these ideas and priorities around and used the members' responses to try and come up with something more succinct in terms of quantity and interpretative quality.

He stated that the green cards are the breakout of the Vision Statement with 14 categories. The Commission members were asked to look at all 5 proposals and then list or name the things each member responded to the ideas listed in the Vision Statement. He stated that if there were any statements that a member does not understand or does not make sense, the author of that particular listing would have an opportunity to explain it. He then stated that the next question is whether something is missing or if any of the categories need to be added to.

Dawn Chaney stated that she feels there needs to be land development to the west. She had not seen it in any of the proposals and feels it should be addressed. Her concern was that it is adjacent to the seven acres so how would that affect the final outcome.

Mr. Linn suggested that the members address each column one at a time, look at what each column says and he would like to have from each column, are two statements that would be representative of what the Commission thinks is important in terms of that column, and he would like for it to describe the qualities and characteristics that relate to this and are measurable. These two remaining cards would be descriptor cards so that at the end, there will be a better general idea of what the Commission members are actually looking for in the proposals presented.

Dyan Arkin stated that the Vision Statement came out of a lot of work that the previous Commission did and it does give a lot of information, but what it doesn't give is measurable

characteristics that can then be put into an evaluation tool. There has to be an evaluation tool with scores and what they are trying to do is get from here to some more concrete things that can then be included in the evaluative tool that will be used. Part of this is for the Commission to have an understanding amongst themselves of what they are looking for during the interviewing process but also part of it is for the bigger picture of evaluating the proposals and the teams so that staff and other people who are evaluating them, will be able to capture things that are important to the Commission members.

Barbara Harris added that staff was instructed that the Vision Statement was to be part of the evaluation.

John Linn stated that the members had listed several listings under “Main Street Style Commercial District”.

From the statements by the members, what was pulled from that was the following: 1) true pedestrian friendly environment and 2) architectural blend and historical influence. What was missing was services in a commercial district.

Under “Destination for diverse cross-sections of piedmont residents”: 1) unique services and/or products for multi-cultural individuals and families and different age groups and educational backgrounds.

Under “Integrating with older neighborhoods including Arlington Park, Ole Asheboro, Warnersville, Downtown and Lee Street Corridor” 1) Important urban design considerations must be studied. 2) round-about 3) pedestrian friendly from all areas of the City.

Under “Shopping, dining and recreation” 1) essential destination point, going to a specific place.

Under “Employment and cultural opportunities, mixed levels of income and demographics” internships/employment during and after construction working with college and university outreach programs 2) Multi-modal – vehicles’ and pedestrians’ accessibility

Under “Unique, harmonious blend of business and lifestyle” 1) celebratory, vibrant, energetic. 2) open areas for park and green space for entertainment, celebrations and meetings.

Cultural patterns for all populations:

Mr. Gravely stated that when talking about early financial stability, anyone investing in the area will need a variation of financing and if they can pull all that together from a financial standpoint, they wouldn’t have to depend on the City for financing.

Mr. Enochs said that maybe a good suggestion would be to have the area wired to be technically friendly; wired for internet, wired for wireless, etc. Mr. Linn stated that he would make a card that reads technically friendly and environmentally friendly.

Mr. Linn stated that so far the members have come up with the following qualities and characteristics: Several pieces to the vision statement that include green environmentally and technically friendly with all the services that are proposed, including medical, education; to be dynamic in this vision it should have areas that encourage public participation, project opportunities listed, neighborhood participation, and how it can serve as a gateway into the downtown area; for Main Street style of commercial districts, it should serve as a green gateway to downtown, building will face Elm Street, true pedestrian friendly environment and an architectural blend and with an historical influence and a variety of services in the commercial district; forward destinations for diverse prospects for the Piedmont residents.

Mr. Gravely stated that he feels it would have been a good idea to put the Vision Statement out before the proposal was put out so that people would have known what the members were looking for and could respond to those ideas and concerns.

John Linn stated that the members had made adjustments to the lists to prioritize the most important concerns and needs that the members are looking for with key words and phrases. All the other phrases stay as informers and clues.

Dyan Arkin stated that she feels everything the members are looking for was asked for in the Request for Proposals as she has not heard anything today that wasn't in the original RFP's. She feels a good job was done in creating the RFP's.

The members decided to call the process Prioritize Proposal.

The next meeting is scheduled for June 8, 2011 at Willow Oaks.

* * * * *

There being no further business before the Commission, the meeting adjourned at 7:06 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Sue Schwartz,
Acting Director, Planning and Community Development

SS/jd

**APPROVED MINUTES OF THE
REDEVELOPMENT COMMISSION
OF GREENSBORO
REGULAR MEETING
JUNE 8, 2011**

The regular meeting of the Redevelopment Commission of Greensboro was held on Wednesday, June 8, 2011 at the Willow Oaks Community Center, 1815 Everitt Street, commencing at 5:00 p.m. The following members were present: Chair Cassandra Rogers, Dawn Chaney, and Clinton Gravely. Staff present included Dyan Arkin, Chancer McLaughlin, and Barbara Harris. Also present was Jim Blackwood, Attorney for the Commission.

APPROVAL OF APRIL 25, 2011 SPECIAL MEETING (A.M.) MINUTES:

Ms. Chaney moved to approve the April 25, 2011 special meeting (a.m.) minutes as written, seconded by Mr. Gravely. The Commission voted unanimously 3-0 in favor of the motion.

APPROVAL OF APRIL 25, 2011 SPECIAL MEETING (P.M.) MINUTES:

Ms. Chaney moved to approve the April 25, 2011 special meeting (p.m.) minutes as written, seconded by Mr. Gravely. The Commission voted unanimously 3-0 in favor of the motion.

APPROVAL OF APRIL 26, 2011 SPECIAL MEETING (A.M.) MINUTES:

Ms. Chaney moved to approve the April 26, 2011 special meeting (a.m.) minutes as written, seconded by Mr. Gravely. The Commission voted unanimously 3-0 in favor of the motion.

APPROVAL OF APRIL 26, 2011 SPECIAL MEETING (P.M.) MINUTES:

Ms. Chaney moved to approve the April 26, 2011 special meeting (p.m.) minutes as written, seconded by Mr. Gravely. The Commission voted unanimously 3-0 in favor of the motion.

APPROVAL OF MAY 2, 2011 SPECIAL MEETING MINUTES:

Ms. Chaney moved to approve the May 2, 2011 special meeting minutes as written, seconded by Mr. Gravely. The Commission voted unanimously 3-0 in favor of the motion.

APPROVAL OF MAY 11, 2011 REGULAR MEETING MINUTES:

Ms. Chaney moved to approve the May 11, 2011 regular meeting minutes as written, seconded by Mr. Gravely. The Commission voted unanimously 3-0 in favor of the motion.

WILLOW OAKS REDEVELOPMENT AREA:

(a) Update from Developer

Mr. James Cox, 4307 Pepper Bush Drive, was present as the lead developer for Willow Oaks. In his update to Commissioners he stated that the initial Housing and Urban Development (HUD) grant, HOPE VI, has been closed out. A final audit by HUD will be conducted later in the year and an official close-out letter will be generated.

Mr. Cox indicated that they are working on an agreement to finish the remaining portions of Willow Oaks, zones B, C, D, and E. Approximately 122 homes have closed in the Willow Oaks redevelopment area and three homes remain on the market. Two of the homes are in the preapproval process for financing and a contract is pending on the third home.

Marketing strategies are being developed for the continued build-out of the Willow Oaks area. Mr. Cox reviewed plans for the development of the proposed Willow Oaks Village Center and single-family homes.

(b) Acquisition of Single Family House at 728 Gillespie Street

Ms. Arkin gave an overview of property located at 728 Gillespie Street. The vacant home is owned by Mr. and Mrs. Robert Siler who have asked the Commission to consider purchasing the house. If the house is purchased it will be rehabilitated to be compatible with the Willow Oaks design. Staff estimates that the cost to rehabilitate the house is \$32,000. The fair market value of the home is \$50,000. Funds to purchase and rehabilitate the property have already been allocated and are available for the transaction.

Ms. Chaney expressed concern that the three-bedroom home only has one bath. Responding to a question from Ms. Chaney, Mr. Cox stated that a selling price of \$85,000 to \$90,000 on today's market would be reasonable for the property after rehab.

Ms. Arkin asked members to consider approving an offer of \$50,000 for property located at 728 Gillespie Street.

Ms. Chaney moved to approve an offer of \$50,000 for the acquisition of property located at 728 Gillespie Street, seconded by Mr. Gravely. The Commission voted unanimously 3-0 in favor of the motion.

At the request of Mr. Gravely, staff will provide appraisals and/or summaries of properties for members to review in the future.

SOUTH ELM STREET REDEVELOPMENT AREA:

(a) Presentation of Draft Evaluation Instrument

Ms. Arkin distributed copies of a draft document to use as an evaluation scoring sheet. The document incorporates Redevelopment Commission vision information and technical pieces requested by the City. The scoring document will be used by everyone evaluating the three proposals.

