

**Meeting Minutes of the
Redevelopment Commission of Greensboro
January 9, 2019**

The Annual Meeting of the Redevelopment Commission of Greensboro (RCG) was held on Wednesday, January 9, 2019, in the Plaza Level Conference Room of the Melvin Municipal Office Building commencing at 5:00 p.m. The following members were present: Chair, Charles McQueary Clinton Gravely, Dawn Chaney and Councilwoman Hoffman. Staff present included Dyan Arkin, Russ Clegg, Hart Crane, and Jose Colon. Also present was Andrew Kelly, Attorney for the Commission.

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

Item 1: Meeting Minutes

- a) Draft Minutes of the December 5, 2018 Regular Meeting are attached.

Dyan Arkin made a few changes to the December meeting minutes. Those changes were to change the word “staff” on page 1 to “new Planning Department member” Jose Colon. The next change was on the bottom of page 5, she wanted to add a thank you to Councilwomen Hoffman for all her support.

Mr. Gravely moved approval of the December 5, 2018 minutes as amended, seconded by Ms. Chaney. The Commission voted 3-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: McCreary, Gravely, Chaney. Nays: None.)

Item 2: Election of Officers

Chair McQueary proposed to postpone until Mr. Enochs would be able to attend the meeting. Counsel Kelly stated that the officers will continue to serve until the Commission can take a vote. Therefore, the Election of Officers was tabled until the February meeting.

Item 3: Willow Oaks Redevelopment Area a) Consideration of Sale of 2503 Everitt Street

Ms. Arkin stated that it this is in consideration for sale of a piece of property that is currently owned by the Commission. Yesterday she sent out a map and a memo that gave more information. Jose Colon was there to present information and answer questions.

Mr. Colon stated that there is a request for a proposal and purchase for development. It is adjacent to Living Hope Missionary Baptist Church. Reverend Lester Woodard was there to provide information for some work he is doing in the community and what he plans to do with the property. The property is .32 acres and zoned Multifamily, and Reverend Woodard plans to put a playground, storage building, and an open-air community facility for activities for the

community. His offer is \$9,000. Prior to closing the purchaser will submit plans for Commission approval. They must also submit site plans and building plans for the property. Purchaser, at closing, shall record a combination deed with further restrictions that the property shall not be subdivided and shall be restricted to uses approved by the Commission. Ms. Arkin stated that final approval will be made by the City Council.

Reverend Lester Woodard, 2218 Ballard Road, stated that he has been the pastor of the church for 18 years. He is trying to do something for the community. He has had some ideas but not the room that he needed. He wants to do more for the community. The storm did a lot of damage to the community. For the last 16 years he has been keeping the yard up, and the community really needs this in this area. Ms. Chaney asked if he had a time frame of how long it will be to have the playground set up, so the children can use the land. Reverend Woodard stated that it would take about two years.

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

Item 4: Ole Asheboro Redevelopment Area a) Consideration of Sale/Development Agreement with Prestwick Land Holdings LLC

Ms. Arkin stated that staff has been working with Prestwick Land Holdings LLC (Prestwick) out of Atlanta, GA to negotiate Sale/Development Agreements for their proposed senior living and mixed-use developments in the Ole Asheboro Redevelopment Plan area. Prestwick has offered to purchase from the Commission the property generally known as 526 Douglas Street, 528 Douglas Street, and 532 Douglas Street and from the City of Greensboro the property generally known as the eastern portion of 503 Martin Luther King, Jr. Drive.

The property was advertised on January 3, 2019 for upset bid in accordance with North Carolina Redevelopment Law. Hart Crane presented details of the final Sale/Development Agreement, Development will begin within 60 days of closing and will be completed within 16 months of closing. After they have completed those activities, they will have another 16 months for the improvements. Prior to closing on the property, Prestwick will provide the following;

- A. Final site plan and elevations in conformity with the following planning documents; Ole Asheboro Redevelopment Plan, adopted 2004; and MLK North Traditional Neighborhood Development Plan, as amended 10/17/18;
- B. Approval of final site plans by the NC State Historic Preservation Office;
- C. Final development program and phasing schedule;
- D. Proposed development budget with sources and uses;
- E. Marketing plan for rental units;
- F. Drawings, specifications, and other documents fully setting forth details relating to exterior architectural facades and interior layout of all building improvements;
- G. Any other matters pertaining to the proposal construction and improvements contemplated;
- H. Documentation as to the projected costs of the construction of improvements;

- I. Proof of award of Low Income Housing Tax Credits, specific to this project, from the North Carolina Housing Finance Agency or evidence of financial ability, through capital contributions, grants, loans or otherwise, to complete the improvements in accordance with this agreement; and
- J. Execution of one or more agreements with the City regarding funding and construction of site preparation, streetscape, and infrastructure improvements for the property.

Mr. Crane stated that this agreement primarily is predicated on the fact that this is a Low-Income Housing Tax Credit project. The award of tax credits from the North Carolina Housing Financing Agency is one of the prime determinants whether this project goes forward, and this agreement speaks to that process. The agreement mirrors the process that the Housing Financing Agency uses. Chair McQueary asked at this time if there is anything that could cause some disruption in the implementation. Mr. Crane stated that the pre-application goes to the Financing Housing Agency by January 19th, 2019. Prestwick must show site control on the pre-application and would help them score higher on their application. In March they will get a notification of those final site scores and they will get an invitation to submit a final application based on those scores.

Edrick Harris, 3715 North Side Parkway Atlanta, Georgia, stated the way that the Housing Financing Authority determines if the project is eligible at the pre-application stage is based on whether they have site control. Without site control, the project doesn't get scored on the other criteria. Counsel Kelly stated that the City Council meets on the 15th and that is why they have worked hard to bring it to the Commission tonight, in case there were any questions or to work out any issues.

Mr. Crane stated that Mr. Harris has met with the community. There was an Open House on November 1, 2018 for about three to four hours, and about 40 people attended. Councilwomen Goldie Wells and Sharon Hightower were in attendance. The Board for the Neighborhood Association voted to approve this project to move forward. There is community support, and they have a direct line to Mr. Harris. In the agreement, the Commission is asked to assist with negotiations with the City to provide funding for site preparations, and to issue a Certificate of Completion upon satisfactory completion of all improvements.

Mr. Harris stated the Tax Credit Program is very competitive, but they are geared up and optimistic and making sure they don't miss anything. Chair McQueary asked about the timeline for the State award process. Mr. Harris said is once a year. Ms. Chaney asked if the property was already zoned for multi-family, that she had thought it was zoned for single family. Mr. Crane stated that the Redevelopment Plan allows for uses in the proposal. Ms. Chaney asked if they would always be rental units. Mr. Harris stated that is correct, with a 20-year compliance period. Prestwick will have to own it for those 20 years.

Chair McQueary expressed concern that the 19th was only ten days away. Ms. Arkin said that all that is left to be done is approval by the Redevelopment Commission and then on the 15th by City Council. To clarify, Prestwick has been and continues to move forward under the

assumption that Redevelopment Commission and City Council will approve. They are ready to submit their application on the 19th. Mr. Gravely stated that this is a good project.

Mr. Gravely moved approval of the proposal, as reviewed, seconded by Ms. Chaney. The Commission voted 3-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: McQueary, Chaney and Gravely. Nays: None.)

Item 5: South Elm Street Redevelopment Area

a) Approval of Submittal of Annual Land Use Restrictions Update

Ms. Arkin stated that the Brownfields Agreement with the State of North Carolina Department of Environmental Quality requires an update on the compliance with the land use restrictions to be made each January. No work has been done over the last year that impacts the agreement, so there is nothing that would put them out of compliance. She asked the Commission to authorize submission of this document and authorize Chair McQueary to execute, as appropriate.

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

b) Development Update and Status

Ms. Arkin provided a development status. Milt Rhodes from the Arden Group was not able to make it this evening, but she can answer any questions. They are still working on the requirements for closing and everything is moving forward. They are currently waiting on the the traffic impact study in order to move to a final design that can be approved for the infrastructure and streetscape as well as the final design for the site design and site infrastructure. The marketing plan has been received and has been reviewed. It is acceptable to Arden and will be submitted to the Commission at a later date. They are still on schedule. Chair McQueary asked if there is any indication that they are not going to make the March 1st date. Ms. Arkin said that Tuesday they would have the preliminary information from the consultant and that staff meets with the development team every Tuesday and will be informed if there is anything that will cause a delay. Greensboro DOT is working with them very closely, and they will be the liaison between the development and the redevelopment of this area and NC DOT. At this point they don't have any reason to think that they can't keep moving in that direction. Ms. Chaney asked when the final approval will come to the Commission. Ms. Arkin stated that if there is not anything that has to be negotiated, then the final approval will happen in the next few weeks, but if it shows anything different it will move back a month. As soon as they get the study then they will know what the next steps are and how quickly they can get those accomplished. If they are planning to begin the site preparation and the preparation for the infrastructure in March, then they would need to know within four weeks. Chair McQueary asked if that would be the February meeting. Ms. Chaney asked if they would have an answer in the next meeting. Ms. Arkin said yes, there should be confirmation at the February meeting. Chair McQueary asked if they could have a telephone call if they can't approve it at the next meeting. Ms. Arkin said they

could call a Special Meeting if necessary. They should be able to give them the information if they are going to have to delay much sooner than the February meeting.

Item 6: Staff Updates

- a) Comprehensive Plan Update and Speaker Series – Russ Clegg said that they lined up the next few months of work right before the holidays. Staff is spending this month finalizing their goals. They are trying to raise some of the goals up a bit. They hope they will have a version of that next week. They will be giving a presentation at the Council Retreat. They will be working the following months to put strategies together and talk with focus groups. They are having another Public Hearing on March 20th.
- b) Heritage House Redevelopment Area – Counsel Kelly stated they have a mediation scheduled for tomorrow.
- c) Security Badges for Commissioners – Ms. Arkin reminded everyone to get their badges.
- d) RCG-owned Property Disposition Analysis and Strategy – No update. They have been working on it. There is a lot of things being layered together to come up with a strategy for disposing of the property.
- e) RCG Annual Report – FY2017-18 – No update. Chair McQueary asked when the report was supposed to be finished. Ms. Arkin stated that was supposed to be last October. Chair McQueary said that needs to be a priority.

Item 5: Additional Business

Ms. Arkin stated the Community Center in the East Side Park neighborhood is on land owned by the Commission and leased to East Side Park Community Center, Inc. The lease began in January 2002 and is not up until January 2032. It requires written approval to sublet the property and the Center is considering leasing to a Non-Profit School Organization. Phil Barnhill, a member of the Board of Directors, was present to give the details. It is acceptable within the lease agreement that they allow the use of the property for periodic events and use by the community. They rent out to the community and that is acceptable under the lease. Because this would be part of the day, five days a week they wanted to do a more formal request of the Commission to approve this plan when they are ready to do so.

Phil Barnhill, 1921 New Garden Road, stated that the individual who came to them about using this center was there tonight and he will speak about the program. They are looking at housing on a temporary basis at least. This educational program would run 8 a.m. until 2 p.m. during the school year and possibly some activities during the summer. Currently the Center is used in the afternoons for an after-school program. They are still contemplating what would have to happen if they decided to do that educational program.

Calvin Shorter, 3504 Altman Street, stated that five years ago he started a private high school for at-risk young men. In the five years that they had been up and running it was a high school for students 9th through 12th grade. During that five years the students treated the program like a job. They had to arrive on time, basically it was “three strikes you’re out” type of program. These were young men who had dropped out of school or on the verge of dropping out of school. Mr. Shorter worked for Guilford County Schools for seven years in the SCALE Program. During that time, he met young men who were falling through cracks of the school system. For the next eleven years he gave his life to building this program. The five years they were open they lost so many men who did not want to follow the regulations of the program. They did drug tests because they were sending them out to get jobs. They graduated ten young men. Three young men are in the military right now, six are in college, and one owns his own business. They realized that they had caught a lot of these young men too late. They were set in their ways already. A lot of the men would not conform to the program. They decided to take it back to the 6th grade so that way they could catch them at a younger age.

He spoke with Mr. Barnhill about needing space and this seemed like an ideal location. They are planning on bringing in 8 to 16 6th graders and educate them from 6th grade to the 9th grade. After 9th grade they would start their high school program back up. It would be a three-year gap in between students that they bring in. The reason for the three year gap is so they get to know the students better. They are here today to see what they need to do to get the program back up and running.

Chair McQueary asked how they find these students. Mr. Shorter stated that they had an interview process and there is an application that the student and parent must fill out. Each accepted student will have home visits. They have child psychologist on the Board who will work with the students and the family. When the student comes in the parent comes in also. Each parent will be required to give six hours a month in the school process, so the parent will know what is going on in that child’s life also. This makes it easier to get a better understanding of the family and the situation.

Chair McQueary asked how they got funding. Mr. Shorter stated that they hold a golf tournament, lots of fundraisers, and they use different foundations every year. Councilwomen Hoffman asked if they got any state funding. Mr. Shorter stated that they do not. They get funding from Guilford County Schools and that is the Title 1 funding. That is to help with their tutoring. Most of these kids are so far behind when they come in. 90% of the students they tested 17, 18, and 19-year-old men were testing on a 3rd and 4th grade level. Their job was to bring them up to where they needed to be to pass the Armed Services Vocational Aptitude Battery or a college entrance test. Ms. Chaney asked what the major problem they have was. Mr. Shorter stated that it starts at home and that is one of the reason he put a child psychologist on the Board. Chair McQueary stated that he applauds him for doing this for these young men and dedicating his life to this. Chair McQueary asked what they needed from the Commission. Ms. Arkin stated that the use of the building would not interfere with the operation of the community center and that is what the lease requires, that they continue to operate as a community center, but because

they want to sublet or sublease, the Staff believes that the Commission would need to give written approval. They are asking the Commission to approve the lease between the Community Center and the Organization should they be able to meet all the City requirements for a school. They have a lot of requirements that they need to meet, but they would like the assurance that if they meet all the other requirements besides the Redevelopment Commission, that the Redevelopment Commission says that this would be acceptable that they move forward with this under the lease. Counsel Kelly asked if they have proposed a sublease. Mr. Barnhill stated that they have not formally approved the potential use as a Board, and they have not drawn up an actual agreement. Ms. Chaney said that they should approve the concept of the sublease and then when the sublease is designed, it is contingent on the approval of the sublease

Ms. Chaney moved the approval of the concept, contingent on approval of the sublease by the Commission at a later date, seconded by Mr. Gravely. The Commission voted 3-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: McQueary, Chaney and Gravely. Nays: None.)

ADJOURNMENT

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

Respectfully submitted,

Sue Schwartz
Planning Director
SS: jd/pr

**APPROVED MEETING OF THE
REDEVELOPMENT COMMISSION
OF GREENSBORO
February 6th, 2019**

The Regular meeting of the Redevelopment Commission of Greensboro (RCG) was held on Wednesday, February 6th, 2019, in the Plaza Level Conference Room of the Melvin Municipal Office Building commencing at 5:00 p.m. The following members were present: Chair, Charles McQueary Clinton Gravely, Dawn Chaney, Wayne Durham, and Robert Enochs. Staff present included Dyan Arkin, and Russ Clegg. Also present were Andrew Kelly, Attorney for the Commission, and Councilwoman Sharon Hightower.

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

Introduction of New Alternate Commissioner

- a) Wayne Durham was appointed by Councilwoman Abuzuaiter on January 15th, 2019 as an alternate to the Redevelopment Commission.**

Chair McQueary introduced Wayne Durham and welcomed him to the Commission. Mr. Durham stated that he is on the Advisory Board for PlanIt Greensboro. He has been on the Insurance Board and he went through the Greensboro Citizen Police Academy and the City Academy. He graduated from Elon College and he grew up in Greensboro. He has spent the last 32 years in pharmaceuticals. He started off as a rep and then various management positions for 26 years out of Atlanta. He moved back here four years ago and decided to retire to here.

Chair McQueary mentioned that Bennett College had been trying to raise \$5 million dollars. It was a wonderful experience to watch this community and others step up and help that school in a time when it was really needed. They raised \$8.2 million dollars. This community should be proud. He watched the City Council meeting and he wished that Councilwoman Hoffman was there, as she made a presentation of a new sculpture that was done by Jim Gallucci and if Commission members haven't seen it yet he encouraged them to see it. It is on display in the Council Chambers. That sculpture is symbolic of the things she has done in this community.

South Elm Redevelopment Area:

- a) Development Update and Status**

Dyan Arkin asked the Commission if it would be okay to move this item up to number two on the agenda. The commission agreed.

Ms. Arkin stated that they have good news from the traffic study. They do not have the final report yet, but they have gotten what they need from the study and are moving toward finalizing the design of the infrastructure and the site preparation work. They are moving toward closing and are working on all fronts and getting a lot accomplished. She stated the impact from the losing some time on the front end of the project was not putting the project in danger of missing the deadline for completion. Mr. Gravely asked what kind of time they were talking about. Ms. Arkin stated they should be moving toward closing in the next couple of weeks. Everything is moving forward as fast as it can.

Milt Rhodes of the Arden Group stated that one of the key questions has been what the traffic study would tell them about where the driveway entrances go. With the report in and it being supportive of the initial proposal, they can now move forward with engineering. It lets them move farther along on the other pieces of the puzzle that must be done before closing. He is still moving toward moving dirt this spring. He wants to have construction in progress for the Folk Festival and he doesn't think they will be far off from that.

Chair McQueary welcomed Councilwoman Hightower to the meeting.

ELECTION OF OFFICERS for 2019:

Ms. Arkin stated that the Election of the Officers was postponed from the January meeting. Mr. Gravely suggested the current Officers remain and Chair McQueary stated he accepted.

Mr. Gravely moved the Officers be left as they currently are, seconded by Ms. Chaney. The Commission voted 5-0 in favor of the request. (Ayes: McQueary, Chaney, Durham, Enochs, and Gravely. Nays: None)

Ms. Arkin asked that the Commissioner also consider adding Russ Clegg as Assistant Secretary, but this will be brought up at a future meeting.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

a) Draft Minutes of the January 9th, 2019 Regular Meeting Minutes

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

2019 CITY of GREENSBORO AUDIT ENGAGEMENT LETTER:

Ms. Arkin stated that the annual City of Greensboro Audit Engagement Letter needs to be signed by the Commission as a Discretely Presented Component Unit of the City, to allow the City to contract with the auditing company.

Mr. Enochs moved to authorize Chair McQueary to sign the Engagement letter, seconded by Mr. Gravely. The Commission voted 5-0 in favor (Ayes: McQueary, Gravely, Enochs, Chaney, and Durham Nays: None).

STAFF UPDATES:

Ms. Arkin stated that items "b" through "f" have no updates at this time. She will be sending them some information on a couple of the redevelopment areas and some things that are going on in preparation for the next meeting.

- a) Heritage House Redevelopment**
- b) Eastside Park Community Center**
- c) Security Badges for Commissioners**
- d) Comprehensive Plan Update and Speaker Series**

- e) RCG-Owned Property Disposition Analysis and Strategy
- f) RCG Annual Report – FY2017-18
- g) Ole Asheboro Project Update

Ms. Arkin stated that the Ole Asheboro Prestwick sales/development agreement was approved by the City Council, and Prestwick submitted the LIHTC pre-application on time. They will be notified of final site scores March 22. If they score high enough then they will be invited to put in a full application in May. Tax credit awards are released in August. She will keep the Commission updated at each meeting. Chair McQueary asked if they had any indication as to how the evaluation was going. Ms. Arkin stated that it is confidential as far as she knows. Counsel Kelly stated that Chair McQueary asked at the last meeting that they be kept updated to make sure that whatever the City or Redevelopment Commission needed to do was being done. Part of that was subdividing the larger parcel that includes Nettie Coad Apartments, and that plat came through his office earlier today and will be recorded within a week.

h) 741 South Elm Street Update

Counsel Kelly stated that many months ago in October or November they met to discuss the encroachment on the property owned by Grays at the Greenway. They have reached an agreement with them. It is \$500.00 a month beginning March 2016 and it increases to \$750.00 a month beginning November 2017. It allows what is there to stay until the work is done to remove it. Mr. Gravely asked about the status of the work to be done. Counsel Kelly stated the design was underway. Chair McQueary asked if it was an amicable settlement and Counsel Kelly stated that it was.

Counsel Kelly asked to go into Closed Session to discuss the Heritage House Redevelopment area.

Mr. Gravely moved that the Commission go into closed session to (1) preserve the attorney-client privilege between its attorneys and the Commission to consult with its attorneys concerning the pending litigation of Guilford County Superior Court Case Number 17 CVS 4458 (the heritage house case) and to give instructions in the handling or settlement of a claim pursuant to N.C.G.S. 143-318.11 (a)(3), seconded by Ms. Chaney. The Commission voted 5-0 in favor of (Ayes: McQueary, Gravely, Enochs, Chaney, and Durham. Nays: None).

The Commission went into closed session at 5:15 p.m. The Commission returned into open session at 6:11 p.m.

ADDITIONAL BUSINESS:

None

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business before the Commission, the meeting was adjourned at 6:11p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Sue Schwartz
Planning Director
SS: pr/jd

**SPECIAL MEETING OF THE
REDEVELOPMENT COMMISSION OF GREENSBORO
APPROVED MARCH 6, 2019 MINUTES**

The special meeting of the Redevelopment Commission of Greensboro (RGG) was held on Wednesday March 6, 2019 in the Plaza Level Conference Room of the Melvin Municipal Office Building, 300 West Washington Street. The following members were present Chair Charles McQueary, Wayne Durham, Dawn Chaney, and Clinton Gravely. Staff present was José Colón. Also present was Andrew Kelly, Counsel for the Commission, City Legal Department, and Councilwoman Nancy Hoffmann, City Council Liaison.

Chair McQueary called the meeting to order at 3 pm and welcomed everyone to the meeting. He advised that Dyan Arkin is out of the country and some items will be postponed until she is back.

Item 1: Approval of Meeting Minutes

Ms. Chaney made a motion to accept the February 6, 2019 meeting minutes as presented, seconded by Mr. Durham. The Commission voted 4-0 to approve. (Ayes: McQueary, Durham, Chaney, Gravely; Nays: none).

Item 2: Willow Oaks Redevelopment Area

a) Presentation on Mobile Food Market

José Colón presented an overview of the Willow Oaks Redevelopment Plan and a proposal for a Mobile Market to the Commission. He stressed to the Commission that they are not expected to take action on the proposal today, that it is strictly informative of what is in the works at this point but they welcome questions and concerns about this idea.

Mr. Colón explained the Willow Oaks Redevelopment Plan was adopted by City Council in September, 2017. One of the priority areas is Area 1, which is the core of the Willow Oaks community. Area 1, Zone C, along McConnell Road, is one of the major focus areas as it is the largest contiguous area within that community that is currently undeveloped. An illustration of what it could be as it develops was shown. Zone C includes attached single-family housing, senior housing, and the C2 Opportunity Site includes an open-air market building and a small park. The market building would be flex-based for uses such as food trucks, markets, and craft booths as shown on page 34 of the plan. Mr. Colón stated staff feels the Mobile Market proposal is a great segue to what they are trying to accomplish in the next coming months.

Mr. Colon explained that the Greensboro Housing coalition and Collaborative Cottage Grove are interested in bringing the Cottage Grove Mobile Marketplace to vacant RCG-owned lots located at 1901 McConnell Road, and 805 and 807 Willow Hope Street. He showed a video of the mobile market and explained that it would be great for the community as it will activate a currently under-used site and aligns with the long term redevelopment plans for this area. It will provide an amenity to Willow Oaks residents by providing access to healthy foods and healthy programs as well as entrepreneurial opportunities. The next step is continuing communication with Willow Oaks residents to inform them of this opportunity. A finalized use agreement will be presented to the Commission at the April meeting.

Ms. Josie Williams, 2685 Lamplight Circle, High Point, is the project manager with the Greensboro Housing Coalition (GHC) for the Collaborative Cottage Grove initiative. They are in the third season of

the market, which has been very successful. Currently it is in the parking lot of the Mustard Seed Community Health Clinic, adjacent to New Hope Baptist Church on South English Street. The New Hope Community Development Group is a partner along with Mustard Seed Community Health.

Collaborative Cottage Grove is a partnership of approximately ten organizations formed in 2015. Ms. Williams was hired by GHC in 2016 to align more partners and expand the partnership. They address social determinants of health, including housing issues, environmental issues, and food access and insecurities.

The Collaborative provides tables and chairs, vendors bring their products, and Collaborative sets the market up. Since the first year, it has grown from two vendors to six vendors. Products have to be homemade or handmade.

To increase healthy food access, they are partners with Cone Health, Guilford County Department of Health, and Guilford College.

Ms. Williams indicated the market has increased community engagement. Even if people are not coming to buy, they are coming to just hang out in fellowship. To continue to spread the success and build the engagement with individuals who live in Willow Oaks, Eastside Park, and Dudley Heights, Ms. Michelle Lucas, President of the Willow Oaks Neighborhood Association, asked Collaborative Cottage Grove if they could partner as well. Ms. Williams feels this is an opportunity to build trust between residents and the City and would like to have the market at Willow Oaks to create something tangible that people can see, feel, and touch regarding the redevelopment plans.

The market is seasonal, starting in March through October. They hope to move the market in early April, contingent on the approval of the Commission.

Ms. Hoffmann asked if Guilford College provided fresh produce as well. Ms. Williams stated yes, the produce comes directly from their farm and other local farmers. Cooperative Extension has food as well. This is bridging gaps between community neighborhoods and organizations.

Chair McQueary stated Ms. Williams made a very promising presentation and asked if the people who live in the area were happy with the idea of relocating the market to Willow Oaks. Ms. Williams stated they always work with resident leadership and have sent out surveys to do an assessment of readiness. From engaging with community leaders and the survey, it seems people will love having it there.

This year the market will be on Fridays from 4 pm to 6 pm, so parents and children will something to do in the evening as a family. Other days and times did not work as parents were involved with homework and eating with their children. They close at 6 pm for safety reasons. Mr. Durham asked about Saturday mornings, and Mr. Williams responded that the survey responses identified Friday as the best day. Also Cone Health has a mobile market on Saturdays and is one of their partners, so they did not want to compete with them.

Chair McQueary asked if it was planned to be one day per week, and Ms. Williams responded that yes, it would be every week rain or shine. The only time it would not be held is if it was treacherous weather. They can handle rain and have purchased a larger tent in anticipation of more traffic after the move. Chair McQueary asked if the tent is left up all the time. Ms. Williams explained that they set up about an hour before and usually break it down by 6:15 pm or 6:30 pm. The Mobile Oasis truck brings their own tables and things and the Collaborative provides the vendors' tables, setting them up and breaking them down for them.

Chair McQueary asked if the Collaborative sets the conditions whereby others can bring things to sell, and Ms. Williams confirmed that was correct. The vendors go through an orientation so they

understand what they can and cannot sell and understand they are on property not owned by them. The Collaborative does not allow anyone to come in to sell anything unless it is homemade or handmade as the market is authentic and organic and is about creating a sense of ownership within a community and bridging communication gaps between the neighborhoods as the residents are interacting and engaging. She encouraged the Commissioners to come and see it for themselves.

Mr. Durham asked if there was any downside. Ms. Williams said the downside is that it's a lot of work and lot of marketing. Engagement is very labor intensive and, even when the market is not in progress, continues. Relationships have to be cultivated and kept going to make it successful. Currently they are surveying, marketing, assessments are being done, and they are talking with people to obtain a buy-in, all of which is very labor intensive, but the fruit of it is very much worth it.

Chair McQueary asked if the market was open to anyone and Ms. Williams replied it was. They hope to see more people try to model after it. The Collaborative partners with Kitchen Connects GSO to provide Safe Plates certification classes and sponsors individuals who can't pay for the class, especially for food vendors.

Chair McQueary thanked Ms. Williams for her work and her enthusiasm for the program. Chair McQueary asked everyone if they have a clear understanding of what the Redevelopment Commission needs to do in order to be supportive. Mr. Colón advised this is just an introduction and hopefully the Commission would receive a finalized use agreement at the next meeting. Chair McQueary inquired if there were any problems. Mr. Colón advised they will address the marketing issues and concerns at the next meeting. Chair McQueary inquired about refuse removal and things of that type. Mr. Colón advised that will all be incorporated in the proposed use agreement.

Item 3: Downtown Redevelopment Area

a) Request for Certificate of Completion of Improvements

Chair McQueary explained this is a request for Certificate of Completion of Improvements going back to 1975. Counsel Kelly advised that in 1975 the Commission conveyed land for what is now the Greensboro News and Record site. The deed restrictions state that if the buyer didn't build what they said they were going to build, the property would revert back to the Commission. The property is under contract to be sold at this time, and during due diligence it was discovered that no Certificate of Completion of Improvements had been recorded. They reached out to Ms. Arkin to ask the Commission to consider issuing the Certificate of Completion of Improvements. Counsel Kelly has drafted this for the Commission's consideration. Counsel Kelly stated they have the original plats which show these were a vacant lot and there is a current survey where the site has been developed and been in use for over 30 years. Staff feels comfortable in supporting this request. Counsel Kelly is requesting the Chairman sign it, after which it will be recorded and the buyer can proceed to closing.

Chair McQueary inquired if there any questions or comments, and there were none.

Mr. Gravely made a motion that the Commissioners allow Chairman McQueary to sign the Certificate of Completion of Improvements, seconded by Mr. Durham. Commission voted 4-0 to approve. (Ayes: McQueary, Durham, Chaney, Gravely; Nays: none).

Item 4: Distribution of the Annual Report

Chair McQueary inquired if the Commissioners were all comfortable with it as presented. They can vote on moving to have it distributed to the City Council or if there are questions will have to be delayed to

the next meeting due to Ms. Arkin's absence. He stated was very pleased to see the incorporation of the work that's been done and how the parcels of lands are being used in an effective way on behalf of the City. To see a plan germinate and put together on how to complete it, is very positive. Chair McQueary suggested, if there are no questions or motions, that someone recommend the Commission approve it so it be forwarded to City Council. Mr. Colón advised Ms. Arkin had stated it could be approved at this meeting, but if there were questions or concerns it could be postponed until next month.

Mr. Durham made a motion to accept the annual report as presented, seconded by Ms. Chaney. The Commission voted 4-0 to approve. (Ayes: McQueary, Durham, Chaney, Gravely; Nays: none).

Item 5: Staff Updates

Heritage House: Counsel Kelly provided an update on the Heritage House case with respect to Defendant Vivian whose case was prepared to go to trial back in October. A settlement was reached and he has received signed consent judgment from Defendant Vivian's counsel. He requested that the Commission approve the settlement and authorize chair to sign.