Staff recently received requested written elaboration in lacking areas from the three respondents. Copies of the information will be sent to Commissioners.

John Linn, 5009 High Point Road, was present to facilitate conversation among members relative to the evaluation process. He and Ms. Arkin reviewed two changes made to language in the evaluation document to better capture comments made by Commissioners. Members agreed with the changes that were made.

Ms. Arkin stated that the purpose of the scoring sheet is to serve as a tool to determine how far to move forward with the respondents and to help identify strengths and weaknesses. The document is based on the requirements in the Requests for Proposals.

Ms. Arkin and Mr. Linn responded to questions from members regarding the scoring sheet.

(b) Presentation of Community Participants

Ms. Arkin indicated that members of the Community Advisory Team (CAT) were asked to participate as community participants in the evaluation process. She reviewed the list of CAT members who were interested and available to provide a voice for the community. The City Manager has approved the list of community participants.

Mr. Gravely moved to authorize staff to draft a letter of invitation to the participants, seconded by Ms. Chaney. The Commission voted unanimously 3-0 in favor of the motion.

Ms. Harris noted for the record that Mr. Eric Robert and Mr. Sidney Gray are to be included in the list of participants to receive an invitation letter.

ADDITIONAL BUSINESS:

None.

ADJOURNMENT:

Ms. Chaney moved to adjourn the meeting, seconded by Mr. Gravely. The Commission voted unanimously 3-0 in favor of the motion.

There being no further business before the Commission, the meeting adjourned at 6:17 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Sue Schwartz,
Interim Director, Planning and Community Development

SS:sm/jd

**APPROVED MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF
THE REDEVELOPMENT COMMISSION OF GREENSBORO
PLAZA LEVEL CONFERENCE ROOM
MELVIN MUNICIPAL OFFICE BUILDING
JULY 13, 2011**

The Redevelopment Commission of Greensboro met in a regular session in the Plaza Level Conference Room, Melvin Municipal Office Building, on Wednesday, July 13, 2011 at 5:00 p.m. Commissioners present were: Chair Cassandra Rogers, Dawn Chaney, Robert Enochs, Clinton Gravely, and Chuck McQueary. Staff included Dyan Arkin, Chancer McLaughlin and Barbara Harris, representing the Planning and Community Development Department. Also present was Scott Brannon, Attorney, sitting in for Jim Blackwood, Attorney to the Commission.

Chair Rogers welcomed the Commission's newest member, Dr. Chuck McQueary.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF JUNE 8, 2011 MEETING:

Mr. Gravely moved to approve the minutes of the June 8, 2011 meeting as revised, seconded by Ms. Chaney. The Commission voted 4-0-1 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Roberts, Chaney, Enochs, Gravely. Nays: None. Abstain: McQueary.)

WILLOW OAKS REDEVELOPMENT AREA:

a) Acquisition of Single Family House at 728 Gillespie Street

Ms. Arkin reported that the City's offer to purchase 728 Gillespie Street for the appraised value of \$50,000 was rejected. The current owners have come back with a counteroffer for the assessed tax value of \$66,900.

The developer and development team are trying to determine the best way to market the Willow Oaks area. They have discussed shifting lot lines to better suit house plans, creating new house plans with a smaller footprint, and building smaller condominium-type units along Gillespie Street. Ms. Arkin reviewed the houses currently being built in the Willow Oaks area. She stated that if the property located at 728 Gillespie Street is purchased, tentative plans are to move it beside 701 Dorgan Avenue, previously purchased by the City.

Ms. Arkin asked the Commission to consider accepting the counteroffer of \$66,900 for the purchase of 728 Gillespie Street.

Responding to a question from Ms. Chaney, Ms. Arkin stated that the assessed tax value of \$66,900 was determined in 2004 and currently, the value is probably less. The owner's rationale for the counteroffer of \$66,900 is that they have been paying on the assessed value in good faith since 2004.

Mr. Enochs commented that the 2004 valuation was conducted at the height of the market and the market has declined. He was not in favor of considering the counteroffer and pointed out that it was approximately 32% above the current appraised value.

Dr. McQueary suggested that an additional appraisal may be needed. He expressed concern that the Commission would be setting a precedent if they accepted the counteroffer based on 2004 tax values.

Ms. Chaney pointed out the additional costs of moving and rehabilitating the house. If the City purchased the property for \$66,900, their total investment in the property would be around \$100,000.

The Commission discussed their options in this matter; accepting the counteroffer, rejecting the counteroffer, or requesting a second appraisal of the property.

Ms. Chaney moved to have a second appraisal on property located at 728 Gillespie Street, seconded by Mr. Enochs. The Commission voted unanimously 5-0 in favor of the motion.

SOUTH ELM STREET REDEVELOPMENT AREA:

a) Orientation of Community Advisory Group

Ms. Arkin introduced the members of the Community Advisory Group. Members included John Harris, owner of property adjacent to the redevelopment site and original Citizen Advisory Team (CAT) member; Eric Robert, property owner renovating the mill across the street from the redevelopment area; Will Leimenstoll, downtown resident; Dabney Sanders, Project Manager for the Downtown Greenway; and Evelyn Taylor, Willow Oaks resident. She added that Sidney Gray, owner of property on South Elm Street, would also be joining the Group.

Ms. Arkin explained the roles and responsibilities of Redevelopment Commission members, Citizen Advisory Group members, and Planning and Community Development staff. In addition, she reviewed the process to select a developer for the redevelopment area.

John Linn, 5009 High Point Road, was present to facilitate conversation between the Community Advisory Group and Commission members relative to the evaluation process. He asked the Community Advisory Group to comment on things they felt were important to the process and the project based on their experience. Responses included the importance of extending the southern footprint of downtown, the ability to move forward due to the clean-up of Brownfield land, the need for grocery stores in the downtown area, the scope of the project, and the high aspirations and vision of the project.

Mr. Linn asked both groups to comment on things they considered critical in the process to interview the three candidates. Members said they wanted a clear understanding of the uniqueness of the site communicated by the developers making sure that they were sensitive to the history of blight in the surrounding neighborhoods, continued communication with the community, communication regarding Greensboro's strengths, and specifications regarding how the site could be made sustainable along with the process to achieve sustainability.

Ms. Arkin provided an overview to the Community Advisory Group of the Redevelopment Commission's Vision Statement and the Scoring and Evaluation Sheet.

Mr. Linn asked Commissioners to identify things that will make the project successful as they go into the interview process. Members of the Commission felt that environmental investment; an expanded downtown footprint; a walkable, safe environment; uniqueness; a clear understanding of environmental clean-up efforts; an emphasis on the Gateway to Greensboro; and educational connections were important factors toward success.

Commissioners commented on potential limitations to the project. In addition to environmental and traffic flow issues, they felt financial and economic components should be well thought out to avoid the risk of failure. The City's commitment to the project should be ascertained before a final recommendation is made for a developer.

b) Developer Selection Schedule

Ms. Arkin reviewed the schedule leading up to the selection of a developer. A recommendation for a developer will be made to City Council on November 15, 2011.

PHILLIPS LOMBARDY REDEVELOPMENT AREA:**a) Presentation of Proposal for Property at Lombardy Street and Phillips Avenue**

Ms. Harris stated that this presentation will be given at the next Commission meeting in August, 2011.

ADDITIONAL BUSINESS:

None.

ADJOURN:

There being no further business before the Commission the meeting was adjourned at 6:41 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Sue Schwartz,
Acting Director, Planning and Community Development

SS/sm:jd

**APPROVED MINUTES OF THE
REDEVELOPMENT COMMISSION
OF GREENSBORO
REGULAR MEETING
AUGUST 10, 2011**

The regular meeting of the Redevelopment Commission of Greensboro was held on Wednesday, August 10, 2011 in the Plaza Level Conference Room of the Melvin Municipal Office Building, commencing at 5:00 p.m. The following members were present: Chair Cassandra Rogers, Dawn Chaney, Clinton Gravely, and Robert Enochs. Staff present included Dyan Arkin, Chancer McLaughlin, and Barbara Harris. Also present was Jim Blackwood, Attorney for the Commission.

APPROVAL OF JULY 13, 2011 REGULAR MEETING MINUTES:

Mr. Gravely moved to approve the July 13, 2011 meeting minutes as written, seconded by Mr. Enochs. The Commission voted unanimously 4-0 in favor of the motion.

PROMISE NEIGHBORHOOD GRANT APPLICATION:

Ms. Arkin stated that an application for a federal grant called the Promise Neighborhood Grant is being submitted by the East Market Street Development Corporation in partnership with North Carolina A&T State University, the Guilford County School district, and other entities. The area for this grant is located in a part of Willow Oaks and is the same area being considered for the Purpose Built Neighborhood initiative. The planning grant is directed toward the "cradle to college" component of the Purpose Built Neighborhood model.

Dr. Dan Miller, A&T State University, spoke on behalf of the grant initiative. He stated that the Promise Neighborhood program is consistent with the Purpose Built Neighborhood model. The strategic approach of both models is that they are community based and involve comprehensive partnerships within the community. He gave an overview of the structure of the planning grant, stakeholders, and their purpose to make significant impacts in neighborhoods around education, economic development, and health outcomes. He asked the Commission to join the consortium of partners and sign a common Memorandum of Understanding (MOU). A single MOU signed by all partners is a requirement of the grant. He explained that each entity's capacity, interest, and contributions in the area will be identified and the drafts will be merged resulting in one signature page.

Ms. Arkin said that Counsel Blackwood has reviewed and made comments on the draft of the MOU before the Commission. She felt this was an opportunity that would serve the initiative and the City of Greensboro very well. In addition, she explained the position of the Redevelopment Commission in the proposal. The Commission would not be committing to any responsibility for grant funds by signing the MOU but their

commitment to redevelopment in this area would continue. The East Market Street Development Corporation would be responsible for the fiscal handling of the grant funds managed under the lead of Dr. Miller.

Mr. Mac Sims, East Market Street Development Corporation, stated that they have been involved in the community working toward the revitalization of east Greensboro for 15 years. He said that the area involved has been in need of expertise and revitalization for a long time. He pointed out that this initiative is about the whole neighborhood, not just providing affordable housing. In addition, Mr. Sims stated that the Redevelopment Commission's vision and planning has made a difference in the community and would bring credibility to the initiative.

Mr. Gravely stated his support for the initiative and encouraged the Commission to sign the MOU.

Dr. Miller added that a possible outcome of this planning process would be representative infrastructure that could serve as a tool for redevelopment throughout the county.

Ms. Chaney moved to support the Promise MOU, seconded by Mr. Gravely. The Commission voted unanimously 4-0 in favor of the motion.

Mr. Enochs moved to allow Chair Rogers or Vice-Chair Chaney sign the Promise MOU on behalf of the Redevelopment Commission of Greensboro, seconded by Mr. Gravely. The Commission voted unanimously 4-0 in favor of the motion.

SOUTH ELM STREET REDEVELOPMENT AREA:

- **Developer Selection**

Ms. Arkin provided an overview of the strengths and weaknesses of the three teams.

(1) South Elm Street Redevelopment Partners - (Rated 196.25 out of 250 points)
Comments regarding strengths included strong team members; varied range of experience; good mix of uses; strong sustainability team through Weaver Cooke; strong balance sheets; and strong Minority and Women-owned Business Enterprise (MWBE) and historically underutilized business track records. Comments regarding weaknesses included experiences in more dynamic markets than Greensboro; building massing and placement looked too institutional; plan for moving forward with sources and uses was not well defined; and concerns were expressed by Greensboro Department of Transportation (GDOT) regarding proposed traffic patterns.

(2) South Elm Development Group – (Rated 187.5 out of 250 points)
Strengths included strong balance sheet; many successful projects; only team with a partner having international experience; well thought-out phasing strategy; good plans for inclusion of MWBE, historically underutilized business, and local businesses; and good linkage shown to Ole Asheboro and Southside areas. Noted weaknesses

included weak history of MWBE inclusion; experiences in more dynamic markets; and no recognition of the Greenway.

(3) H.J. Russell New Urban Development Group – (156.75 out of 250 points)

Strengths included the concept of a “big box” retailer; defining the residential as only “for rent;” great urban projects; strong reputation in Georgia; strong plan and commitment for engaging MWBE, historically underutilized business, and local business.

Weaknesses included an unclear plan regarding purchase of the land; the “big box” retailer concept; slow to present design; defining the residential as only “for rent;” and experience mostly in the Atlanta area.

Mary Elizabeth Black, President of the Arlington Park Neighborhood Association, asked about the proposed traffic circle. Ms. Arkin explained that the traffic pattern needed to be redrawn to be workable in the area. In response to another question from Ms. Black, she stated that Union Hill Cemetery was not included in the redevelopment area.

Ms. Chaney agreed with the high rating given to the South Elm Street Redevelopment Partners team. She expressed concern that the South Elm Development Group did not include the Greenway in their proposal.

Ms. Arkin asked for direction from the Commission regarding site visits. Following a discussion, it was decided that a two-day travel period was the most effective for site visits to projects of all three teams possibly during the period of August 21, 2011 through September 2, 2011. Ms. Arkin suggested finalizing the interview schedule after the site visits had been made. She also discussed the possibility of visiting additional projects not built by the three teams in Greeneville, Durham, and Raleigh, North Carolina that are a good fit and could help inform the decision making process.

- **Schedule and Process**

Ms. Arkin informed the Commission that City Council recently requested a briefing session on the Commission’s progress in selecting a development team.

The next item on the schedule is the September 14, 2011 Redevelopment Commission meeting where members will select a team to recommend to City Council. Staff will work with the team to make sure there can be an agreement on terms. The terms of agreement will be brought back to the Commission, a recommendation to City Council will be made at their October, 2011 meeting, and a presentation will be given to City Council in November, 2011.

Members of the Community Advisory Team introduced themselves and commented on the three development teams.

Dabney Sanders, Project Manager of the Downtown Greenway, felt that the South Elm Street Redevelopment Partners proposal was a strong project although the team has never worked together. The South Elm Development Group proposal was strong as

well; however, they were not engaged with the Greenway. She suggested asking them for more details on how they viewed the Greenway. She felt the H.J. Russell Group proposal was not as compelling as the others.

Sidney Gray, Community Advisory Team member, suggested calling other cities to ask for photos and information on top infill projects in their area. He felt that good ideas could be obtained through networking with other municipalities.

Jim Bryant, Community Advisory Team member, introduced himself and said that he has been a team member since 2004.

Carolyn Flowers, 1504 Yanceyville Road in Brown Summit, stated that she was an original member of the Community Advisory Team in 2004.

Eric Robert, 816 South Elm Street, said that he was glad a preliminary presentation to City Council was planned.

Evelyn Taylor, 912 Vandalia Road, stated that she has seen work done by the H.J. Russell Group. She urged members not to rule out the team because of lower scores until they are able to see their projects on the site visits.

John Harris, Community Advisory Team member, had no comment.

Ms. Arkin stated that she will fine tune the schedule, continue to see who is available to participate on site visits, and respond back to members with the details.

WILLOW OAKS REDEVELOPMENT AREA:

- **Acquisition of Single Family House at 728 Gillespie Street**

Ms. Arkin stated that a new appraisal was received for property located at 728 Gillespie Street in the amount of \$60,000. A review appraiser deemed that valid methodology was used to arrive at the valued amount. She has traded voicemails with the Silers and felt that an offer of the new appraised value would probably be accepted.

Mr. Gravely moved to offer \$60,000 for property located at 728 Gillespie Street, seconded by Ms. Chaney. The Commission voted unanimously 4-0 in favor of the motion.

- **Update on Lead Developer, Urban Atlantic LLC**

Ms. Arkin stated that Vickie Davis, President of Urban Atlantic, is the new developer contact. Ms. Davis does not intend to have a full-time presence in Greensboro at this time; however, she will make herself available in any way required.

COLLEGE HILL REDEVELOPMENT AREA:

- **Disposition of Funds Remaining after Blandwood House Moves**

Mr. McLaughlin reviewed the history surrounding two historic houses that were located on property being proposed for the new Guilford County Jail. The houses were moved to Washington Street and North Cedar Street in an attempt to save them. The Redevelopment Commission designated funds to Greensboro Housing Development Partnership (GHDP) to cover the expense of relocating the houses. There are funds remaining from the amount allocated for both moves.

Mr. McLaughlin asked the Commission to consider the disposition of remaining funds. He stated that at the time the funds were allocated the Commission was operating with an account; however, no account exists now.

Counsel Blackwood reviewed the origin of the funds along with previous meeting minutes to determine if the original intent of the Commission was to turn over any remaining funds to the College Hill Neighborhood.

Ms. Chaney moved to take the remaining money and open an account for the Redevelopment Commission, seconded by Mr. Gravely. The Commission voted unanimously 4-0 in favor of the motion.

Ms. Chaney pointed out to the Commission that the house moved to Washington Street is currently sitting on blocks. The property is in jeopardy of being demolished if it is not permanently attached. She stated that in the future when funds are allocated to a project, there should be a plan to insure funds are available from the owner or developer for completion of the project.

Chair Blackwood recommended that (1) the remaining funds be moved into an account as passed in the earlier motion and (2) that research be done to see what occurred at the house on Washington Street and report back to the Commission to determine if action needs to be taken with the funds. Staff volunteered to look into the situation and contact the property owner.

ADJOURNMENT:

Mr. Gravely moved to adjourn the meeting, seconded by Mr. Enochs. The Commission voted unanimously 4-0 in favor of the motion.