South Elm Street: Mr. Colón presented an update on the South Elm Street redevelopment area. Milt Rhodes could not attend the meeting to provide an update but Ms. Arkin has shared that they're ready to submit a pre-conveyance package in April.

Comprehensive Plan: Mr. Russ Clegg provided a Comprehensive Plan update. He reminded the Commissioners that Carolyn Dwyer is speaking this evening at the History Museum on the connection between planning the built environment and community health. Some events coming up are the 2040 Fair on March 20 in the Nussbaum Room at the public library from noon to 6:30. There will be a big media blast to let people know. Interactive ways to get people involved in addition to comment cards are planned. On April 18, the continuation of the speaker series will bring Kristen Jeffers back to Greensboro. She is a Greensboro native, who has a multi-media platform called the Black Urbanist and can be seen on YouTube. She talks about a wide range of planning issues, including design, urban planning, and transportation and is passionate about Greensboro. She will be doing a Lunch and Learn and an evening talk will be held at the Event Center at Barber Park.

Chair McQueary asked if the City was getting what they had hoped to get from these various sessions. Mr. Clegg believes so. Weather has affected attendance at some of the pop-up events, but usually they have engaging conversations and talks. They are also doing short on-line surveys. The bike and pedestrian issue had about 400 respondents, which is a good number. Currently there is one on transit, and there will be several more coming up. They are trying to add a couple of events in east Greensboro and on the college campuses this spring. It's an ongoing process and moving in the right direction.

Chair McQueary inquired if they were getting a good turnout for the speaker series, and Mr. Clegg replied they have been.

Item 6: Additional Business

Mr. Colón announced there was no additional business.

Chair McQueary thanked Councilwoman Hightower for attending the meeting and requested she tell the Commission who she is recommending to become a member of the Commission. Councilwoman Hightower stated Sondra Wright had been appointed the previous night. Ms. Wright brings real estate and developer experience. Chair McQueary advised Councilwoman Hightower to let Ms. Wright know,

if she wishes to call him and talk about being a member, he would be happy to talk with her. It was advised that Ms. Wright will be at the next meeting.

Adjournment

There being no further business before the Commission, the meeting was adjourned at 3:44 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Sue Schwartz, FAICP

Planning Director

SS: cs

APPROVED MINUTES
REGULAR MEETING OF THE REDEVELOPMENT COMMISSION

April 3, 2019

The regular meeting of the Redevelopment Commission of Greensboro (RGG) was held on Wednesday April 3, 2019 in the Plaza level conference room of the Melvin Municipal Office Building, 300 West Washington Street. The following members were present, Chair Charles McQueary, Wayne Durham, Dawn Chaney, Clinton Gravely, Patrick Johnson, Sondra Wright, and Councilwoman Nancy Hoffmann (City Council). Staff present was Dyan Arkin, José Colón, Russ Clegg, and Andrew Kelly, Counsel for the Commission, City Legal Department. Chair McQueary called the meeting to order at 5:00 pm and welcomed everyone to the meeting and welcomed Dyan Arkin back from her trip.

1. Introduction of New Commissioners

Chair McQueary introduced two new members to the Commission: Sondra Wright, just recently appointed by Councilwoman Hightower and Patrick Johnson, appointed by Justin Outling to replace Robert Enochs. Chair McQueary stated he was very pleased to have them on board. Chair McQueary also introduced Wayne Durham, who was appointed by Councilwoman Abuzuaiter as an alternate. Mr. Durham has shown a great interest in what the Commission does, showing up even when he is an alternate, which the Committee appreciates. He added his appreciation to Councilwoman Hoffmann for her engagement and representation with the Board.

Chair McQueary asked the new members to introduce themselves and talk about their involvement in Greensboro, so everyone can know them a little bit better. Chair McQueary asked Ms. Wright if she knew Dawn Chaney. Ms. Wright thought it was her first time meeting Ms. Chaney. Ms. Wright introduced herself as a North Carolina native, born in Chapel Hill, raised in Durham, and has been in Greensboro since 1981. She has owned a commercial landscaping company with her husband for the past 22 years and is a licensed real estate agent.

Patrick Johnson introduced himself as a local commercial real estate attorney, who came to Greensboro in 2008 to attend Elon Law School. When he got out of school, he practiced in Greensboro and moved for a while to Winston-Salem and then moved back to Greensboro two years ago. He is happy to be here and considers it an honor to sit on the Commission.

Wayne Durham introduced himself. He was born and raised in Greensboro and went to Elon College. He was a paramedic for Guilford County EMS for five years, then worked for a pharmaceutical company for 32 years, 26 of which were in management in Atlanta, Georgia. When he and his wife retired, they moved back to Greensboro. Since they have moved back, he has assumed several different roles within the City and served on different boards outside the city as well. Chair McQueary thanked everyone and asked if there were any questions. No questions. The meeting was turned over to Ms. Arkin.

2. Approval of Meeting Minutes (Approved)

a) Minutes of the March 6, 2019 Regular Meeting. Ms. Arkin noted on this agenda she had neglected to change the word 'Special' at the top of the agenda to the word 'Regular' as this was not a special meeting. Chair McQueary asked if there was a motion to accept the minutes. Mr. Patrick Johnson advised he was going to abstain from voting as he was not present.

Mr. Gravely moved to have the minutes approved, seconded by Ms. Chaney. The board voted 5-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Chair McQueary, Mr. Gravely, Ms. Cheney, Mr. Durham, and Ms. Wright. Nays: 0.)

3. Willow Oaks Redevelopment Area (Approved)

a) Consideration of Use Agreement for Mobile Food Market. Ms. Arkin advised that, regarding the Willow Oaks Redevelopment area, the Commission has been informed about the interest of local non-profits, the Greensboro Housing Coalition and Collaborative Cottage Grove in moving their established mobile food market to a location in the heart of the Willow Oaks community on property owned by the Redevelopment Commission. Ms.

Arkin turned the update over to José Colón to present and advised that Ms. Josie Williams is present also to speak and answer any questions.

Mr. Colón introduced himself to the new members and stated he is a senior planner and is also the Redevelopment Planner for the Willow Oaks area. Mr. Colón inquired whether everyone had received the updated Use Agreement this morning. Everyone indicated they had. Mr. Colón stated that in the minutes there was a summary of a presentation that they did last month. Mr. Colón inquired whether the Commission wanted him to go over the project. If not, they can jump straight to the agreement. It was agreed to go ahead to the agreement.

Mr. Colón provided hard copies of the Use Agreement to those interested in having them. The terms allow for the use of properties on Friday afternoons from 2:00-8:00 pm. The event will be held from 4:00-6:00 pm. Two hours before and after provide ample time for setup and take-down associated with the activities of the event. The use of the property includes conditions and restrictions that the Greensboro Housing Coalition must agree to, such as no alcoholic beverages and requiring pickup of litter and waste after every event occurrence.

Signage must be approved by the Redevelopment Commission and must meet applicable laws and ordinances. Chair McQueary inquired if there was recourse if someone doesn't clean up. Mr. Colón stated they would be notified. Mr. Colón advised parking of vehicles is not allowed on the properties, except the vehicle providing the produce and one additional food truck. Attendees and volunteers must park in available on-street parking near the site. There will be no storage, discharge, or disposal of hazardous substances on the site.

Section 6 prohibits assigning this agreement or subletting the property to another party without prior consent of the Commission. Section 7 ensures the Commission is not responsible for any damage to the Coalition's personal property or injury to any parties related to the Coalition.

Mr. Colón advised that the Commissioners may have noticed changes between the document sent with the agenda packet and the one distributed today, but most of the relevant changes are in Section 8, which is the liability and indemnity clause. In this section Greensboro Housing Coalition is required to maintain a general liability insurance of at least one million dollars for the duration of the term of this agreement and to name the Redevelopment Commission as an additional insured party on the policy. Mr. Colón added the insurance company must be A-rated and acceptable to the Redevelopment Commission. A Certificate of Insurance stating that the Redevelopment Commission has been added as an additional insurer must be provided to the Commission.

Chair McQueary inquired how much does the organization have to pay for a million-dollar insurance policy and how does that affect their finances. Counsel Kelly advised that is the standard with respect to what minimum amount of insurance will be acceptable. The insurance advisor who counsels the City stated it was his opinion that would be appropriate at least for a starting point. Counsel Kelly believed, if it is too much of a burden, the Housing Coalition could come back with the insurance that they do have to see if it would be acceptable. At that point the insurance advisor can determine if it is acceptable. If they're a non-profit, doing business in the City of Greensboro, they should have some level of liability insurance. Chair McQueary inquired if that was something both Mr. Kelly and Mr. Colón would examine and advise the Commission on. Mr. Kelly stated that was correct and that he takes whatever advice he is given on those matters. Ms. Wright inquired whether, if they currently have a certificate of insurance on file with the City for some other purpose, this would require an additional certificate of insurance. Mr. Kelly replied it is not likely they have one on file that is going to name the Redevelopment Commission but if they did, it would satisfy. Ms. Wright asked if they have one that doesn't name the Redevelopment Commission, can they just get the rider. Mr. Kelly replied they can use the same policy and have the Redevelopment Commission named as an additional insurer.

Mr. Colón stated Section 9 establishes the right to terminate the agreement for both the Commission and the Coalition. The remaining sections are condemnation notices, applicable laws, and heading and interpretations which are relatively standard and self-explanatory. Staff is asking the Commission to consider approval of the Use Agreement contingent on the Coalition satisfying the liability requirements in Section 8. The agreement will not be executed prior to legal staff ensuring the terms and conditions are met.

Chair McQueary asked if there were any questions for Mr. Colón or Mr. Kelly. Mr. Johnson inquired about Section 9, the right to terminate upon 30-day notice, whether there was any consideration of foregoing the 30-day

notice if insurance isn't upheld during the term. If they have no insurance, are the rights automatically terminated without having a 30-day notice and creating a gap in the essential coverage? Mr. Kelly stated he would defer to the insurance representatives on that issue but generally the way it is written in, once the Commission is named as an additional insured the insurance company would apprise staff and the Commission by mail saying they they're not paying or whatever the issue is. At the same time, most policies are for the duration of a specific term and not something that is going beyond year to year. If there is an issue where it is cancelled, staff is immediately notified. He does not foresee that being an issue based on how they're going to purchase it, but it is something he would consider based on what they're submitting. Most commercial policies are already paying for six months or at least quarterly. It will be spread out, so once it's not paid, staff will get notice of it being cancelled. A question was asked if the general policy applies to any site in the city. Mr. Kelly responded yes, but it only covers the named additional insurer. If it is on Redevelopment Commission property, then their insurance will cover that and their activity. Mr. Gravely inquired if anyone else comes on the site or might be liable, would it take care of that too. Mr. Kelly responded the indemnity provision is quite broad; it includes everybody they're asking to come as well.

Chair McQueary inquired if there were any further questions or comments. As there was nothing further, he asked if there was a motion to approve the Use Agreement. Mr. Gravely made a motion to have the Use Agreement approved, seconded by Mr. Johnson. Chair McQueary inquired if there were any further questions or comments. Hearing none, the board voted 5-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Chair McQueary, Mr. Gravely, Ms. Cheney, Ms. Wright, and Mr. Johnson. Nays: 0.) The agreement was approved.

Chair McQueary congratulated Mr. Colón and everyone involved. He feels it a wonderful use of the property, and it's nice to see the community coming forward to participate. He stated José did a great job in helping to facilitate and thanked him and Ms. Josie Williams for their participation.

4. South Elm Street Redevelopment Area

a) Conveyance of Property to Greenline Holdings, LLC. Ms. Arkin advised that work is continuing toward closing and conveyance of the property to Greenline Holdings for the development of a mixed-use building and for-sale and for-rent housing. Most of the Commissioners are very familiar with this project, so she has begun to bring the new Commissioners up to date and did not go over the full history of the project.

At the August 2018 meeting of the Commission, the Commissioners voted to approve a Sales Development Agreement for the sale of the parcels listed in the staff memo to Greenline Holdings, LLC for a development of single-family and multi-family residential units with first floor commercial/retail space along West Gate City Boulevard under the terms and conditions included in the Sales Development Agreement. City Council, at their August 21, 2018 meeting, approved the sale of the parcels to Greenline.

The next step in the process has been completing those terms and conditions within the Sales Development Agreement that need to be met prior to the closing and conveyance. There has been a lot of progress made. It is moving forward on every front, and they wanted to come before the Commission today and share the the pieces of the Sales Development Agreement that have been finalized to date.

Within the packet is the final site plan, final development program, phasing schedule, and marketing plan. Summaries have been provided and there is a lot of background material that goes along with it, but Ms. Arkin felt the summary is the basis for the Commission understanding that these things have been accomplished.

The release of the property from the HUD Section 108 Loan Guarantee collateral pool is completed. The Master Plan has been updated by the Master Developer and the assignment of the option to purchase the land under the Master Development Agreement has been completed and agreed to by all the relevant parties.

Ms. Arkin advised there are still some things to be done. They are completing the revision of the Declaration of Conditions, Covenants, and Restrictions. The drawings and specifications setting forth the details related to the exterior facades and the interior layouts have been reviewed by, staff and are being refined. Final drawings and specifications will be approved as part of the building permit process. She will bring the documents to the Commission as part of a complete package.

Ms. Arkin stated the developer is still working through the evidence of financial ability to complete the improvements and will speak to this in a moment. Staff has documentation as to projected costs, but the final

construction budget cannot be done until completion of the construction drawings for those buildings. The proposed development budget has sources and uses and includes execution of one or more agreements with the city regarding funding and construction for site preparation, streetscape, and infrastructure improvements for the property. Ms. Arkin and the developer provided these documents to show the Commission that work is progressing and a lot of things have been accomplished. She advised it will all come before the Commission as one complete package. Unless there are specific questions, she was not going into more detail about each of the items.

Ms. Arkin stated staff is working with the developer to provide verification of the City's commitment to certain subsidies and certain funding that the developer can use to finalize negotiations with their lender. Ms. Arkin stated that was where they are in a nutshell. The developer and the Master Developer are here to speak more to process, the next steps, or any questions that the Commission would like to ask.

Mr. Gravely inquired about monitoring minority participation. Ms. Arkin replied the contracts for the work that will be done, the construction work and other work associated with the development of the project, will all be monitored for minority and women business enterprise participation. The Master Developer, in the Master Development Agreement, made a commitment to a 20 percent overall inclusion or participation rate for the whole project. The Commission will be provided updates of what the individual component developer is achieving, or hopes to achieve, as well as participation in the overall project. This will include this project and the Union Square Campus project together, which the Master Developer, aggregates to calculate the 20 percent goal they are trying to achieve.

Chair McQueary followed up on Commissioner Gravely's point and suggested staff cover this subject every time there is a discussion about this project. Ms. Arkin asked if he meant MWBE. Chair McQueary stated yes, how they are doing in fulfilling the commitment on that. Ms. Arkin replied absolutely. Ms. Arkin inquired if the Commissions would like to have the component developer or the master developer speak about any of what has been presented of if there were questions for them?

Mr. Gravely asked whether everything was on schedule. Milt Rhodes, on behalf of Greenline Holdings, replied the schedule was supposed to have concluded in December, so no, but they continue to work through each of the stops and it is evolving. It is doable and will close and they are very proud of it. Ms. Arkin stated there is no action being requested at this meeting with the Commission.

The representative from the Master Developer, Bob Chapman of Durham, North Carolina, stated it was a pleasure working with everyone. He introduced Marcus Jackson and advised they are meeting with a developer who is interested on developing the other side of the street and the other side of the tracks where there is Redevelopment property, and they will keep the Commission posted. Chair McQueary inquired as to when they expect to be able to provide more information. Mr. Chapman stated Mr. Jackson would need to speak to that but the interested developer is bringing a team to visit Greensboro. They are from Atlanta and seem very interested.

Marcus Jackson, Raleigh, North Carolina, with Avison Young, stated the interested development team has a lender that is already attached to them that has underwritten the rents. Mr. Jackson stated he was surprised when they said they were okay with the rents because the rents in downtown Greensboro are substantially lower than Raleigh and Durham right now. The typical rule of thumb is you need \$1.65 - \$1.75 a foot to make new construction work when there is a parking deck involved. Greensboro rents run \$1.30 - \$1.40, but he is hopeful Mr. Carroll will achieve \$1.50 with the Bella Meade project. Mr. Chapman explained they have received pre-approval for HUD's 221(D)(4) mortgage program, which spreads the amortization over 40 years, so the debt service is much lower and the threshold for rents is lower.

Mr. Gravely and Chair McQueary inquired about the land between the railroad and Eugene Street. Mr. Chapman explained the Commission had given permission for that property to be included in the packages they've sent out for the last couple of years. Mr. Jackson stated the Commission controls five acres and the Housing Authority controls an additional two that would be of interest. Ms. Arkin stated the land being referenced is on the west side of the railroad tracks. It spans the Greenway and is owned by the Redevelopment Commission. Much of it was a city right of way for a street that never got built, and it went from the Commission to the City, then back to the Commission. The property Chair McQueary referred to is on the corner of South Eugene Street and West Gate City Boulevard. It is owned by the Greensboro Housing Authority and was used as their maintenance building for

many years, and Ms. Arkin believes it has been vacant for 12 years or more. She stated it would be an amazing piece of property to round out the parcel there, but they don't have control over it. Through the years, staff has spoken with the Housing Authority about what they want to do with it and how the Commission could partner with them. At this point it is just a vacant maintenance building, and the Commission owns the property to the south of it, which is a very desirable parcel as it has access to the Greenway from both sides and frontage on Eugene Street.

Chair McQueary inquired if that was the largest tract of land that the Redevelopment Commission has. Ms. Arkin stated it is the largest contiguous tract of land. There are some environmental issues, a portion was used as a coal gasification plant and there is some residual coal dust and some heavy metals on a portion of the land. Staff is in the process of applying for a Brownfields Agreement with the North Carolina Department of Environmental Quality (NCDEQ) for that piece of property, which will allow for some of the liability to be removed from a future developer. Ms. Wright inquired when that will be completed. Ms. Arkin stated the application is maybe three months being fully accepted as they are going back and forth answering questions. If NCDEQ accepts the application, staff will work to put together an agreement with them. It's a partnership in every sense of the term, and City staff works very closely with Brownfields Program staff to come up with a set of land use restrictions and an environmental management plan that defines how people working on the property and ultimately developing and living or working on the property are kept safe. The South Elm project itself is a Brownfields area and is subject to a Brownfields Agreement. Ms. Arkin stated the Commission will not see this one for maybe up to a year. Once the application goes through, the real work begins and there will be more environmental testing and negotiations with NCDEQ.

Chair McQueary inquired if the Commission has the financial responsibility for remediation, if there's remediation to be done. Ms. Arkin replied it can go one of two ways. Either the Commission can do the Brownfields Agreement, then procure a developer and allow the developer to do the remediation up to whatever they determine is best to develop there, or the City can go ahead and do remediation up to an anticipated level necessary for a proposed development. With the South Elm project, they had a pretty good idea of what was going to end up being developed there as they had a full redevelopment plan. They went ahead and did the remediation and the City spent about 1.1 million on remediation of the property and then marketed it as property that had already been remediated up to that level with a Brownfields agreement. She is not positive but feels they would follow the same methodology as it seems to be easier to market a property once at least a portion of the remediation has been done.

Ms. Arkin stated that the Planning Department has also applied for another EPA Assessment Grant. They have received approximately \$600,000 from two or three different grants over the years for assessment of environmentally challenged properties and have submitted an application and should hear possibly by the end of May whether they have been awarded another \$300,000 grant for doing more assessments on this and other properties.

Mr. Gravely inquired if the old Saint James property was included in the parcel along Eugene Street. Ms. Arkin replied it is and explained the old Saint James property was several strings of apartment buildings that were affordable units, but not public housing units. The apartments were there for many years and were demolished when the City negotiated the acquisition of that property. Ms. Arkin advised that St. James property itself is not considered to be environmentally compromised, but the property that abuts it is, so there needs to be testing on that property as well.

Chair McQueary inquired if there were any other questions or comments. There were none. Chair McQueary inquired if there were any questions concerning the redevelopment of South Elm Street before moving on. There were none. Chair McQueary stated they expect to hear a lot of good things at the meeting in May.

Ms. Arkin moved on to staff updates and deferred to Counsel Kelly to provide an update on Heritage House.

5. Staff Updates

Heritage House: Counsel Kelly stated demolition of the Heritage House building will be going to the Minimum Housing Commission possibly on their May agenda.

Comprehensive Plan: Russ Clegg stated staff is continuing to move along in the process to update the Comprehensive Plan. A public meeting was held on March 20 at the Central Library, and there were

approximately 80 people in attendance. There was an Advisory Committee meeting in which they went over some good material regarding new language they are trying to insert. There are shorter surveys once a week now with good response numbers and information. Staff hopes to have strategies developed soon and will take those to the public in May and June to ensure they are moving in the right direction.

Speaker Series: Flyers for speaking events with Kristen Jeffers have been distributed. She is a Greensboro native, who will be speaking on April 18 at a lunch-and-learn and in the evening event. She will also talk to young professionals April 17 and then at an event at UNCG that evening.

Ms. Arkin sent flyers for the Kristen Jeffers lunch-and-learn to the Commissioners. The Planning Department will sponsor registrations for Commission and Board members. Ms. Arkin advised the contact information has been provided in the email on how to register but if they prefer, they can contact her and she will take care of it.

Chair McQueary inquired of Mr. Clegg how many *PLAMIT* GSO meetings have there been so far. Mr. Clegg replied they had one large event in the spring and had six smaller ones in the fall. They have been to a lot of pop-ups, probably 15 or more and have two more scheduled. They have been to other groups to do presentations. Mr. Clegg stated the survey responses have increased and have approximately 400 survey results

Mr. Clegg stated they are using Facebook and doing more with Instagram also. Chair McQueary asked how they will decide it may be time to move on to what to do with all the data. Mr. Clegg responded they developed the goals last summer and reviewed them in the fall. This spring they are presenting revised goals and digging into what the public's ideas for strategies are.

As staff receives input, they are starting to see trends and starting to see consistencies and they feel they are getting good input. Mr. Clegg advised the Commission they are tracking where responses come from to make sure they're getting thorough representation. If they see spots in the city where they're not getting good representation, they will look at those to make sure they're hitting all those pieces.

Mr. Clegg stated that even though the Plan has a 20-year time frame, it will focus on action steps and really put a focus on a five-year time horizon for most of the action steps. Once they get to that point, they can reassess and look at the next five years.

Ms. Arkin requested that everyone like the page on Facebook and share it and do what they can to get the information out to their networks. If they have an organization or an opportunity for someone to come and speak about the Comprehensive Plan process, please let her or Russ know. They have several folks who have done it so many times now they are what she would term as experts. Ms. Arkin stated they are happy to go and meet with neighborhood groups or with civic groups. They will go just about anywhere. She asked Commissioners to please share information as it is important that they hear from a wide range of people.

Commission Administration: Ms. Arkin advised she has completed the updated roster and will send it out to them. There are copies of the Commission handbook available if anyone wants to update theirs. There have been a couple of revisions or amendments to the bylaws, which are included as an attachment. Commissioners may or may not have the latest set of by-laws in the older notebooks, but she will see that everyone gets them. There will be things added to the notebook, some information that may be interesting for the Commission to be able to refer to about some of the things that they do, such as a chart that shows the production of Redevelopment Plans and more information on things such as eminent domain, disposition, and acquisition. Ms. Arkin is putting together small summaries of that which can be tucked into the back of the book. Staff is also going to provide dividers for the book, but they have not been prepared yet.

Chair McQueary inquired if there was anything else? Ms. Arkin advised that it appeared there were some students present. The students said they were from Dr. Christian's class on Community Communications at UNC, Greensboro, observing for their class. Chair McQueary suggested the students get involved in their city and be a contributor as they can provide points of view that are different than what has always been done. It is more important to be heard and listened to than it is to complain. He is not suggesting that they do complain but is suggesting they become actively involved as there is a need for young people to be involved. He thanked the group for coming and stated they are welcome to attend any time. If they would like to speak, Ms. Arkin can arrange for them to be added on the agenda if it is relevant to what the Commission is trying to do.

6. Additional Business

Mr. Clegg urged the students to look up *PLAMIT* GSO and get involved in the Comprehensive Plan process on Facebook and sign up for emails and other things.

Chair McQueary stated he attended the Home Show over the weekend, and one thing that caught his attention was a group talking about “tiny houses,” although he personally does not like the name “tiny houses.” Chair McQueary stated the Commission owns a lot of property, not suggesting it ought to be dedicated for small houses, but does think that as a group it is time to begin thinking about what would be the position of this Commission on small houses as it is clearly something that is becoming more and more popular.

Ms. Arkin stated Mr. McQueary had spoken to her about this. She reached out to the Neighborhood Development Housing group to inquire of any involvement as she knew of this group but didn’t really know if the City had been involved. Apparently the project they are currently working on has no City financial involvement, but Cyndi Blue, manager of their housing division, said she was meeting with the executive director next week and asked if she wanted an invitation. She is going to meet with them and will bring some information back to share with the Commission.

Ms. Arkin stated that to planners what this movement is about is different options for housing. This is possibly an opportunity for a partnership either with this group or with some other group who is interested doing a pilot program or a demonstration of some sort of housing that isn’t necessarily being built by the market here in this area. Ms. Arkin stated there are many housing types that are not being built by the market here. Staff, as planners, would love to see them being built and perhaps that is a role the Commission wants to move into.

Ms. Chaney recalled that they had a proposal come in front of the Commission before, but it didn’t make it. Ms. Chaney stated it is not just lower and middle income that they’re going with now. They are talking small houses for people who are retiring and want to downsize with smaller square footage, less maintenance, less overhead. And they want to have it in a community. There is a variety of options for this type of housing. She stated it is not only things that the Commission could use but thinks it is going to be throughout the city.

Ms. Wright stated if they do move in that direction, the Commission might want to embrace the name “tiny houses” because nationally there is a movement. People of all ages, of all economic and social backgrounds are migrating toward these tiny houses. She feels the Commission might miss something if they don’t embrace the name. Chair McQueary stated her point is well taken. He is not suggesting this is just a low-income solution.

Ms. Chaney stated there was a speaker who came and talked of older homes that you could buy and purchase and put them into multi-family if you lived there. The speaker talked about some of the historical areas where people are downsizing and are looking at options where you can downsize by making two apartments on the second floor and the owner would be on the first floor, which would have to pass a lot of code enforcement and zoning. She stated there are some areas in Greensboro where that could work.

Chair McQueary asked if there were any other comments or suggestions for improvement or anything that anyone wants to bring up. Nothing more was indicated.

7. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 5:55 pm.

Sue Schwartz Planning Director

SS: cgs

**APPROVED MINUTES OF REGULAR MEETING OF THE
REDEVELOPMENT COMMISSION OF GREENSBORO**

May 1, 2019

The regular meeting of the Redevelopment Commission of Greensboro (RCG) was held on Wednesday May 1, 2019 in the Plaza Level Conference Room of the Melvin Municipal Office Building, 300 West Washington Street. The following members were present: Chair Charles McQueary, Wayne Durham, Dawn Chaney, Clinton Gravely, Patrick Johnson, and Sondra Wright. Councilwoman Nancy Hoffmann was present. Staff present were Dyan Arkin, Russ Clegg, and Andrew Kelly, Counsel for the Commission. Chair McQueary called the meeting to order at 5:00 pm and welcomed everyone to the meeting.

1. Approval of Meeting Minutes (Approved)

a) Minutes of the March 6, 2019 Regular Meeting. Dyan Arkin advised she received changes to the minutes prior to this meeting from Mr. Johnson and stated members are welcome to send changes, suggestions, or comments to her directly or bring them up at the meeting. Ms. Arkin stated there were three grammatical changes and one clarification:

- Item 1, page 1, third paragraph, line 2, "lived" should read "moved."
- Item 3, page 2, sixth paragraph, first line, "he" should read "the."
- Item 3, page 2, ninth paragraph, second line, "whether was" and should read "whether there was."
- Item 3, page 3, ninth paragraph, 14th line, "libel" should read "liable."

Chair McQueary asked if there were any other additions or corrections to the minutes; there were none. Chair McQueary asked for a motion to accept the minutes with the corrections as noted. Ms. Cheney moved to approve the minutes; seconded by Mr. Gravely. The board voted 5-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Chair McQueary, Mr. Gravely, Ms. Cheney, Mr. Johnson, and Ms. Wright. Nays: 0.)

2. South Elm Street Redevelopment Area

a) Conveyance of Property to Greenline Holdings, LLC. Ms. Arkin stated the ongoing process of getting to closing on the redevelopment of the west lot is moving forward, and they have been working on all the components. Mr. Rhodes could not attend this meeting, but had anticipated providing a more detailed update on what progress has been made on their end. Ms. Arkin stated staff is waiting on a few things from them that are in progress and anticipate receiving them soon. The outstanding documents are related to the financial capacity of the developer, which include a letter of intent or a commitment letter from their lender and verification of the developer's capacity. Once that is completed, a full package will be put together to bring to the Commission with the request to move to closing.

Chair McQueary stated he was at the DGI (Downtown Greensboro Inc.) luncheon today and happened to be seated next to Mr. Rhodes, who reiterated the points Ms. Arkin made and indicated he had received a letter from Planning Director Sue Schwartz, outlining the City's commitments vis-à-vis the development. Mr. Rhodes confirmed that the letter satisfied the needs they had in order to move forward and stated he had the full commitment of his immediate management to go forward.

Chair McQueary asked if Ms. Arkin could send a note out to the Commissioners on any developments at all, so everyone is up to speed on this in the final days of trying to reach closure.

Bob Isner, South Elm Development Group, spoke and advised he had a meeting with Milt Rhodes who said everything is moving forward and is a go.

3. Distribution of Revised Boards & Commissions Handbook

Russ Clegg advised that the final handbook would be distributed next month. Mr. Clegg stated some of the boards and commissions meet later in the month, but since this commission meets early in the month, they are not ready yet to present it. He explained the differences and what will need to be signed.

Chair McQueary asked whether there were any additional changes to the Commission's operational procedures in the new document. Mr. Clegg responded no, that a couple of corrections had been made, but it is basically what the Commission has already seen. Staff wants to present it more formally to ensure everyone feels welcomed and appreciated as a board or commission member.

Chair McQueary stated one thing that appears rather important is the chair will be required to send a letter to people who do not show up for the meetings to let them know they're not in compliance with attendance requirements. He stated a key element is for anyone who must miss a Redevelopment Commission meeting is to let Ms. Arkin know ahead of time, so the absence can be excused.

Mr. Clegg responded that this is a problem on a lot of boards, for example, the Zoning Commission must have a quorum to take official actions each month, so needs to have people committed to being there. City Council is trying to make sure that expectation level is clear.