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

Respectfully submitted,

Sue Schwartz
Director, Planning and Community Development
SS:sm/jd

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF
THE REDEVELOPMENT COMMISSION OF GREENSBORO
PLAZA LEVEL CONFERENCE ROOM
MELVIN MUNICIPAL OFFICE BUILDING
SEPTEMBER 14, 2011**

The Redevelopment Commission of Greensboro met in a regular session in the Plaza Level Conference Room, Melvin Municipal Office Building on Wednesday, September 14, 2011 at 5:00 p.m. Commissioners present were: Chair Cassandra Rogers, Dawn Chaney, Robert Enochs, Clinton Gravely, and Chuck McQueary. Staff included Dyan Arkin, Chancer McLaughlin, and Barbara Harris, representing the Planning and Community Development Department; and Jim Blackwood, attorney for the Commission. Also present was John McClendon, attorney for Greensboro Housing Development Partnership.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF AUGUST 10, 2011 MEETING:

Mr. Gravely moved to approve the minutes of the August 10, 2011 meeting as written, seconded by Ms. Chaney. The Commission voted unanimously 4-0 in favor of the motion.

Mr. Enochs joined the meeting at 5:15 p.m.

SOUTH ELM STREET REDEVELOPMENT AREA:

a) Update on Greenway Design

Deniece Conway, Greensboro Department of Transportation (GDOT), updated members on the Greenway design. Referring to a map of the proposed Greenway, she indicated that they are proposing to widen Bragg Street between Elm Street and Arlington Street on the north side to allow the curb line to match on the west side of Arlington Street. She anticipated that approximately 47 feet of right-of-way would be needed from the existing center line of Bragg Street.

Ms. Conway stated that the proposed design will be presented at a public meeting scheduled for the end of October, 2011. Construction of the design should begin around mid-2013 with completion in early spring of 2014.

Ms. Arkin stated that construction will be coordinated with development of the site.

b) Developer Selection Schedule and Process

Ms. Arkin reviewed recent visits made by members to developer project sites.

On August 29, 2011, a visit was made to Russell New Urban Design projects in Atlanta, Georgia. Ms. Arkin, Commissioner McQueary, John Shoffner, and Community Advisor Carolyn Flowers participated in the site visit. She indicated that the group was pleased with the quality of construction, the type of neighborhoods they were working in, and the coordination of work with surrounding revitalization.

On September 1, 2011, a group visited Raleigh, North Carolina and returned through Durham, North Carolina. They looked at projects done by Bob Chapman with Traditional Neighborhood Development Partners (TND), one of the partners of the South Elm Development Group. Commissioners Chaney and Enochs, John Shoffner, Carolyn Flowers, and Ms. Arkin participated in the visit. The projects visited on this trip were not done by the full development team but by one of the entities within the team. Projects shown were intended to be similar to what was being proposed for the South Elm Street area. Ms. Arkin felt that all of the projects were very well done and pointed out the significant

amount of adaptive reuse in all of the projects done by TND Partners; however, she questioned how the sites related to the South Elm Street redevelopment area. They also visited North Hills Mall, an outside project not done by any of the proposed development teams.

The third site visit trip is planned for September 16, 2011. Commissioners Chaney and Gravely, John Shoffner, Ms. Arkin, and Ben Roush plan to participate in the visit. Mr. Roush is a student at NC A&T and plans to do his senior project on the South Elm Street Redevelopment project. They will be visiting Greenbridge, a Weaver Cooke project in Chapel Hill, North Carolina. In addition, they will visit the Gallery Lofts in Winston Salem, North Carolina. Gallery Lofts is an adaptive reuse project by Yvonne Smith, lead developer with Sustainable Community Solutions.

Ms. Arkin reviewed the proposed schedule and the next steps in the process. A work session was scheduled for September 21, 2011 at 5:00 p.m. for Commissioners and Community Advisors to discuss site visits and determine which firms to interview. Members discussed City Council support for the project and involvement during the work session. Ms. Harris suggested that members contact the Councilperson who appointed them to request that they attend the work session.

PHILLIPS LOMBARDY REDEVELOPMENT AREA:

a) EDGE Proposal to Lease Phillips Lombardy Quarry Site

Mr. Gayland Oliver, Kings Forest neighborhood resident, described the Eastern Development Growth Enterprise (EDGE) proposal to lease land at the Phillips Lombardy quarry site. Two "high tunnel" greenhouses are being proposed to provide fresh fruits and vegetables to the community in District 2. They plan to collaborate with North Carolina A&T University's Agriculture Department for the project through a one-time grant of \$300,000. The produce will be grown and sold throughout the year at a reduced price while still providing enough profit to allow sustainability year after year.

The Commission discussed the property to be leased within the ten-acre tract. The area being considered is less than five acres and is considered to be buildable. Counsel Blackwood referred to a map and described the area to be leased.

Mr. McLaughlin stated that EDGE representatives held a preliminary meeting with the City's Technical Review Committee to evaluate the engineering aspects of the buildable areas of the lot. They received a favorable review.

Ms. Harris informed the Commission that there is no recommended use for the land due to the condition of the site.

Mr. Paul Gilmer, #3 Thacker Ridge Court, is the Chairman of the Board of Directors of EDGE. He stated that he supported Mr. Oliver's efforts in the community.

Counsel Blackwood recommended that a description of the property boundaries be secured. Ms. Harris stated that the City Survey Crew can delineate the boundaries of the property. The Commission charged staff with putting the information together to facilitate the process.

Mr. Enochs moved to enter into a Letter of Intent that would indicate an agreement to enter into a lease agreement for a term of five years for a property to be described by the City of Greensboro Survey Crew on the Phillips Lombardi ten-acre tract, the site itself to be approximately two to four acres as so described and conditioned upon EDGE and North Carolina A&T University receiving the grant funding they are applying for, seconded by Mr. Gravely. The Commission voted unanimously 5-0 in favor of the motion.

GORRELL STREET REDEVELOPMENT AREA:**a) Magnolia House Proposal for 725 Plott Street**

Mr. Sam Pass, 515 Martin Street, is the owner of the historic Magnolia House Motel. He gave an overview of the history and restoration of the house. He asked the Commission to consider his request to purchase 725 Plott Street to be used for parking. The parking area would be landscaped and would add to the appearance of the Lee Street area.

Mr. Pass stated that the vacant lot is zoned for residential use and he has the approval of all the neighbors to use the lot for parking. The lot would be paved and would accommodate 15 to 20 parking spaces.

Ms. Arkin said that one way to proceed would be to request staff to have the lot appraised and work with Mr. Pass on a proposal that includes the value of the land. She said that 725 Plott Street has been held aside for several years for potential use with the Magnolia House.

Mr. McQueary recommended that staff have the lot appraised and continue discussions with Mr. Pass. Staff will bring back methodology for disposition of the lot at the next meeting.

ADDITIONAL BUSINESS:

Mr. McLaughlin was recently contacted by the president of the College Hill Neighborhood Association regarding the remaining funds from the house moves as determined by the Commission at their last meeting. The Association has asked to appear before the Commission at next month's meeting to request funding toward the restoration of 919 Spring Garden Street. The house, owned by College Place Methodist Church, was damaged by fire in June, 2011. They plan to ask for funding in the amount of \$24,000 to prevent the house from being demolished. The funds are a portion of the amount returned to the Commission from the house moves.

Ms. Chaney requested that a defined proposal be provided by the College Hill Neighborhood Association.

ADJOURN:

Mr. McQueary moved to adjourn the meeting, seconded by Mr. Gravely. The Commission voted unanimously 5-0 in favor of the motion.

There being no further business before the Commission the meeting was adjourned at 6:41 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Sue Schwartz,
Acting Director, Planning and Community Development

SS/sm:jd

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF
THE REDEVELOPMENT COMMISSION OF GREENSBORO
PLAZA LEVEL CONFERENCE ROOM
MELVIN MUNICIPAL OFFICE BUILDING
SEPTEMBER 21, 2011**

The Redevelopment Commission of Greensboro met in a special session in the Plaza Level Conference Room, Melvin Municipal Office Building on Wednesday, September 21, 2011 at 5:00 p.m. Commissioners present were: Chair Cassandra Rogers, Dawn Chaney, Robert Enochs, and Clinton Gravely. Staff included Dyan Arkin, Chancer McLaughlin, Barbara Harris, Andy Scott, and Sue Schwartz. Also present was Jim Blackwood, attorney for the Commission.

Chair Rogers called the meeting to order.

Work Session to Consider Developer Selection and Development Terms for the South Elm Street Redevelopment Area:

Ms. Arkin stated the objective of the meeting to determine if the Commission is ready to move forward on the recommendation of a developer or if more exploration is needed. Following a summary and discussion of proposals and site visits, the Commission will determine a course of action and the next steps.

Ms. Arkin gave a presentation on each of the three development teams noting their strengths and weaknesses.

Russell New Urban Development proposed a plan over the course of four phases. Phase I would include 194 rental units and 2,300 square feet of commercial retail space. The estimated completion date of Phase I would be 2014. Phase II includes 8,500 square feet of space for an anchor grocer or general merchandise store. Phases III and IV would be dictated by the market. In addition, they have proposed a 200-space parking structure. Russell New Urban Development estimated a post-development value of \$68 million dollars with the bulk of density located on Lee Street. Funding sources include a \$22 million private bank loan and they are requesting approximately \$3 million of City participation in funding.