Ms. Arkin explained that, in the agenda packet, she sent the generic board and commission information, plus what was specific to the Redevelopment Commission. She stated they will make sure that everything is accurate and, at the next meeting, go over in more detail the new absence and attendance policies. Ms. Arkin advised they have never had to do anything like this before and it may take some explaining. Ms. Arkin stated Commissioners will need to sign the Code of Conduct form in their packet, but that clean copies will be brought back at the next meeting to go over and be signed.

Chair McQueary asked if there were any questions or comments. Ms. Cheney stated she was concerned about the excused absence policy being based only on written medical justification, signed by a duly authorized physician of medicine. Ms. Cheney asked, if somebody is going to be excused, do they need a doctor's report of what happened so they couldn't be at the meeting. She stated she was asking for clarity as it could have some major repercussions if someone is sick and not necessarily going to the doctor or the hospital, but should not be at the meeting. Ms. Arkin stated she thought it was important that the Commissioners agree as a group that people should stay home if they are sick. Chair McQueary stated it seemed to him the language could be written to say that. Ms. Arkin stated that, within the 12-month timeframe that absences are allowed, there may be a couple of unexcused absences, but it would be okay. Ms. Cheney stated she did not think this is a bad policy, she just thinks there needs to be clarity. Mr. Durham spoke about one board that was televised where this was a big deal with two people being removed, and it continued to be a big deal about absences.

Ms. Arkin explained the Handbook allows for three unexcused absences within a 12-month period. It doesn't state that anyone would automatically be removed after the third absence, so there may be an opportunity for an explanation if somebody is ill. Ms. Arkin felt the language works for checkbox purposes, so unless there is a note from a medical doctor, she will be checking the unexcused absence box. Mr. Kelly stated he thought absences could be excused retroactively. It could be noted that a member was absent and that a doctor's note may be needed. A note could be brought in after the absence, and at that point, the Commission could retroactively change and unexcused absence to excused.

Chair McQueary asked if a commission or board could adopt some clarifying language as to how it would be implemented within its own purview. Mr. Kelly stated what Council has adopted cannot be changed, but it can be clarified. If someone has missed because of illness, the board or commission can address whether the absence should be marked as excused or unexcused at the following meeting. Mr. Kelly stated they might be able to adopt some policies about how to implement these rules, but they cannot be changed from what has been adopted.

Chair McQueary stated this is not a problem this commission has had based on the five years he has been on the board. Attendance has been very good. Ms. Arkin responded that was correct. Ms. Cheney stated this commission only has five members, unlike larger boards, which creates a problem if absences prevent there being a quorum. Mr. Dunham asked if it applied to alternate members. Council Kelly stated it would not. If you are

not needed as an alternate member and you are not going to be here, it is not an absence. Ms. Arkin stated this will be back at the next meeting and will be gone over in more detail with the full document.

Councilwoman Nancy Hoffmann joined the meeting in progress.

4. Staff Updates

Heritage House - Mr. Kelly stated he received notice on Monday that Heritage House is on the Minimum Housing Commission's agenda for May 9th. He will be there to answer any questions and to relay that the Redevelopment Commission wants to bring about change to the property, has no intention of repairing the property, and would like to see it demolished per the Redevelopment Plan. Mr. Kelly will report back to the Commission with the results of that meeting.

Comprehensive Plan - Mr. Clegg provided an update on the Comprehensive Plan update process and stated they are taking the information gathered earlier in the spring and creating a set of strategies, which align with the goals that have been crafted. Staff has developed draft strategies over the past couple of weeks and is meeting with other departments to get their input and ideas to ensure the strategies align with existing plans. Staff will be meeting with advisory committee members and will be talking with focus groups and the broader public in June to get a sense of what people's priorities are and to make sure there are not gaps in the recommendations. Over the summer, staff will begin to craft the plan itself with priorities and how they will be applied in different parts of town identified town. They hope to have most of it wrapped up by the end of the year or at least have most of the planning done by then.

Chair McQueary asked if they are generally satisfied with all the input they are getting. Mr. Clegg responded they have gotten a good sense of direction that folks want to go in. It is hard to work churning through it and turning the input into strategies, but that some consistent themes have been identified from the input, which will eventually translate into action steps.

Chair McQueary asked if Mr. Clegg could comment briefly on how they take what they're doing and integrate downtown Greensboro activity as there must be a tremendous amount of overlap or intersection. Mr. Clegg responded they are reaching out to partners in the City, such as the Chamber of Commerce, DGI, and the Next Generation Ecosystem to make sure their plans are lining up, are supported, and to get strategies from them as necessary that fit in. For downtown, they're identifying top priority projects, areas for growth, and other projects that the plan needs to support. Similarly with neighborhoods, staff is identifying where they want to see more intensive development, other opportunities they want to prioritize, and what corridors they want to prioritize throughout town.

Ms. Chaney stated she thinks staff has done a very good job of separating areas that need the Advisory Committee's attention. She feels the way it has broken down is very good and will answer a lot of questions throughout the entire city. Mr. Durham stated that one thing the Advisory Committee is looking at is how infrastructure is built to bring in other people and create more of an interest in Greensboro by reaching out to all groups of people.

Chair McQueary asked for any other comments or thoughts. There were no further comments or thoughts.

5. Additional Business

Rosters and RCG Annual Report - Ms. Arkin stated she sent out updated rosters and hard copies could be provided at the next meeting. Ms. Arkin asked if there are errors or if they would prefer anything to be shown differently to please contact her and explained this is a tool for their use and not necessarily anyone outside. Ms. Arkin stated the bound copies of the RCG Annual Report to Council they have been provided are theirs to keep.

Mobile Food Market - A flyer was distributed for the Mobile Food Market in the Willow Oaks area. Chair McQueary asked if there was anything else they needed to do, and Ms. Arkin responded there was not. All the

documentation has been provided as required and has been vetted by the legal staff, and everything is ready to go. They have been ongoing at another location and are looking forward to moving to their preferred location and are very appreciative and excited. Ms. Arkin encouraged the Commission members to participate in the market.

Phillips/Lombardy Urban Farm - Ms. Arkin provided an update on the Phillips/Lombardy property in the Phillips/Lombardy Redevelopment area off Phillips Avenue across from Claremont Courts public housing community. It is an old quarry site that was approved three years ago for N.C. A&T State University and Concerned Citizens of Northeast Greensboro to lease a portion of the property for an urban farm location. They have installed "high towers," which are Quonset hut shaped greenhouses. Students are learning about agriculture and growing food, which they donate to the community.

The program was funded by a grant. They are in the process of applying for a second or third round of the grant to do even more. It is coming back before the Commission next month because the lease ran out and went unnoticed. The Concerned Citizens of Northeast Greensboro want to either renew this lease or begin a new lease, under basically the same conditions. They are working with their insurance contacts to get verification of the insurance requirement within the lease itself, which will be an item for action next month and will be in their packet. Representatives from the Concerned Citizens and N.C. A&T will be at the meeting to provide an update and talk about what has been done over the last three years and then ask that the lease be reinstated.

Chair McQueary asked if there were any known issues at this point. Ms. Arkin responded that one challenge they had is they originally did not have enough funding under the grant to do a parking area and have been using an open area with gravel on it. Ms. Arkin stated they desire to do a paved parking area on one side which is allowable under the lease. They are going to request funding for that in the next grant. Ms. Arkin stated there have not been any serious issues, but there have been a few slumps where they had trouble getting students interested in doing this, but they have been consistently growing food. Ms. Arkin stated it will be nice for them to come to speak and there will be maps and photographs to share.

Chair McQueary asked if the working relationships between the two parties still good. Ms. Arkin responded it seems to be.

Tiny Houses - Chair McQueary brought up the subject of tiny houses and whether they might be an appropriate use of land that the Commission owns and what might be entailed in the process that was discussed last month. Chair McQueary, Mrs. McQueary, Ms. Arkin and other city staff visited the existing tiny house location that has six houses.

Photographs were projected on the screen, and Ms. Arkin stated all the houses are 288 square feet, except one that is even smaller. One of the surprises was that they did not feel cramped and were very comfortable. Chair McQueary stated it was sufficient for one person. Ms. Arkin stated the assumption was that one person would live there, although a couple possibly could. They are nicely made and the detailing is good. A house with a bay window took everyone's breath away. It was quite an experience for those who had only seen model tiny houses, not real tiny houses. Councilwoman Hoffmann stated she believe the rent from what she understood was \$450 a month, which is very affordable. The bay window was donated and incorporated into one of the houses which gives a whole different look to the room.

Ms. Arkin stated each house has some privacy, they are not looking window to window. The houses are laid out very carefully. There is a community garden by a non-profit. Chair McQueary stated BB&T donated the materials for a deck with a Pergola and a grill on it. Ms. Arkin stated it is a lovely small area. Ms. Arkin stated that one thing that they talked about relationships with the neighbors. On one side there is multi-family which is about a 12 unit building next door. On the other side there is a single-family house that is set back but not right against the property line. On both sides, neighbors have come by and have been very positive and supportive. Ms. Arkin stated the tiny house people have been thrilled with the response to them there.

Ms. Arkin stated staff has talked internally wants to talk more with the Commission about the possibility of doing some demonstration projects for housing types that are not the norm in the Greensboro area. She believes tiny homes are a perfect example.

Ms. Arkin advised staff had a conversation with the Tiny Houses Greensboro staff about lots that the Commission owns that might be a good match for a project they are planning with Greensboro Day School. They are working

on their end and staff will certainly bring to the Commission anything for the Commission to consider. Ms. Arkin advised there might be a match there that could be fun and exciting and a good add to the housing stock for the City of Greensboro.

Mr. Durham stated veterans are a big part of who they are putting the houses up for. Mr. Durham stated it is a phenomenal idea for going into these places that are not used. Mr. Durham thinks two people could be in these houses and thinks they are designed for a couple. Mr. Durham feels it would get people out working and into the tiny houses. Mr. Durham thinks is a very good idea.

Chair McQueary advised each home is air conditioned and heated. Councilwoman Hoffmann asked if these homes are built for \$36,000. Mr. Durham stated college students would love these types of home and for people not able to afford a home, this is perfect for them. Councilwoman Hoffmann compared this to a New York City studio apartment. Chair McQueary stated what drives the cost is the inside utilities such as kitchens and bathrooms. If a room was 10 x 10 and you have that in it, you would have that cost no matter what, so it is the space. If it is 400 square feet, it would not cost a \$100 a square foot, or whatever it might be, because you can expand the footprint without having to buy all the associated amenities that go with it. Mr. Durham stated this is perfect for people that have not been able to afford homes and a big step up.

Ms. Wright explained her Keller Williams office will be building tiny house frames as part of their annual service project called "Red Day." Ms. Arkin stated it was a wonderful community and the quality of the construction was extremely good.

Chair McQueary stated this is not a finished site. One house is occupied and another is ready for occupancy. Construction on the interiors of the others was still in progress. Chair McQueary stated this might be a logical idea to be considered when looking at how to effectively use RCG-owned properties. Ms. Arkin stated at this point the Commission has enough land to do something interesting and fun if they choose.

Chair McQueary asked if they could ask of staff to take on the task of helping to figure out what might be done to consider moving forward.

Chair McQueary stated they probably should have the group that is heading the Tiny Houses come and talk to the Commission after the Redevelopment Commission becomes a little bit smarter on what to do. It sounds as though they carry mortgages of about 80 or 90 percent of whatever the value is and assume they rent it out. Chair McQueary advised the \$36,000 was for the house alone. Utilities and other things must be put in and the gentleman from Tiny Houses said it averaged about 8,000 per house to put in sewers, water, water meters and those types of things.

Chair McQueary asked if there were any questions, or comments, or suggestions. Ms. Chaney stated her only suggestion would be that they would hopefully get to the point where the owners could buy them, and the money could be recycled back into more housing. Mr. Durham suggested Scott Jones, Executive Director for the Non-Profit for the Tiny Houses, as a person to come and speak.

Chair McQueary stated this was a feel good experience for him to see these homes. Ms. Arkin added it was a very hopeful feeling that something interesting and positive can be done for a reasonable amount of money on land that is already available. Ms. Arkin stated staff will get back to them and continue to bring information.

Ms. Arkin stated she did not have any other updates or additional business.

Chair McQueary thanked everyone for coming and with no other business, the meeting is adjourned.

6. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 5:53 pm.

Respectfully Submitted,

Sue Schwartz Planning Director

SS: cgs

SPECIAL MEETING OF THE REDEVELOPMENT COMMISSION

APPROVED MINUTES

June 19, 2019

The meeting of the Redevelopment Commission of Greensboro (RCG) was held on Wednesday June 19, 2019 in the Plaza level conference room of the Melvin Municipal Office Building, 300 West Washington Street. The following members were present: Chair Charles McQueary, Wayne Durham, Dawn Chaney, Clinton Gravely, and Sondra Wright. Staff present were Dyan Arkin and Russ Clegg. Also present were Andrew Kelly, Attorney for the Commission, and Councilwoman Nancy Hoffmann. Commissioner Patrick Johnson was not in attendance. Chair McQueary called the meeting to order at 5:00 pm and welcomed everyone to the meeting.

Withdrawals

Ms. Arkin advised the Commission of a request to remove Item Number 4, Eastside Park Redevelopment Area and address the item at a later date as the offer from the potential development team is not ready.

1. Approval of Meeting Minutes (Approved)

a) Minutes of the May 1, 2019 Regular Meeting. Chair McQueary inquired if there were any additions or corrections to the minutes. There was none.

Ms. Chaney moved to have the minutes be approved; seconded by Mr. Gravely. The board voted 5-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Chair McQueary, Mr. Gravely, Ms. Chaney, Mr. Durham, and Ms. Wright. Nays, 0.)

2. South Elm Street Redevelopment Area

a) Conveyance of Property to Greenline Holdings, LLC. Ms. Arkin stated the developer is present and requested Mr. Chapman of the South Elm Development Group (SEDG), Master Developer, to provide a brief update regarding this project.

Bob Chapman, SEDG, 447 Arlington Street. Mr. Chapman introduced his intern for the summer, David Altidore. Mr. Chapman stated they are very pleased with Mr. Rhodes' involvement, and the City is being supportive. SEDG has executed a Memorandum of Understanding with a developer from Atlanta, Rea Ventures, who believes Greensboro is the wave of the future and wants to develop Commission-owned property within the South Elm Street Redevelopment area. Mr. Chapman has talked to John Merrill regarding the Union Square Campus and whether they intend to exercise their option on the parcel indicated on the projected map [the corner of East Gate City Boulevard and South Elm Street]. Union Square Campus has a right of first refusal on that parcel that expires in another year. Mr. Merrill has encouraged SEDG to seek other offers. Rea Ventures is looking at the possibility of 220 apartments. Mr. Chapman reminded the Commission that in 2013 his company had signed an agreement with Grays on the Greenway LLC work with the Gray family on development of their parcel indicated on the projected map [714 South Elm Street].

Mr. Chapman indicated the Commission-owned parcels along South Eugene Street on the map. These parcels are not a part of the South Elm Redevelopment area, but Rea and SEDG are looking to develop them as well. They will be talking with the Greensboro Housing Authority regarding the former maintenance building at the corner of South Eugene Street and West Gate City Boulevard. In the past three days, they have also had other inquiries for development of a health and fitness building and a CrossFit Gym.

Chair McQueary asked if the CrossFit is the same group that owns the one at Friendly Center. Mr. Chapman responded that CrossFit is a national franchise with about 2000 gyms.

Mr. Gravely asked if the maintenance building was still owned by the Housing Authority. Ms. Arkin advised it is still owned by the Housing Authority. Mr. Chapman explained their thinking is perhaps the City or Redevelopment Commission would be an interim owner and fold it into an overall plan. Councilwoman Hoffman requested more information on the parking deck plan. Mr. Chapman stated Ms. Arkin had reached out to him to advise the City recognized the importance of parking in the area. The location shown for parking on the master plan is currently in conflict with the existing cell phone tower, but the lease expires in about three years. By the time a deck could be

built, the townhouse could be gone or the company could be cooperating to place a mast on the new deck, which has been proposed to them. Ms. Arkin stated the need for parking is also because of development activity across Gate City Boulevard, including the company locating at the Zimmerman building. Councilwoman Hoffmann inquired if they knew how many spaces. Mr. Chapman responded 600 to 800 is what is anticipated. He indicated the apartments on the map and advised to have it work economically as a mixed-use retail and commercial use, the area needs more parking and would probably be full immediately. The Grays have a contract with SEDG to add spaces at their expenses if a structure is built.

Milt Rhodes, 1134 Paris Street, is the project planner for the Arden Group and Greenline Holdings. He stated they have been working with the City on the townhome portion of the project for the 41 for-sale units. Mr. Rhodes presented slides of renderings of He stated they are working to finish the pricing exercise in conjunction with the City's Neighborhood Development department to meet the 80% Area Median Income requirement for 51% of the for-sale units. Mr. Rhodes indicated there will be outdoor space in the form of courtyards, balconies, and terraces and explained they are still working on the design for the units fronting the Greenway. He stated that the current phasing plan is to start construction on the Greenway, then move to South Elm Street, and complete it with the units in the middle. Mr. Rhodes stated these buildings are a combination of brick and cement board siding and addressed how and why the different units will be different in material. An interior view of the courtyard was shown indicating a common open space. Floor plans were shown indicating the different sized units and layouts. He stated the parking for all the units in on-site and every home is designed for at least two parking spaces. Mr. Rhodes stated there is private covered outdoor open space. Mr. Rhodes stated there would be a Homeowners Association to manage the common space.

Chair McQueary asked about the nominal width of the buildings shown in the middle of the rendering. Mr. Rhodes responded 20-feet, 18-feet, and 16-feet. Mr. Durham asked about the cost. Mr. Rhodes responded the selling price at the low end is approximately \$228,000 and stated a \$150 a foot is the market price in downtown Greensboro. If options were added in, the price would be higher. Mr. Rhodes believes they can start with a market rate unit in the \$215,000 to \$220,000 range. Mr. Gravely inquired about the space between the buildings. Mr. Rhodes responded that it is either 12-feet or 16-feet between the buildings to allow for a passageway and a walking path through them.

Ms. Arkin made note of the mixed-use building on Gate City Boulevard, which will include rental properties, possibly some retail, some office, and some commercial. There are challenges with parking and they have been working on a variety of possibilities. There is a possibility of adding additional spaces in the building for use by the public, but due to the topography and the Brownfields restrictions, if you go below ground level with parking, the cost increases exponentially. Ms. Arkin stated they are looking at various items to ensure this building will be viable and affordable. Discussion ensued regarding the City's sub-surface study and what the study involved. Ms. Chaney asked if it would be feasible for the Commission to put parking on the land located across the tracts as a temporary measure. Mr. Rhodes stated it would be a good idea. The bank they are working with is fine with off-site parking because of the downtown urban location and their underwriters understand the parking issues.

b). 741 South Elm Street. Ms. Arkin advised the Commission that the owners of the property at 741 South Elm Street, Grays on the Greenway, were present and would like to address the Commission about the issues they have had with this property and moving forward. Ms. Arkin reminded the Commission this is the parcel where the temporary parking required encroachment on the Grays' property. An agreement between the City and the Grays has been underway for some time. Ms. Arkin provided pictures depicting the encroachment.

Mr. Sidney Gray, 4224 Starmount Drive. Mr. Gray stated he is following up on the encroachment issues on their land at 741 South Elm Street. He asked why this issue has not been resolved as it has now been four years without having the encroachment settled. Mr. Gray spoke to how many times this issue has been addressed and is part of the public records. Mr. Gray read from a script and provided a copy to be incorporated in the minutes of this meeting.

Mr. Kelly recommended that the Commission not comment as an attorney represents Mr. Gray. He reminded them that they had a closed session meeting concerning the settlement matter where he was advised on how to proceed, and he has been working with their attorney to do produce an agreement. Mr. Kelly stated he received a draft of the easement agreement recently. There are no construction plans yet, so the work is still not done. Mr. Kelly stated it is his opinion that plans are needed to finalize the agreement.

Chair McQueary asked about the expected time frame for closure. Mr. Kelly stated he did not know when the plans would be done. Other aspects of the agreement have been worked out and are acceptable to the parties. Mr. Kelly stated he is relying on the engineers to tell him what is required to remove the encroachments from their property.

Ms. Wright asked if there is continued use of this property. Mr. Kelly responded there was an agreement drafted regarding payment arrangements when the encroachment originally began and when it will be finally removed. It is agreed to among the parties that while the encroachment exists, the Grays will be paid for the use of their property. Ms. Arkin advised the encroachment runs approximately 15-feet from the property line onto their property. It is two storm water pipes tying from new pipe on the Commission's property into an existing pipe on their property.

Chair McQueary asked what needed to be done to reach closure and have this issue resolved. Mr. Kelly stated from his perspective the Commission and the City need to remove the encroachments. An engineer will determine how large a temporary easement would be sufficient to remove what is there and put it back on the Commission's property. Discussion has been ongoing regarding development of the area, which is the main reason plans have not been completed. Ms. Chaney clarified that rent is being paid for the use of the property until it is finalized. Mr. Kelly responded that was correct.

William Benjamin, 301 North Elam Street, Attorney, represents the Grays. He stated there is a promise to pay, not an agreement signed, and there has been no money transferred. Mr. Benjamin explained that this encroachment is not only pipes but also land sloping onto the Grays' property. He has been in communication with Mr. Kelly and has prepared a draft agreement. One possibility is, if there is difficulty understanding what has to be done, why not say an additional 20 feet would be the temporary easement to operate the removal. He feels someone can determine what he or she can do to move a couple pipes out and this encroachment. It does not appear to be a major task. It is frustrating for the Grays and for him not to have closure.

Chair McQueary stated the established communication path is between the attorneys. Chair McQueary stated there needs to be a timeframe stating what the Commission must do. Chair McQueary stated this situation has gone on for too long and the Commission needs to be doing its part to help progression. Chair McQueary asked Mr. Kelly to prepare a timeframe as soon as possible advising the Commission on what needs to be done to move forward. Mr. Kelly responded he will prepare a timeframe and will continue to update the Commission. He stated he has made it clear to the engineers what the Commission needs. Chair McQueary apologized to Mr. Gray for his having to come back to the Commission with this issue.

Mr. David Gray stated there was a cost analysis done to determine the cost to remove the encroachment. It was determined it was very expensive and were better off waiting to the new project took place for the new sewer and main street drains in. Chair McQueary declined to hear additional comments from Mr. Gray.

3. Phillips Lombardy Redevelopment Area

a) Concerned Citizens of Northeast Greensboro Lease for Urban Farm. Ms. Arkin explained the Concerned Citizens of Northeast Greensboro lease that allowed them to work with NC A&T on creation and operation of an urban farm has expired. Ms. Arkin invited Dr. Terrence Thomas from North Carolina A&T to provide an update on what has been accomplished and what a new lease will allow them to accomplish.

Dr. Terrence Thomas stated that over the past three years they have installed two high tunnels. They had planned three but due to budgetary concerns could not install all three. Dr. Thomas described what crops they have grown. They have established a marketing arrangement with Eastern Carolina Organics to take the vegetables. The model they are working with is to be able to provide vegetables at a reasonable, affordable price to the community and sell a portion of them in the commercial market to earn income to sustain the project. They need to purchase growing materials, seeds, fertilizers and other supplies for the next spring season and need to earn a certain level of revenue while still marketing vegetables at a reasonable price.

Dr. Thomas stated they would be seeking additional funding to have two more towers on the same site. They have a pilot program where young people are being trained as entrepreneurs in the hopes of demonstrating this can work, they can earn money and can explore opportunities to get into business for themselves supplying

specialty high priced vegetables throughout the Triad area and Charlotte. The renewal of a three-year lease will allow them to accomplish the vision.

Councilwoman Hoffmann left the meeting in progress at 5:54 pm.

Mr. Gravely moved to approve the lease renewal; seconded by Ms. Wright. The board voted 5-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Chair McQueary, Mr. Gravely, Ms. Cheney, Mr. Durham, and Ms. Wright. Nays: 0.) Chair McQueary stated it was a good success story.

3. Distribution of Revised Boards & Commissions Handbook

Ms. Arkin presented the guidelines and code of conduct adopted by City Council. Ms. Arkin detailed each of the specific changes in the handbook and explained this is required from all of the Boards and Commissions. She distributed a Code of Conduct for the Commissioners to sign and return to her before the end of the meeting. Ms. Chaney inquired if City Council approved this. Ms. Arkin responded they did. Ms. Chaney asked what if there are two meetings in a day. Mr. Kelly responded there are areas that are being addressed and requested for the Commissioners to express questions or concerns. This an ongoing discussion and there are questions and clarifications that will need to be addressed. There has never been an issue with this Commission. Chair McQueary stated he personally appreciates everyone's effort.

4. Staff Updates

a) Heritage House. Mr. Kelly stated Heritage House went before the Housing Commission in May and the inspector's order to demolish was upheld. The owner of the Meridian Center has appealed the decision and Mr. Kelly will keep everyone updated on the outcome.

b) PlanIt GSO. Mr. Clegg stated GSO has been creating strategies for the identified goals. They have six elements and goals for each and are working on strategies. They are online and available in survey format. Staff is attending pop-up meetings and provided the dates for coming events they will be attending. Bruce Katz will be in town in the fall as part of the Speaker Series. Mr. Clegg stated they are asking people to tell them where they go in Greensboro. He indicated a piece of paper with instructions. It is simply taking a picture, posting it on Facebook at Greensboro Planning and add hash tags. There will be a gift card for the person who has the most likes.

5. Additional Business

Additional business cannot be added to a special meeting.

Chair McQueary advised there had been a potential offer to buy three lots belonging to the Commission from the Tiny Houses of Greensboro, but not enough time to do the necessary paperwork. The homes would have been available to young mothers and currently in school. Chair McQueary referenced the tiny houses on Causey Street. Chair McQueary stated the land the Commission has could represent an impetus toward having more of that type of housing. Chair McQueary spoke to the cost and potential of tiny houses. Ms. Chaney stated she attended the grand opening of the tiny houses and feels they have great potential. The Redevelopment Commission owns land that has been vacant for years and feels this is an opportunity to have the land better used to represent what is needed in the community with housing that is affordable and could be leased or potentially purchased. Ms. Wright asked if there were other areas being considered for tiny housing. Mr. Durham stated the homes on Causey Street in Greensboro. High Point is also creating tiny houses. There is a non-profit organization working with that and looking at parcels of land all over Greensboro and different types of projects.

6. Adjournment

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

Respectfully Submitted,

Sue Schwartz Planning Director

SS: cgs

APPROVED MEETING MINUTES
OF THE REDEVELOPMENT COMMISSION OF GREENSBORO
AUGUST 7, 2019

The special meeting of the Redevelopment Commission of Greensboro (RGG) was held on Wednesday August 7, 2019 in the Plaza Level Conference Room of the Melvin Municipal Office Building, 300 West Washington Street. The following members were present: Chair Charles McQueary, Sondra Wright, Patrick Johnson, Dawn Chaney, Clinton Gravely, as well as Councilwoman Nancy Hoffmann (City Council). Staff present was Dyan Arkin, Planning Director Sue, Schwartz, and Terri Jones, acting as Counsel for the Commission, City Legal Department. Chair McQueary called the meeting to order at 5:00 pm and welcomed everyone to the meeting.

Withdrawals/Continuances

Ms. Arkin requested item 2b, 741 South Elm Street to be removed from the agenda as Mr. Gray has requested to be removed from the agenda because the settlement agreement has been executed.

1. Approval of Meeting Minutes (Approved)

a. Minutes of the June 19, 2019 Special Meeting.

Chair McQueary asked if there were any other additions or corrections to the minutes. Ms. Chaney's name was spelled incorrectly and the minutes will be amended to reflect the correct spelling. Chair McQueary asked for a motion to accept the minutes with the corrections as noted. Mr. Johnson abstained from the approval of minutes as he had not been present at that meeting. Ms. Chaney moved to approve the minutes; seconded by Mr. Gravely. The board voted 4-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Chair McQueary, Mr. Gravely, Ms. Chaney, and Ms. Wright. Abstained: Mr. Johnson. Nays: 0.)

South Elm Street Redevelopment Area

a) Conveyance of Property to Greenline Holdings, LLC.

Ms. Arkin introduced Mr. Robert Chapman, South Elm Development Group. Mr. Chapman stated he was contacted by Milt Rhodes who advised him he had been given the final green light and was ready to request the Commission's approval to set a closing date for conveyance of the property. Mr. Chapman received another call stating the owner, Stuart Parks, had been approached by local developer Andy Zimmerman. Mr. Zimmerman approached both Milt Rhodes and Stuart Parks and advised he felt the plan could be greatly improved. They listened to Mr. Zimmerman as he has done great work in the neighborhood and is well known. Mr. Chapman spoke about the things that cannot happen if they proceed with the current plan. The main issue is there is no way to provide a significant amount of parking for the area. Originally a parking deck was to be built in the middle of the block with up to 650 spaces, enough to provide a higher intensity of the property. The deck would have required some support from the City. When looking at what was economically feasible, it came down to surface parking and one of the key elements Mr. Zimmerman questioned was what will be done about the real need for parking for the greater area. Mr. Parks and Mr. Zimmerman decided to become partners and would need more time to fully rework the plan, so they are requesting a 90-day extension to rework the plan. Mr. Chapman stated they have been working on a plan for the east side property and indicated on the projected map the area where a five-tray parking structure with 520 spaces could be located and not be seen from the street, Gate City Boulevard, or the Greenway. Rea Ventures of Atlanta has joined forces with the South Elm Development Group (SEDG), which includes Robert Isner, Seth Harry, and himself. SEDG is recommending that the Commission accept Mr. Zimmerman's offer to join the team and allow sufficient time for a higher and better use plan.

Milt Rhodes, 1134 Parish Street, Greensboro, Greenline Holdings and the Arden Group, stated that the Arden Group was requesting additional time. He explained that while working on the project, a meeting was requested by Mr. Zimmerman, which resulted in significant questions about trying to fit a square peg fitting into a round hole on this property. There was a request made by Mr. Zimmerman and SEDG to spend more time working as a broader team to identify opportunities that may have been missed as they moved forward with the goals for a single block as opposed to goals associated with a broader site plan. They are grateful to have Mr. Zimmerman,

with AZ Development, involved. Mr. Rhodes feels that, as a redeveloper, Mr. Zimmerman has his finger on the pulse for what people are need along South Elm Street and in Greensboro. Mr. Rhodes feels they and the City can greatly benefit from working with Mr. Zimmerman and believes the site can be used in a better way. The project was good but had serious flaws that were not recognized as it was being looked at through a lens that was not focused sharply enough. Mr. Zimmerman pointed out the flaws and they want to take advantage of that. Mr. Rhodes explained that 90 days would put them on a short track to get something done, and they will be back regularly to provide updates. He stated Mr. Zimmerman has been very supportive and patient as they worked to present a case to the Commission for consideration, and he is asking for the additional time.