Strengths of the Russell New Urban Development group include a strong reputation and existing projects that are of excellent design and siting. Possible concerns include being new to the Greensboro area and the original proposal did not address site and building design. In addition, the big box type of anchor may not be compatible with the Commission's vision for the character of the downtown area.

South Elm Development proposed a five-phase development plan. They utilize an incremental urbanism concept and plan to establish Lee Street as a destination. They are proposing 26 for sale units, 168 rental units, and parking structures to accommodate 390 spaces. South Elm Development plans to use a Market Rate Apartment Mortgage Insurance Program that allows the development of multi-family units for rent, tax exempt bonds, low income housing tax credits, and City HOME funds as sources of funding. Developer equity is \$1.4 million. They are proposing a Certificate of Participation by the City in the amount of \$2.67 million. South Elm Development has indicated they would like to pay for the land as the buildings are completed.

The strengths of South Elm Development include experience in urban infill, downtown mixed-use projects, and sustainable development. They have exhibited a high quality of urban design in other projects they have done. In addition, several of the team members have experience in the area. One

weakness of the South Elm Development group is that they have not demonstrated success including MWBE or HUB firms in previous projects.

South Elm Street Redevelopment Partners has a four-phase development plan. Their initial plans are to put in public space to draw people to the project. The first phase will also consist of 161 townhouse apartments and 30,000 square feet of retail development. The second phase would add 20,000 square feet of retail space on Lee Street with some institutional space on the ground and lower floors, along with 54 units of multifamily and student housing. In later phases they are proposing senior housing and a Wellness Center. Built into the initial proposal was the potential for a fifth phase expanding out from the project site to the south. They view this as a catalyst project for a much larger area. South Elm Street Redevelopment Partners is looking for \$3 million of City participation along with an aggressive 48-month build-out for all phases.

South Elm Street Redevelopment Partners have strength in their team experience and commitment to MWBE on prior projects. The concept of the Wellness Center and senior housing was well received. Their design also addressed connectivity and compatibility with the area. Ms. Arkin pointed out a concern that the group has never worked together as a team. Another weakness is that Landex, the equity partner, is primarily involved in developing affordable housing, not commercial projects.

Commission members and Community Advisory members shared their observations regarding recent site visits. Community members present included Carolyn Flowers, 5014 Yanceyville Road in Brown Summit, North Carolina; Jim Bryan, 901 Dover Road; Sidney Gray, Starmount Drive; Ben Roush, 408 Arlington Street; John Shoffner, 1013 North Elm Street; and Eric Robert, 120 West Lee Street.

Ms. Arkin, Mr. Shoffner, Ms. Flowers, and Mr. McQueary participated in site visits to Russell New Urban Development projects in Atlanta, Georgia.

Ms. Flowers was impressed with the quality of product, scope of the footprint exhibited in the projects, and interaction with the community.

Mr. McQueary emailed comments regarding the site visit. He indicated that Russell New Urban Development was an extremely professional and well-respected company.

Participating in the South Elm Development site visit was Ms. Chaney, Mr. Enochs, Ms. Arkin, Ms. Flowers, and Mr. Shoffner.

Mr. Enochs and Ms. Chaney did not feel that the projects they visited were relevant representations of what could be done in Greensboro.

Ms. Flowers pointed out the adaptive reuse of older buildings and also questioned their relevancy to the proposed development. She commented that although the single family housing across from the Duke University campus was beautiful, it did not fit into plans for the South Elm Street redevelopment project.

Ms. Arkin addressed the question of relevancy and indicated that Mr. Chapman, South Elm Development, was trying to show their quality of new construction and how an urban environment can be created using a lot of different pieces and uses.

Mr. Schoffner pointed out that South Elm Development developed Southside in Greensboro which was more in line with expectations for the proposed development.

Chair Rogers, Mr. Gravely, Ms. Arkin, Mr. Schoffner, and Mr. Roush visited projects by South Elm Street Redevelopment Partners.

Mr. Gravely felt that the building quality and green efforts exhibited in the developments were good.

Chair Rogers stated that the quality of construction at Greenbridge was good; however, it did not fit the neighborhood. She commented on the adaptive reuse done at Gallery Lofts but felt it was not relevant to the proposed project.

Mr. Roush was impressed with the South Elm Street Redevelopment team. He agreed with observations regarding quality of construction and irrelevancy of some of the sites that were visited. He felt the team understood the area in Greensboro and took a site-specific approach with location and community aspects. He was supportive of their proposal to bridge a connection across Lee Street along with their emphasis on open space and green efforts.

Mr. Schoffner felt that South Elm Street Redevelopment Partners was a top-notch team and he liked their concept of connectivity.

Ms. Arkin reviewed a list of questions that could be used by Commissioners to structure interviews.

Alex Ricks, 2510 Hyatt Street, spoke from the audience and stated that an economic impact study should be done to assess the effects of a big box retailer on the area. He also pointed out that the quality of the property will affect the rental rates on the rest of the neighborhood.

In anticipation of putting a median in the middle of Lee Street, Mr. Gray commented that land owned by the Redevelopment Commission should be set aside to make extra lanes in the future. This would prevent taking the land from the north side of Lee Street which would disrupt parking and the character of the area.

Mr. Robert commented that crossing Lee Street was an important issue and should be handled by the City sooner than later.

Ms. Arkin clarified that any changes made to Lee Street would be City initiated. The issue is also included in the list of interview questions because of the importance of considering the surrounding areas and all types of connectivity.

Mr. Enochs asked about the City's commitment to participate in funding the redevelopment project. He felt that an informed decision on the proposals was not possible until a direction was received from City Council indicating what they were prepared to bring to the table in terms of funding.

Following a lengthy discussion, Mr. Scott suggested that if there was concern on the part of the Commission, a letter could be written to the Mayor requesting that he poll Council members on where they stand regarding the City's original commitment of \$3 million and to request an informal briefing session with City Council following the interview process. In addition, he informed members that the City is legally bound to HUD and EPA to make the \$3 million available to fund the project.

Mr. Enochs felt that the South Elm Street Redevelopment Partners proposal was the strongest; however, he expressed concern that Landex was losing money. The Russell New Urban Design proposal was not complete but he thought the site visit went very well.

Mr. Gray said all the proposals should remain on the table for the time being. He felt that more detail and further discussion was needed to arrive at a recommendation.

Chair Rogers said that South Elm Street Redevelopment Partners was the strongest team, especially in the site visits, because of their conviction to include the surrounding community in their development process and the fluidity of their development procedures. Russell New Urban

Development seemed to be grandiose in their production and even though they are involved in the community, their structure may be too large.

Mr. Gravely and Ms. Chaney indicated their first choice to interview would be South Elm Street Redevelopment Partners. Ms. Chaney liked their multifamily for sale units and townhouse units along with retail; their entryway, and the extension of South Elm Street across Lee Street.

Members indicated their preference to interview South Elm Street Redevelopment Partners as the next step in the process. Chair Rogers suggested that a letter be sent to the Mayor to ask Council members where they stand on the \$3 million commitment to infrastructure simultaneous with the interview process.

Mr. Enochs moved to direct staff to (1) prepare a letter to be signed by the Commission directly to the Mayor to be shared with City Council requesting a statement of intent acknowledging the prior funding commitments that were involved in the South Elm Street Redevelopment Plan to be determined to be applied as needed to the redevelopment property, and (2) call a Special Meeting in the daytime to be determined to further interview South Elm Street Redevelopment Partners, seconded by Mr. Gravely. The Commission voted unanimously 4-0 in favor of the motion.

Members agreed that Community Advisory members should be involved in the interview process. The special meeting to conduct the interview will be held in the late afternoon to facilitate greater attendance.

ADJOURN:

Mr. Enochs moved to adjourn the meeting, seconded by Ms. Chaney. The Commission voted unanimously 4-0 in favor of the motion.

There being no further business before the Commission the meeting was adjourned at 7:15 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Sue Schwartz,
Acting Director, Planning and Community Development

SS/sm:jd

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF
THE REDEVELOPMENT COMMISSION OF GREENSBORO
PLAZA LEVEL CONFERENCE ROOM
MELVIN MUNICIPAL OFFICE BUILDING
OCTOBER 12, 2011**

The Redevelopment Commission of Greensboro met in a regular session in the Plaza Level Conference Room, Melvin Municipal Office Building on Wednesday, October 12, 2011 at 5:00 p.m. Commissioners present were: Chair Cassandra Rogers, Dawn Chaney, Robert Enochs, Clinton Gravely, and Charles McQueary. Staff included Dyan Arkin, Chancer McLaughlin, Barbara Harris, and Sue Schwartz. Also present were Jim Blackwood, attorney for the Commission, and City Council members Zach Matthey and Jim Kee.

Chair Rogers called the meeting to order.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF SEPTEMBER 14, 2011 REGULAR MEETING:

Mr. McQueary moved to accept the minutes as amended, seconded by Ms. Chaney. The Commission voted unanimously 5-0 in favor of the motion.