Mr. Gravely asked what happens at the end of the three-month time. Mr. Rhodes responded his goal will be for the Commission to have a packet to take action on. The attorneys have been talking about getting to this date and setting a closing date. His suggestion is in 30 days they will come back to the Commission with a formation of a plan. It may be a list, a schedule associated with the list, and the work from there to complete the task. A site plan should be presented in 30 days.

Councilwoman Nancy Hoffmann asked if November would be the time a full plan will be presented to the Commission. Mr. Rhodes responded they would love to present the Commission with a nice Thanksgiving present.

Chair McQueary asked Mr. Rhodes for his opinion regarding the risks of waiting three months to begin. Mr. Rhodes responded some of the risks there are things that are fundamentally flawed with the approach in dealing with this property. One of the risks is there may be some real fundamental flaws with this piece of property but does feel this can be a great project. It is a fear, but has always been a fear.

Ms. Chaney asked if he thought it would increase the residential amount of space available for sale and lease by going with the parking garage. Mr. Rhodes stated at this meeting it would be too presumptuous for him to say anything specific, but one of the challenges has been how to build a building that can satisfy affordable housing rents and provide adequate parking. If the current plan had been executed, it would have been regretted. Mr. Rhodes feels with everyone working together on this plan they will be able to determine how to obtain more units, more substantial buildings, and figure out the right way to distribute and share parking while still focusing on the site.

Chair McQueary stated one of the documents talked about the cost of digging down for the parking garage because of the brownfield aspects of the site and asked if has been thought out or discussed. Mr. Rhodes responded that was recently learned about this particular site and is why the drawing is different than what was presented in the spring. There is contaminated ground water at a lower level that presents a big challenge in going too deep.

Ms. Arkin stated while there is ground water, it is not necessarily contaminated. If a second level is attempted under the parking on grade, they would have to deal with a significant amount of ground water issues. Chair McQueary asked if it was a brownfield issue. Ms. Arkin responded not necessarily. Councilwoman Hoffmann stated there is a lot of underground water. Ms. Wright asked Mr. Rhodes why he used the word contaminated. Mr. Rhodes responded because of its brownfield history. The three acres is all part of a brownfield site and there are contaminated places within the site that if you dig, you will have to deal with the soils and other things in there. Mr. Rhodes stated he used the word incorrectly. Ms. Arkin stated there are land use restrictions and there's a very clear set of rules when doing construction on the site. It is unknown if this particular water has any contamination, but the site does have to be addressed in certain ways. Mr. Rhodes stated one reason they are asking for 90 days is so due diligence can be done together and looking at the issues with fresh eyes and lens.

Chair McQueary asked about a question Mr. Zimmerman had asked previously asked about why it was taking so long and maybe the question is why is it going to take an additional three months to get this settled. Mr. Zimmerman stated it has been only three or four days since they started talking. Mr. Zimmerman stated the project looks different than what had been anticipated and that a lot has transpired in this time. He explained that, when he bought Betty Cone's building across the street, he was looking forward to a much larger Union Square Campus. He sat on a committee where they were trying to decide what the next buildings would be as a part of the campus, which has now fallen by the wayside, and it is no longer going to be a campus with multiple buildings for education and collaboration. What precipitated him contacting the Arden Group to ask if there was something he could do to help was these projects will help transform the whole south end in that neighborhood. When

meeting with everyone, he saw flaws that maybe they didn't see and it was pointed out to him the challenges that they have been up against with this project. Mr. Zimmerman feels these are challenges that can be overcome. The landscape in Greensboro and downtown has changed dramatically. There are other housing projects that have been completed, apartment buildings completed, and others that are on the table to additionally transform downtown. Mr. Zimmerman feels he has identified a void and a product that has not been done and that nobody else was thinking. He is excited to be a part of it and hopes everyone will see the benefit of this additional time.

Ms. Arkin stated there has been a lot of work done since the sales development agreement was executed initially, including a new transportation impact study, soil study, and geotechnical studies. The project is much further along than a year ago and there are a lot of tools that can be used by the new group that Arden did not have the benefit of for many months.

Chair McQueary referenced the date on the drawing and stated everyone would like to see soil turned and something happening. He stated the expression of "projects don't get into trouble, they start out in trouble" and stated it is very important to get the planning done right.

Chair McQueary asked for clarification on what needed to be done for consideration. Ms. Jones stated if they are entertaining an extension, there would need to be a motion to give them 90 days to revise their plans.

Mr. Gravely made a motion to grant the three-month extension. No further discussion was held. Seconded by Ms. Wright. The board voted 5-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Chair McQueary, Mr. Gravely, Ms. Chaney, Mr. Johnson, and Ms. Wright. Nays: none.)

2b. South Elm Street Redevelopment Area

Mr. Chapman stated at the last meeting he had mentioned that they had been approached by Rea Ventures from Atlanta. He has met with them and was impressed by the company, the people, and their staff. There was a full-day design session scheduled in Atlanta at the office of Lou Oliver, with Seth Harry, their project architect and partner. Two weeks later there was another design session and next week will be the third. Mr. Chapman indicated on the projected site plan the locations of the Union Square Campus, the temporary surface parking and the cell tower. The lease for the cell tower expires in two years, and the tower company has been informed the Commission will not extend their lease. The City was approached by a national grocery store chain indicating their interest in a downtown location.

Mr. Gravely asked if there has been any contact with the Greensboro Housing Authority (GHA) to see if there were possibilities there. Mr. Chapman stated they have made a formal request to have a meeting with the Executive Director. He stated they were told three years ago that if they provided housing, GHA would be willing to cooperate. They were only interested in housing. The team has talked about putting a grocery store there and doing a land swap with GHA.

Ms. Arkin clarified she has had some discussion with a grocery chain, but it is definitely not a done deal. It is being considered among other possibilities as part of this overall site. Councilwoman Hoffmann stated the more residential is increased in this area, the more attractive this area would be to a grocer. Ms. Arkin stated they are looking forward to that possibility. It will also provide an opportunity for Rea Ventures to spread out the required affordable housing component more. The site was looked as an independent site because that what it was with Arden and now that Rea has joined, they have all had the opportunity to look at all of these sites and establish how the affordable component would work. It is easier to look at this as one site now that there is a second developer and a good development team for the site.

Ms. Wright stated the possibility of a grocery store, along with the activities and restaurants at this site, appears to be a very attractive area for an active aging community and asked if there was any plan for an active aging community. Mr. Chapman stated they have been approached by a realtor with the Brown Investment Group who is interested in a wellness center and are also talking about active aging as part of that. At this point, one possibility is placing it on top of the parking deck, which was well received. Ms. Wright asked if there was any place in the plan for one story housing for active aging residents. Ms. Arkin stated they are not there yet in the planning. Ms. Schwartz advised that two blocks over there is a proposal from Prestwick Development for an active aging housing community off of Martin Luther King Jr. Drive.

3. Distribution of Draft 2018-2019 RCG Annual Report

Ms. Arkin stated that, if the Commission is ready to approve the 2018-2019 Redevelopment Commission Annual Report, the next step will be for the report to be finalized and distributed to City Council and the City Manager's office as the official report for the year for the activities that have occurred. No comment or discussion.

Ms. Chaney made a motion for approval of the 2018-2019 Redevelopment Commission Annual Report. Seconded by Mr. Gravely. The board voted 5-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Chair McQueary, Mr. Gravely, Ms. Chaney, Mr. Johnson, and Ms. Wright. Nay: none.)

4. Staff Updates

Ms. Arkin stated she received information from Hart Crane, project manager for the Prestwick project in the Ole Asheboro redevelopment area. Prestwick is anticipating the tax credit award announcement from the North Carolina Housing Finance Agency. Ms. Arkin advised Prestwick does have a Plan B if they are not awarded, and it should not delay the project as they will use another finance mechanism. This is an affordable senior housing multi-family, active aging development, located in the Ole Asheboro neighborhood. There will be approximately 80 units. Full engineering has not been completed and it could shift up or down a little bit.

Ms. Arkin stated Mr. Crane is also working with the Prestwick Company to negotiate and enter into a sales agreement for the A2 property, north of the site that the Prestwick Company is going to do the senior housing. Another division of the Prestwick Company is planning to do a mixed-use, market rate development along the Greenway and along Gate City Boulevard on the property owned by Greensboro Housing Development Partnership. It is part of the redevelopment area, so there will be items coming to the Commission for some of the same approvals that are needed when property is directly owned by the Commission. Mr. Crane will speak in the near future to provide further details on a Sale/Development Agreement. Ms. Arkin believed everyone had contact information for Mr. Crane if there are questions. If Mr. Crane is not available, questions can come to her and she will make sure they are answered.

PLANIT GSO – Comprehensive Plan

Russ Clegg provided an update on the Comprehensive Plan process. They are working on writing introductory pieces and some of the text that goes around the elements where goals and strategies. They are starting to work on the maps. Now that policies are in place, they are looking at how they will create the next Generalized Future Land Use Map and the other maps that support that.

Chair McQueary asked about the interaction to get budget input, because a lot of things cannot happen unless there are budget monies available to do them and how does that factor into the City budget planning process. Mr. Clegg stated they are obtaining input on the overall impact on different types of development over the course of time has on the City's overall budget. They will be starting the implementation part and will visit what the cost will be. Ms. Schwartz added it will also be used as part of the basis for the capital improvements as the City starts doing the long-range bigger picture budget. There is a commitment to put a stronger tie between the Comprehensive Plan and the capital budgeting process.

5. Additional Business

Ms. Arkin stated there is an update on the Heritage House Redevelopment Area, but they will need to go into closed session.

Chair McQueary inquired whether there was any other business to be taken care of before going into closed session. Ms. Arkin responded there is no additional business. The Commission went into closed session at 5:45 p.m.

The Commission returned into open session at 6:24 p.m.

6. Adjournment

Ms. Arkin stated the Heritage House hearing is scheduled for September 4, which is the date of the next regular meeting. She is subpoenaed to speak at the hearing and would like to request the Commission consider moving that meeting to September 11. No one had any issues with the change.

With no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 6:26 pm.

Respectfully Submitted,

Sue Schwartz Planning Director

SS: cgs

**APPROVED MINUTES OF SPECIAL MEETING OF THE
REDEVELOPMENT COMMISSION**

September 11, 2019

The special meeting of the Redevelopment Commission of Greensboro (RGG) was held on Wednesday September 11, 2019 in the Plaza Level Conference Room of the Melvin Municipal Office Building, 300 West Washington Street. The following members were present, Chair Charles McQueary, Wayne Durham, Dawn Chaney, Clinton Gravely, Patrick Johnson. Councilwoman Nancy Hoffmann (City Council) was present. Staff present was Dyan Arkin, José Colón, Russ Clegg, and Dan Curry from the Planning Department. Andrew Kelly, Counsel for the Commission, City Legal Department. Chair McQueary called the meeting to order at 5:00 pm and welcomed everyone to the meeting.

Chair McQueary spoke to the day of September 22, 2001 and requested a moment of reflection in remembrance of the anniversary of 9/11/01.

1. Approval of Meeting Minutes (Approved)

a) Minutes of the August 7, 2019 Regular Meeting.

Ms. Arkin stated Ms. Chaney's name was spelled incorrectly in the minutes. Mr. Johnson advised that under item 1a he abstained from voting but in the count of approvals was included. The minutes will be amended to indicate both changes. Mr. Johnson moved to have the minutes be approved as amended. Seconded by Mr. Gravely. The board voted 4-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Chair McQueary, Mr. Gravely, Ms. Chaney, and Mr. Durham. Nay:, 0.)

2. Willow Oaks Redevelopment Area

a. Proposed Development for 1600, 1602, 1604 McConnell Road.

José Colón advised that Commission-owned 1600, 1602, and 1604 McConnell Road and city-owned 1548 McConnell Road, are located in the Willow Oaks Redevelopment Area may include and indicated the properties on the diagram presented. It would be a combined disposition. Mr. Colón introduced Jeff Guernier, project manager with True Homes construction company, and explained that Mr. Guernier has a plan to acquire the properties for a partnership with North Carolina Agriculture and Technical University to build three single family structures. Mr. Colón stated the properties have been owned by the Commission for 20 years and have a total current tax value of \$28,000 and that mowing and maintenance on the RCG-owned properties is approximately \$781 a year. Mr. Colón indicated on the diagram where the properties were located. The goal is to have an official request and a sales agreement at the October Redevelopment Commission meeting. In response to a question from Chair McQueary, Mr. Colón stated it would be a joint recommendation to sell the RCG- and city-owned properties.

Jeff Guernier, 5313 Wayne Road, Greensboro, introduced Scott Wentz, Executive Partner of True Homes, who will also be speaking before the Commission.

Scott Wentz, 459 Laterberg Lane, Fort Mill, South Carolina. Mr. Wentz thanked the Commission for the opportunity to speak about their company and the relationship and partnership they have with North Carolina A&T. True Homes is a privately held homebuilding company based out of Charlotte, NC. Mr. Wentz stated their homes are built in the entry level price points. They anticipate selling 1900 homes and close on about 1600 of those, with 900 out of Charlotte and about 250 in the Triad area. Mr. Wentz stated the company was founded on the vision of providing people with an opportunity for life and a mission unique in how they relate with their associates, clients, trade, and key stakeholders. As part of that, they have a foundation named the True Foundation and through that foundation developed a partnership in approximately 2016 with North Carolina A&T through the National Housing Endowment, which is the philanthropic arm of the National Association of Home Builders for the sole purpose of promoting the homebuilding industry and to help create an NAHB student chapters in local high schools and universities. True Homes has partnered with the National Housing Endowment

and committed to a \$100,000 donation to the endowment earmarked for North Carolina A&T to open their National Association of Home Builders student chapter and to promote residential instruction within the university. The university will receive \$25,000 a year for the next three years. Mr. Wentz introduced Dr. Robert Pyle with North Carolina A&T. the partnership was launched in 2017 and has developed into a very good partnership in promoting the residential construction industry to students. It is a part of construction that historically has not been the primary focus of construction management programs. Mr. Wentz stated Dr. Pyle had asked a group of 21 students how many would want to be in a residential and how many in commercial, and 19 students raised their hand to be in residential which is radically different than what it has been in the past. Mr. Wentz stated they also have a non-profit called Builders Bridge and through that non-profit provide internships for high school students with local trades. True Homes approached Dr. Pyle for about True Homes acquiring lots close to the University and through the True Foundation building homes. It would be the same permitting process and all the same trades they have used in the Triad area which would be used as a North Carolina A&T curriculum for the construction program. Once a home is sold, True Homes will not make any money on it, they only want to provide the opportunity for the students and opportunities for the students to be exposed to residential construction. There seems to be a movement of young people who want to start their own businesses. The home building industry is starving for new businesses and labor. The biggest industry challenges across the US is land and labor. Mr. Wentz stated their foundation works with several organizations and will build approximately four homes a year to be given to an organization. They do not ask any of the trades for discounts and do not promote. Mr. Wentz stated this project will be unique in the sense they will have to slow it down in order to align it with the curriculum. Mr. Wentz stated his company felt it was also a great opportunity to help with the revitalization of Greensboro. These will be new homes that will match the architectural style of Willow Oaks as closely as possible.