SOUTH ELM STREET REDEVELOPMENT AREA:

(a) Interview with South Elm Street Redevelopment Partners

Ms. Arkin gave a brief introduction and review of the interview process.

Ms. Judy Siegel, Chairman of Landex Companies, introduced the other members of the South Elm Street Redevelopment Partners team in attendance. Present at the interview were Peter Siegel, Landex Companies; Evon Smith, Sustainable Community Solutions; CC Lamberth, Sustainable Community Solutions; Richard Brigstocke, Artios Retail Consultants; Wayne Deal, Weaver Cooke; and Scott Knudsen, Windsor Associates.

Question #1: Discuss the proposed development in terms of its long term viability.

Mr. Siegel pointed out the long-term financial feasibility, sustainability from an environmental point of view, and longevity from a construction and marketing point of view. In addition, the project has the ability to change as the world changes.

Ms. Arkin presented a subset of follow-up questions for the team's response.

--What aspects of the proposed development create the foundation for continued success?

--The older urban fabric was very flexible, adaptable, and accessible to a broad range of demographics. How will this new urban fabric do that?

--How will the development promote social interaction and cultural enrichments for residents in all demographics in Greensboro: age, race, and income?

--How does this project build upon or enhance surrounding land uses?

What is your strategy for inclusion and integration of the mid-block parcels not included in the RCG offering?

Ms. Siegel and Ms. Smith described the team's intent to integrate the proposed development into the surrounding area and use it as a catalyst for additional development. Ms. Smith felt there must be job opportunities for local residents on the site. They want to integrate different types of housing stocks within existing neighborhoods utilizing the green space to have a walkable community with an urban feel.

Mr. Knudsen stated that one aspect of long-term viability is flexibility in programming, use and physical form as the development is built. He stated that their concept is based on defining public space and interconnecting street grids. The team will use community input and market studies to set the most feasible direction.

Ms. Smith pointed out the aging population in the communities surrounding the area. To avoid having these families leave the area, they would integrate housing for seniors as part of the new development.

Mr. Brigstocke addressed project longevity by citing the American Can Company and his work with the project over a 15-year period. The project is still evolving and changing. He described meeting different markets and trying to grow as the economy changes. From a retail perspective, he emphasized creating a multi-use project with multiple landowners, mixed uses, and mixed price points

Mr. McQueary asked the team what characteristics they saw as being pertinent to create sustainability of the project. Mr. Brigstocke responded by describing concepts that included reaching out to local retail and targeting the college population along with strategies for lease renewals. Ms. Siegel pointed out Mr. Brigstocke's strength in understanding the process of retail evolution. Mr. Siegel reiterated that dialogue with the City and stakeholders was important to meet the needs of the community.

Ms. Chaney asked the team how they would deal with Lee Street in relation to the development of South Elm Street. Mr. Knudsen replied that the team would evaluate many scenarios but they felt there should be some form of public space on the south side of Lee Street. The public space would become an area for programmed activities. He stated the importance of the Greenway to the project because it straddles the bicycle connection to all the universities and vehicular connection to the rest of the City. The intersection of Lee Street and South Elm Street would need to be redesigned to create a pedestrian-friendly way to cross over. He felt that a parking garage would be necessary; however, the team was uncertain at this time as to the City's contribution.

Question #2: Whatever is developed at this site needs to generate investment in the surrounding area. Discuss how your proposal will trigger or positively influence offsite investment.

Ms. Siegel stated that the team would reach out to adjacent land owners as a master plan was developed. Mr. Siegel felt that the investment had already increased with the issuance of the Request for Proposals and as interest grows, the land value will continue to increase. Ms. Smith discussed the team's ability to change the face of the southern gateway into downtown.

Questions #3: Describe your strategy for communication and coordination with City staff and local institutions that could be involved with the project.

Ms. Siegel described the organizational makeup of South Elm Street Development Partners. The group divides into teams to focus on design, construction, financing, management, and legal matters. Each team has a leader and there is constant communication as all facets are related. Landex will be the managing member of the partnership. The team discussed their unlimited time commitment to the

project and their intent to set forth a detailed plan with a schedule and budget at the beginning of the process. Meetings with the City, the market study, and other information will be put on a time line.

Ms. Chaney asked the team to comment on what they viewed as the biggest limitation of the project. Ms. Siegel stated that the development project must meet the needs of a diverse population with many differences of opinions. Stakeholders need to be engaged in a participatory process to reach a consensus. She commented that the process was not easy but could be done. In addition, she felt that another challenge was financing. Ms. Smith pointed out the challenge of obliterating the perception of crime in the area.

Ben Roush, student and Community Advisory member, asked the team how they envisioned retail on the site. Ms. Arkin asked how the team would insure that the site would be a unique destination and would stand on its own as well as a part of the existing downtown fabric. Mr. Brigstocke said that successful retail was dependent on increasing pedestrian traffic on the sidewalk, increasing the daily traffic to Lee Street, and bringing people to the community. He felt that at this time a big box retailer would not be feasible because of the current lack of daily traffic and necessary demographics of the site.

The team gave an overview of the functions involved in a viable development and presented a sample project budget.

(b) Developer Selection Schedule and Process

Ms. Arkin reviewed the process and explained options available to the Commission. The Commission can direct staff to move forward with negotiating terms with South Elm Street Redevelopment Partners or they can direct staff to set up interviews with other teams.

Ms. Arkin gave an overview of the sets of conditions and agreements that will be signed with the developer during the process.

Responding to comments from members relative to City Council involvement in the selection process, Ms. Harris clarified that the directive of staff is to take information to the City Manager who in turn takes the information to City Council. Staff routinely reports to the City Manager's office on the activities of the Commission relative to the development project. Staff has not received any information that would indicate City Council wants the Commission to go in a different direction at this point.

Following a discussion, members commented that there was not an overall comfort level at this point to proceed with the South Elm Street Redevelopment Partners. Chair Rogers asked staff to set up interviews with Russell New Urban Design and South Elm Development Group.

To aid members, Ms. Arkin stated that she will share the list of items that staff expects to see in a development agreement

Eric Robert, Community Advisory member, stated his concern that the South Elm Street Redevelopment Partners presentation represented a lack of vision and was very abstract. He felt that it would be a waste of time to all concerned if the incentives expressed for this project were not a reality or the project was vetoed at the last minute.

Mr. Enochs moved to direct staff to schedule interviews with Russell New Urban Design and South Elm Development Group over the next two regularly scheduled meetings of the Redevelopment

Commission of Greensboro, seconded by Ms. Chaney. The Commission voted unanimously in favor of the motion.

Counsel Blackwood stated that he would workup an outline of a Development Agreement to assist Commissioners.

Ms. Chaney directed staff to ask Russell New Urban Design to provide information relating to their time frame and phasing schedule.

Chair Rogers asked staff to pull the information out of the South Elm Development Group proposal and make the interview with Russell New Urban Design contingent upon providing the missing information.

ADJOURN:

Mr. Enochs moved to adjourn the meeting, seconded by Mr. McQueary. The Commission voted unanimously 5-0 in favor of the motion.

There being no further business before the Commission the meeting was adjourned at 7:15 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Sue Schwartz,
Director, Planning and Community Development

SS/sm:jd

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF
THE REDEVELOPMENT COMMISSION OF GREENSBORO
PLAZA LEVEL CONFERENCE ROOM
MELVIN MUNICIPAL OFFICE BUILDING
NOVEMBER 9, 2011**

The Redevelopment Commission of Greensboro met in a regular session in the Plaza Level Conference Room, Melvin Municipal Office Building on Wednesday, November 9, 2011 at 5:00 p.m. Commissioners present were: Acting Chair Dawn Chaney, Robert Enochs, Clinton Gravely, and Chuck McQueary. Staff included Dyan Arkin, Chancer McLaughlin, and Barbara Harris, representing the Planning and Community Development Department; and Jim Blackwood, attorney for the Commission.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF SEPTEMBER 21, 2011 SPECIAL MEETING:

Mr. Gravely moved to approve the minutes of the September 21, 2011 special meeting as written, seconded by Mr. McQueary. The Commission voted unanimously 3-0 in favor of the motion.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF OCTOBER 12, 2011 REGULAR MEETING:

Mr. Gravely moved to approve the minutes of the October 12, 2011 regular meeting as written, seconded by Mr. McQueary. The Commission voted unanimously 3-0 in favor of the motion.

Mr. Enochs joined the meeting at 5:03 p.m.

Ms. Arkin informed members that the Annual Meeting of the Redevelopment Commission is scheduled for the second Wednesday in January, 2012 at 5:00 p.m. The election of officers will take place at this meeting.

PHILLIPS LOMBARDY REDEVELOPMENT AREA:

(a) EDGE Proposal

Mr. McLaughlin indicated that the official survey and legal description of the property, as requested at the last meeting, was made available to Commissioners in their agenda package. In addition, Concerned Citizens of Greensboro has supplied a letter of neighborhood support for the proposal. He explained that the survey and legal description were needed for the Commission to enter into a Letter of Intent to lease property to EDGE for a term of five years.

Mr. Gravely moved to go forward with the proposal as it relates to the three acres of land, seconded by Mr. McQueary. The Commission voted unanimously 4-0 in favor of the motion.

WILLOW OAKS AND EASTSIDE PARK REDEVELOPMENT AREAS:

(a) Disposition of Houses at 701 Dorgan Avenue and 728 Gillespie Street

Ms. Arkin requested that this item be removed from the agenda at this time.

SOUTH ELM STREET REDEVELOPMENT AREA:

(a) Interview with South Elm Development Group

Ms. Arkin gave a brief introduction and review of the interview process. She distributed a one-page summary of interview questions. The Commission will ask the team to discuss the long-term viability of the project's role as an economic catalyst for the surrounding area along with the team's capacity to bring to life the vision described in the Redevelopment Plan adopted in 2007.

Mr. Bob Chapman, from Durham, NC, introduced other members of the South Elm Development Group in attendance. Team members included Bob Isner, from Greensboro, NC; Seth Harry, from Baltimore, Maryland; James Covington, engineer with Covington-Waller & Associates; Rusty Porter, C.F. Evans Construction Company; and Tony Sease, architect and engineer from Durham, NC.

The South Elm Development Group team gave a PowerPoint presentation highlighting projects that team members have been involved with. Mr. Chapman described the Southside City View I and II projects in Greensboro, NC; 37 townhouses in Old Salem, Winston Salem, NC; Morris Ridge in Durham, NC; Trinity Heights in Durham, NC; The Village at Hendrix in Conway, Arkansas; and Southlake Cagan Crossing in Florida. Mr. Harry, master planner for the South Elm project, reviewed joint venture projects in Australia and Ireland along with the Chesire Community in Black Mountain, NC.

Mr. Chapman described the team's design concept to link Lee Street with downtown Greensboro, effectively connect the new Greenway with the downtown area, and provide safe pedestrian connections across Lee Street. He described their plan as flexible with a range of uses. South Elm Development Group would like to have owner occupied housing in addition to rental units. Their plan is to have 25 townhouse/condominium units, 168 for rent residential units, ground floor retail space, restaurants, and an international market place. The team felt that a market study would support building a 75-90 unit hotel. Mr. Chapman explored the idea of a downtown university campus, 15,000 square feet of office space, numerous out parcels, an esplanade, and a wellness center. He discussed the team's concept of using incremental urbanism to create a gateway to Greensboro.

Mr. Gravely asked the team to discuss their financial expectations from the City. Mr. Chapman stated that the best way to finance parking decks is through tax increment financing. He said that \$4.2 million is budgeted for parking decks and it would be helpful to have a tax incremented financing mechanism to allocate some of the incremental tax generated from the project. The main financing source would be the HUD 221D4 Market Rate Guarantee Program. In addition, bids may be requested from financing sources. He indicated that the team may also ask the City for consideration in the way they release the land.

Mr. McQueary asked the team to describe what might be done to enable pedestrians to safely cross over Lee Street. Mr. Chapman indicated that a median has been added to their plan and they hope to have on street parking to help calm traffic. Mr. Sease added that many tools exist that recognize the technical relationship between street design, pedestrian activity, and economic development activity. He said that design standards in the Institute of Transportation Engineers Major Thoroughfares Manual would be appropriate for conditions on Lee Street and Elm Street.

Mr. Enoch asked the Group to comment on the long-term viability of mixed use in the development. Mr. Chapman stated that retail should not be overbuilt and should initially be looked at as an amenity. He felt it was important to select retailers who will succeed and to start with destination retail. He explained that long-term viability is proven by new urbanist projects across the country.

Responding to a question from Acting Chair Chaney, Mr. Chapman commented that he was unsure if student housing would be built in the first phase of the project. His philosophy is to attract people who will stay in the area for a long time. He explained that the rental housing, for sale housing, and retail would be built at the same time with retail shops located on the first floor. In addition, he stated that their proposal for a garage occurs in Phase 3 of the plan.

Mr. McQueary asked Mr. Chapman to comment on what can potentially go wrong with the project. He elaborated on real estate risks that included entitlement, market, financing, construction, and management. Mr. Covington addressed storm water regulations relating to the project and Mr. Porter discussed bonding capacity relative to construction risk.

The team was asked to discuss their MWBE participation. Mr. Chapman stated that C.F. Evans Construction was highly recommended by the Charlotte Housing Authority for their MWBE program. Mr. Porter discussed the awareness, planning, and implementation involved in MWBE participation using a targeted approach.

Acting Chair Chaney suggested that South Elm Development Group use available data on downtown Greensboro relating to vacancy rates, rate per square foot of lease space, type of space not leasing, and the type of businesses with turn over. She felt that this information could be useful in the market study for the live/work and retail spaces. In addition, she commented on Triad Local First, a significant movement that encourages local businesses to become involved in the downtown area.

Ms. Arkin asked the team to comment on how their plan would trigger offsite investment. Mr. Chapman said that the Daily Bread Flour Mill was an asset and would play an integral part in the experience. In addition, the vacant property located under the tressle could be brought into the value created by the project. He felt that development should not end with South Elm Street or the Greenway.

Ms. Arkin asked if any community members present had questions for the South Elm Development Group team.

Eric Robert, Community Advisor member, asked if retail was a vital component to the project or if density and people were more important in the initial phase. Mr. Chapman replied that financing would be driven by residential, not retail rents. He indicated he would rather see a variety of local retailers rather than top dollar retailers.

Dabney Sanders, Project Manager for Downtown Greenway, asked the Group to discuss their concept for community engagement. Mr. Chapman indicated that they plan to hold a series of public charettes inviting everyone to participate. Mr. Harry added that the charette is a tool to engage the public, fact check assumptions, and establish dialogue.

Ben Roush, Community Advisor, asked the team to describe their plans for open space in the development. Mr. Chapman said that an urban formal landscaping concept is being considered; however, as the project grows open land will be curated for use as part of the experience. He commented on the possibility of incorporating an adventure playground into the plan along with pocket parks.

ADDITIONAL BUSINESS:

Members discussed changing the date of the December, 2011 meeting to accommodate scheduling conflicts of members. Commissioners decided to schedule the next meeting on December 16, 2011 at 3:00 p.m. in the Plaza Level Conference Room.

Ms. Arkin stated that members are in receipt of an e-mail from East Market Street Development Corporation regarding Promise Neighborhoods. The e-mail mentions getting the primary team members together. She said that this matter can be delegated to staff with reports brought back to the Commission or members can participate in the process.

Mr. McQueary moved to delegate the matter to staff as a starting point, seconded by Mr. Gravely. The Commission voted unanimously 4-0 in favor of the motion.

Gorrell Street Redevelopment Area:**(a) Magnolia House Proposal for 725 Plott Street**

At the last meeting the Commission directed staff to conduct an appraisal on 725 Plott Street. The appraisal value was determined to be \$10,000. Staff feels that based on the lot square footage there is sufficient space to meet the zoning requirements. The Magnolia house also has an agreement with the church across the street to provide them with 20 additional parking spaces which would help meet the parking requirements of the new zoning district.

Sam Pass, 515 Martin Street, is the owner of the Magnolia House located at 442 Gorrell Street. Mr. Pass has made an official offer on the lot in the amount of \$7,000.

Following a discussion, Ms. Arkin provided additional history on the lot. She indicated that the lot has been intended for use in some way by the Magnolia House for over ten years. The lot has been held aside and not marketed for single family residential use. She said that Mr. Pass is the only individual that she is aware of who has ever expressed interest in the lot in the ten-year period. The Magnolia House is a historic monument and an important part of the history of Greensboro.

Mr. Enoch moved to approve the sale of the lot at 725 Plott Street for \$7,000 on the condition that the zoning requirements are met for the inclusion of said property to be one tract of land with what is now known as the Magnolia House property to be used for parking and/or other uses consistent with the historic land use of the bed and breakfast known as Magnolia House, seconded by Mr. Gravely. The Commission voted unanimously 4-0 in favor of the motion.

ADJOURN:

Mr. Enochs moved to adjourn the meeting, seconded by Acting Chair Chaney. The Commission voted unanimously 4-0 in favor of the motion.

There being no further business before the Commission the meeting was adjourned at 7:05 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Sue Schwartz,
Planning and Community Development

SS/sm:jd

**APPROVED MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF
THE REDEVELOPMENT COMMISSION OF GREENSBORO
PLAZA LEVEL CONFERENCE ROOM
MELVIN MUNICIPAL OFFICE BUILDING
DECEMBER 16, 2011**

The Redevelopment Commission of Greensboro met in a special session in the Plaza Level Conference Room, Melvin Municipal Office Building on Friday, December 16, 2011 at 3:00 p.m. Commissioners present were: Acting Chair Dawn Chaney, Robert Enochs, Clinton Gravely, and Chuck McQueary. Staff included Dyan Arkin, Chancer McLaughlin, and Barbara Harris, representing the Planning and Community Development Department; and Jim Blackwood, attorney for the Commission.

1. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF NOVEMBER 9, 2011 REGULAR MEETING:

Mr. Gravely moved to approve the minutes of the November 9, 2011 regular meeting as written, seconded by Mr. McQueary. The Commission voted unanimously 4-0 in favor of the motion.

2. SOUTH ELM STREET REDEVELOPMENT AREA:

(a) Interview with Russell New Urban Developers

Ms. Arkin reviewed the interview process along with a brief overview of the proposal from Russell New Urban Developers.

Members of the Russell New Urban Development team included Jerome Russell, an owner of H. J. Russell and Company; Jeremy Hall, Director of Planning with Wakefield Beasley and Associates Architects in Atlanta, Georgia; Christina Ngugen, ESPA Architects and Planners in Greensboro, North Carolina; Jody Efird, ESPA Architects and Planners in Greensboro, North Carolina; and Edrick Harris, Development Manager for Russell New Urban Development.

Mr. Harris stated that Russell New Urban Development's revised plan meets the needs and concerns of the citizens of Greensboro. The plan is financially feasible and the early phases of the project will serve as catalysts for future phases. He indicated that their plan proposed the incorporation of an urban prototype of a big box retailer in the project such as Target, Walmart, or a grocery store chain.

Referring to the site plan, Mr. Hall gave an overview of the proposal and pointed out important factors including the Lee Street connection with Elm Street and the Greenway that were used to determine gateway elements. The plan treats Elm Street as the primary street utilizing corner plazas, outdoor dining areas, and on-street parking to calm traffic and create a pedestrian friendly environment. Retail will be located on both sides of the street. To prevent driveways off the main street, two-way side streets will be introduced for access to residential, hotel, and retail parking.

Mr. Hall pointed out that the 40,000 square foot anchor retail store will open onto a plaza area on Elm Street. The store will have service entrances hidden behind the building backing up to Lee Street. He discussed plans for a small hotel, conference center, retail that would address Greenway traffic, office flex space, and residential space.

Mr. Harris discussed the catalytic phasing of the project. He indicated that Phase I would include apartment and townhouse units while Phase II would focus on retail. Depending on the market and local user input, Phase III might include a hotel and additional retail. Future phases would be based on additional acquisitions.

Mr. Harris stated that the project represented a \$28 million development just for residential units and associated retail. For remaining phases, retailers and hotel developers would purchase the site directly from the City as part of the project.

Ms. Arkin passed out and reviewed the three sections of interview questions.

Mr. McQueary asked the team to discuss the risks and problem areas associated with this project. Mr. Russell felt the biggest risks with any project were construction and financing. He addressed these areas in detail and stated the advantage of finding retailers who would purchase parcels directly from the City. Mr. Harris commented that potential risks could be mitigated through an understanding of the market and obtaining an in-depth market study. Mr. Hall felt that it was important to have flexibility in the site plan to address changes in use, form, or quantity as the project evolved. Flexibility should exist to react to the market.

In response to a question from Mr. Enochs, Mr. Russell said that currently there is not a demand for a downtown hotel; however, he supported a hotel in a future phase. He envisioned a nice, yet moderately priced hotel built in three or four years.

Mr. McQueary stated that a safe crosswalk across Lee Street was a crucial factor in the project. Mr. Hall commented that a traffic engineer could be brought in to create an appropriate crosswalk situation. Ms. Arkin clarified that this project does not include changes to Lee Street. Any changes made to Lee Street would be the ultimate responsibility of the City who would work closely with the developer.

Responding to a question regarding financial expectations from the City, Mr. Harris stated that the RFP indicated roughly \$2 million for parking structures from the City. Depending on uses of remaining components and the final design, additional sources will be sought out. Additional sources will be required for the first phase due to site challenges. Based on results determined in the market study, Mr. Russell said that funding options included a HUD loan, insurance companies, and tax exempt bonds for the Phase I component.

Ms. Arkin asked the Russell New Urban Development team how they would insure an urban anchor store would fit into the architectural integrity of the site. Mr. Harris said that the design team would work on development guidelines with the City focusing on flexibility. They would set up controls to insure that whatever was developed fit with the context and fabric of the surrounding area. An Architectural Review Board would be part of the process. He also discussed the possibility that the retailer could purchase the site along with the approved design.

Ms. Arkin asked the team to explain how they would integrate the required income specific housing. A percentage of affordable housing is required based on funding sources used to acquire the land. Mr. Harris felt that they were able to carry the reduction for affordable housing on the site based on the incentives loaded into the financial model. They would also look to other sources including grants and subsidies to help with rents.

Mr. McQueary commented on his impression of projects completed by the team during the Commission's visit to Atlanta. He felt the team had done a superb job creating new spaces and the projects reflected good quality.

Carolyn Flowers, Community Advisory Team member, conducted her own background check on the team and confirmed that they were much engrained in the community. They were very open as to what they were doing and they incorporated the community into the process.

Members of the Community Advisory Team introduced themselves. Members present included Carolyn Flowers; John Shoffner, Economic Development Manager at the City of Greensboro;

Ben Roush, Landscape Architecture student at A&T University; Dabney Sanders, Project Manager for the Downtown Greenway; Eric Robert, neighbor; and Sidney Gray, property owner. Also present from the community were Deana Hayes and John Green of the Ole Asheboro Neighborhood Association.

Ms. Flowers asked Russell New Urban Development to comment on their time frame and the number of jobs that would be created by the project. Mr. Harris said that once the contract is awarded, a period of due diligence and predevelopment activity exists of around 6 to 9 months before construction can begin. Mr. Russell said that construction jobs would be generated during the project. Once completed, ongoing jobs would be created when retailers come in.

Mr. Russell stated that a local project manager would be chosen using their strong networking relationships in North Carolina. Ms. Hayes commented on the importance of NWBE participation in the project.

Mr. Roush asked the team to comment on the viability of office space along Lee Street and on the amount of open space planned for the site. Mr. Hall felt the amount of office space was flexible and could involve a variety of different users. In addition, he commented that open space has been included in plaza areas and courtyards around residential areas. The team said that pocket parks could be tucked into the site to encourage public usage.

(b) Developer Selection Schedule and Process

Ms. Arkin proposed that unless a decision could be made at this meeting, Commissioners should look toward the January, 2012 meeting to make a decision. Staff will summarize and prepare a package for Commissioners to review before the meeting. If a decision is made at the January meeting, several weeks will be available for staff to work with the selected developer and assure members that even if terms are not fully finalized, staff feels that details can be worked out during the process of reaching a Development Agreement. Commissioners would be in a position to finalize their recommendation at the February, 2012 meeting; advertising for the upset bid process would occur; and Commissioners would make their presentation and recommendation to City Council at the second meeting in February, 2012. Members agreed that this was a rational schedule to proceed.

Members asked for feedback from the Community Advisory Team.

Mr. Robert felt that the Russell New Urban Development presentation lacked detail. He was hoping for more clarity from the questions. Mr. Roush agreed with Mr. Robert.

Ms. Sanders expressed concern that the first development team to make a presentation to the Commission had never worked together before. She felt that the second team gave an amazing and inspiring presentation. They looked closely at the community and addressed the questions they were asked. Ms. Sanders commented that she had a concern regarding Russell New Urban Development's plan for a big box retailer with the back fronting on a major street and their 3-story parking structure with no buffer. She felt their presentation was less interesting and the visuals were not as detailed as other presenters.

Mr. Enochs commented that although all of the teams were evasive regarding financing, Russell New Urban Development seemed to give less concrete answers. The team stated they wanted the City to keep ownership of the land so they would not have to pay taxes on it during construction. He noted ambiguity in Russell New Urban Development's response to questions about when the City would sell the land to pay off debt.

Mr. McQueary asked that staff include in their summary a set of common criteria comparing the financial approach for each team, visual pictures of their designs, and a list of pros and cons based upon what has been heard.

Mr. Shoffner was asked to comment on the financial aspect of the project. He was not surprised that the teams would be vague regarding financing until a final selection was made as the process of negotiating with investors is time consuming. He indicated that Russell New Urban Development shared their financial reports with staff and the information reflected a fair amount of equity. Mr. Shoffner's impression was that they appeared to be a solid development group. He felt it was important to ask each group how much equity they could put into the project.

Ms. Arkin outlined the next steps in the process. Staff will put together a matrix of criteria for selection and populate it with data from each team. In addition, staff will extract sections relating to the South Elm Street Redevelopment project from the minutes of previous meeting to give perspective to Commissioners.

Mr. McQueary urged Commissioners to be in agreement that their selection criteria are correct before a decision on a developer is made.

Ms. Chaney asked staff to be sure that City Council members were included in the list of those notified by email of the January, 2012 meeting. Any one present at the meeting will be given an opportunity to comment.

ADJOURN:

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

Respectfully submitted,

Sue Schwartz,
Planning and Community Development

SS/sm:jd