Chair McQueary inquired as to how they found the Redevelopment Commission. Mr. Wentz responded through Mr. Guernier. Mr. Wentz first came up with the idea and bounced it off of the people at A&T who were very excited about it. Mr. Wentz then spoke with Mr. Guernier and determined who owns some of the lots, and that is how they became aware of the Redevelopment Commission. Mr. Guernier stated he used a service called Metrostudy that lists subdivisions that have vacant improved lots and through research identified the ownership. They spoke to Ms. Arkin and Mr. Colón and started the conversation. Mr. Guernier explained that last year it was a voluntary program with A&T where the student chapter participated in a national competition sponsored by the National Association of Home Builders. This year it is a senior level seminar which allows for more accountability for the students to participate. Mr. Guernier stated he does participate and help in the class. He does real estate development locally for True Homes and helps to guide them. Last year the students presented the project in a design and financial sense and will be done again this year. Mr. Wentz stated he started the non-profit and wanted to create synergy and build a bridge between the opportunities existing through home building and the needs of the community. The program has already started in Greensboro. An internship program will be in place for the summer with high schools. The schools also want something for their students to go and do, as a lot will not attend college and will not join the military which are great pathways, but not for everyone. They are trying to provide an opportunity where that gap can be bridged. It is still young in framework. Mr. Wentz stated once everything is in place, they will hire an intern from A&T who will help oversee all of the students who will intern. The more they are exposed and understand the home building industry, the more likely they are to come back.

Mr. Gravely stated he thought the program was great and requested to hear more about the size of the houses and what they might look like. Mr. Wentz responded the size would be whatever they need to make it because they want to accommodate what the Commission wants to see. Regarding the exterior, they have four different collections and over 200 floor plans within their portfolio. This property will be affordable housing for families to move into.

Chair McQueary asked who would carry the financial liability as they are going through the project. Mr. Wentz responded the project is fully through their foundation and stated the foundation is well funded. They are looking for partnerships like this that are long term and are connected to the community.

Ms. Chaney asked if an analysis of the properties surrounding the area had been done, so that what is built will be compatible with the neighborhood. Mr. Wentz responded they are not that far into the process but it will be done. Mr. Guernier stated the elevations have been evaluated, and they will make sure the architecture is appropriate for the neighborhood. There will be variety and the intent is to do one home a year to ensure it is sustaining the student chapter, the scholarships, and the educational benefits to the university moving forward.

Chair McQueary asked if this was something that A&T is very interested in. Robert Pyle, 2043 Stewart Hutchens Road, Whitsett, NC. Dr. Pyle responded they are very much interested. They have a Department of Built Environment, and this project falls into the construction management of the residential area for that department.

Mr. Colón stated this is in Area 3 of Willow Oaks, which has more relaxed architectural standards, and True Homes and staff will ensure the architecture is compatible with the surrounding area. Mr. Gravely asked if the Commission will have a chance to look at the plans. Mr. Colón responded they will make that as part of the presentation for the October meeting.

Councilwoman Sharon Hightower verified the address and asked if it still fell within the Willow Oaks neighborhood plan and still has standards. Mr. Colón responded that was correct, but they are more relaxed than Areas 1 and 2 of Willow Oaks. Mr. Colón stated Area 3 runs south along McConnell Road and north of East Gate City which has a lot of homes up for rehabilitation. The standards are much more relaxed than Areas 1 and 2. Councilwoman Hightower asked if this was the Commission's land. Mr. Colón responded that three lots were RCG-owned and one is city-owned. Mr. Colón stated this is more than a project, it is a program he is excited about and believes it has great potential for the City.

Mr. Colón introduced Dan Curry, a roster employee with the Planning Department, to assist in providing an update on Willow Oaks and stated they both have been working extremely hard to kickstart development in the core of Willow Oaks. It's been more than a decade since single family development and changes were needed to the standards and procedures currently in place in order to get more houses built. Currently there is a focused effort to kickstart development in B and E, Area 2, which includes 27 single family lots, four twin home lots, and one townhome lot.

Mr. Curry stated he was very excited when asked to return to the city and work part time with Mr. Colón and staff to make something happen in Willow Oaks. Mr. Curry stated he enjoys working with Mr. Colón as he not just focusing on homes being built but also doing a lot of community work in helping the Neighborhood Association and the Homeowners' Association in Willow Oaks. There has been a coordinated effort on how to build up the neighborhood organization at the same time houses are being built in the community. Mr. Curry stated he and Mr. Colón are not here asking for anything to be done today but are setting the stage for what they hope to ask next month. There will be a series of recommendations coming for the Commission to review from the Greensboro Housing Development Partnership (GHDP). Mr. Curry provided a brief background for those new to Willow Oaks. In 2007 this Redevelopment Commission entered into a development agreement with the Greensboro Housing Authority (GHA) to set up how property assembled by the Redevelopment Commission on the surrounding areas of what was originally the Morningside Homes public housing project would be redeveloped. The agreement laid out a lot of things including pricing of the lots, how the Housing Authority would hire a lead developer to coordinate all of the development work, and that agreement in 2007 resulted in everything present today which is over 300 housing units.

Mr. Curry stated this is a beautiful neighborhood. There is a lot of vacant land and the way to help this neighborhood is to get the rest of this property built out, get new residents into the community to help support the HOA, and build a strong community. They are currently putting together a development strategy. In 2010 the Housing Authority entered into an agreement with GHDP to take over the lead developer's responsibilities. Councilwoman Hightower is on GHDP's board. It's a collaboration between the City of Greensboro and GHA to achieve development projects, primarily based around affordable housing.

GHDP now is the lead developer and owns most of the vacant land indicated on the map and has the charge to determine how to get developers interested in building again in Willow Oaks. Currently they are phasing this work in Zones B and E, which are located on the east side of the neighborhood and will be the first phase of offerings for property development. There are 32 lots in the two zones scattered among houses already built. The properties will be offered to private homebuilders. The GHDP board will be meeting later in the month to review the strategies recommended. Mr. Curry advised there will be changes that will require approval by the Commission. There likely will be changes in lot pricing, development strategies, types of incentives that will be put out for home builders, and possibly some ideas about how to assist homeowners in buying homes within the community. Mr. Curry feels this will likely to be a comprehensive set of recommendations. It will require some legal work to change the development agreements that are currently in place. It will take several months to work through to get all of it accomplished, but Mr. Curry and Mr. Colón are very excited about the direction they are

going. There was a meeting where home builders were present, along with realtors and lenders' with good ideas expressed. There is interest in getting this program restarted, and ideas will be presented at the next meeting to discuss.

3. Eastside Park Redevelopment Area

a. Consideration of Usage Agreement for Eastside Park Community Center

Ms. Arkin stated that the Eastside Park Community Center is on land owned by the Redevelopment Commission, which has an existing lease with the Eastside Park Community Center non-profit to manage it and provide services and opportunities for the community to use the center, but does not own the center per se. Ms. Arkin stated Mr. Kelly will be speaking to this issue.

Mr. Kelly stated the last time the Commission heard this idea, his general sense was the Commission was looking favorably upon this opportunity for the proposed use as a school program, but there were also concerns to be addressed before coming back to the Commission. Mr. Kelly wanted to make sure the Commission was protected in the sense of whatever they were asked to approve, all the necessary approvals to be able to operate whatever would be in this place. With respect to its operation, it would be insured to the extent that the Commission was protected. Mr. Kelly stated he is not an insurance expert, so he sent the proposal to the City's insurance advisors to ask them to provide input on what was necessary. Mr. Kelly stated the response was included in the facility use agreement provided to the Commissioners. The other hurdle was the approvals from the various building and fire inspectors concerning this property as a school. His understanding is that has not been finalized and the program will not start until next semester but, will asked Phi Barnhill to speak on this issue.

(Councilwoman Hoffmann left the meeting.)

Ms. Arkin explained that Mr. Barnhill is a board member with the Eastside Park Community Center and an employee of East Greensboro Now.

Phil Barnhill, 1921 New Garden Road. Mr. Barnhill stated there are stipulations if the facility is used for these purposes. There were two levels of inspections. Mr. Barnhill advised the items that have to be addressed if this is to proceed would be separate from the agreement as it is all contingent. Mr. Barnhill advised they are waiting on a written report from the Fire Marshall who has completed the inspection. There are a few stipulations that may actually stop the process because it goes back to the original agreement between the City and the East Side Park Community Center in terms of its use. The Fire Marshall spoke to changing the use of the building to a school. If that were to become a requirement, it would stop the project and would not be able to move forward because this cannot be changed from a community center.

Chair McQueary asked if there was something the Commission needed to do. Mr. Barnhill stated he will not be doing anything until there is something in writing to discuss. If a change of use is required, this will not move forward.

Ms. Arkin advised this was placed on the agenda because since this is a special meeting, if it was not on the agenda, there would be no opportunity for the Commission to take action if asked. Since everything has not been completed that is required to be done, Mr. Barnhill will not be requesting approval to sign this agreement. Mr. Barnhill stated it is twofold, to make sure the agreement that is proposed is acceptable and if it did not affect the center, nothing would be done until the other standards are met.

Mr. Gravely inquired what the official use was currently. Mr. Barnhill stated it is a community center, but does not know what the official code is for its community center use. Mr. Barnhill stated if the Fire Marshall has his way and changes are made, it would be reclassified and would lower the current capacity which impacts renting the center for community purposes.

Ms. Arkin stated the lease agreement between the Redevelopment Commission and the Eastside Park Community Center, a non-profit is the same agreement that Mr. Barnhill is referring to. The use stated within the lease agreement is that it needs to be an operating community center in order for them to keep the lease in play.

Chair McQueary asked if this was for information only at this point. Mr. Kelly responded his preference is the Commission not get out ahead of other approvals that are necessary. Mr. Barnhill stated the last conversations, because of this delay, would be if everything can be done at the logical time, it would start in January.

Ms. Arkin stated it appears there is time, so the Commission can choose not to take action at this time. Chair McQueary agreed that the Commission should not make a move without knowing about the other approvals. He felt they were generally in support of the idea, but they need to make sure the approvals are in place. Chair McQueary asked if there were any additional motivations the Commission could provide to get these other entities to provide their inputs. Ms. Arkin stated the Commission could ask staff to facilitate moving this process forward.

Ms. Chaney asked in order to bring it up to code for the fire department and others, if there were funds available. Mr. Barnhill responded some of what the Fire Marshall is requesting will be handled by Eastside directly but some things specific to that program will be placed on them to do.

4. South Elm Street Redevelopment Area

a. Update from Master Developer – South Elm Development Group

Ms. Arkin advised the next item was for two updates. One from the Master Developer, South Elm Development Group and an update from the Component Developer, Greenline Holdings for the South Elm Street Redevelopment area. At the last meeting, the Commission voted to allow Greenline Holdings/Arden Group an additional 90 days to rework the plan with the new partner that has been brought onboard. The Master Developer was the first speaker to provide an update.

Robert Chapman, 2525 Lanier Place, Durham. Office address 410 West Geer Street, Durham. Mr. Chapman stated since the last meeting, there has been a lot of progress with the Rea Ventures, LLC team. They met with staff and others to plan the building of 220 apartments on the east side of South Elm Street. Mr. Chapman stated this project would be using 221D4 HUD loan guarantees. They have spoken to Carol Ward at HUD and there are no projects in the pipeline that have an affordable housing component. Their idea is that 44 of the 220 units would be set aside as affordable, which would give them priority. A contract has been signed with Real Property Research Group to do a market study. There will be a phase for the inducement stage of HUD and a full market study following that. Mr. Chapman stated he feels good about the team, everyone in it, and the help from the City. The big unknown is parking. It has become an even bigger unknown because of Mr. Zimmerman's pressing need to provide parking for an important tenant coming into his facility. Mr. Chapman requested Mr. Rhodes to speak about their 90-day extension and what they have been thinking about.

b. Update from Component Developer – Greenline Holdings, LLC

Milt Rhodes, 1134 Parish Street, Greensboro. Mr. Rhodes stated they participated in the work shop with Rea Ventures and the City. Mr. Rhodes stated he and Mr. Zimmerman attended the meetings. Mr. Rhodes stated their job over past 30 days has been to prepare to come back and provide the Commission with an update. The workshop was all day and was very informative and helpful. They need to focus on their plan and the four pieces of their plan.

Mr. Rhodes stated AZ Development/Arden Group is still working on what the partnership element is. They are looking at a formal partnership that has yet to be determined. They expect to bring before the Commission a draft plan that addresses the program, the timeline, budget applications, and how it coordinates with the east block by the 60-day mark. They do need to consider what is happening on the Eugene side of the railroad tracks as well. Mr. Rhodes stated that is what he expects to bring to the Commission to have something to modify at the 90-day mark and something to take action on.

Chair McQueary asked how the relationship with AZ Development was going. Mr. Rhodes stated they meet approximately twice a week and it is only getting better. Mr. Rhodes stated Mr. Zimmerman brings a very nice presence to their side of the table and stated working with Mr. Zimmerman and Stuart Parks has been very productive.

5. Commission Discussion of Property Disposition

Ms. Arkin provided the Commissioners with a list of the properties owned by the Commission for discussion regarding the disposition of the properties. Chair McQueary stated he thought it may be worthwhile for each of the Commissioners to have an opportunity to air their thoughts about use of the properties that are available and their thoughts regarding where small or tiny houses fit into the overall structure just to make sure everyone is thinking about how to effectively use these properties. Chair McQueary asked the Commissioners to speak to their thoughts and ideas. The general consensus of the Commissioners was the Commission needs to explore all options and have a variety of homes.

Mr. Clegg stated the neighborhood Development Department is in the beginning phase of a long-range housing plan and looking to see how tight the focus needs to be on certain blocks and making improvements, so that people feel comfortable moving into a neighborhood. There are schools that would need to be looked at and how that would impact the real estate market. There are lots of things that cannot be controlled, but there are places where an investment can be made to build on some strengths that are already there. Mr. Clegg is hopeful in the next month or so, there may be an update on that kind of strategy.

Mr. Curry stated the number one thing builders are saying is the biggest barrier is carrying costs. If they're guaranteed they have a home buyer the day that the home is finished, they will build it. Mr. Curry stated it is really important to figure out a way to create a pipeline of buyers and solve the equation of how to build in a market where there are very few comparables that will work for the appraisers and lenders. Mr. Curry stated they will need to slowly build up the values in these communities. That is what is being looked at in Willow Oaks currently and will be the same for the Commission when talking about selling these lots.

Chair McQueary asked Ms. Arkin if she could provide a list indicating what is the most logical lot to convince someone to build a house on. Crime statistics need to be done to attempt to make it possible to come up with an estimate of which properties have the most logical location to make it attractive for someone to purchase and builders to develop. Ms. Arkin stated it would be reasonable to be asked to provide the Commission with other models. There are a lot of practices in other locations that are not being done in Greensboro. Staff can provide the Commission with a handful of those that have some feet or legs elsewhere, that if not highly successful, at least produce some results.

Chair McQueary stated they have talked about giving these properties to adjoining property owners, and it was believed they don't want them because the adjoining property owners do not want to pay any more taxes. Chair McQueary stated perhaps a way could be found to give the property to the adjoining owners tax free, as long as they agree to maintain them, and when the property is sold, it becomes the part of a new plat of land that the next owner will be responsible for.

Mr. Kelly stated Guilford County has a piece of every tax parcel owned in Greensboro. The City of Greensboro has no ability to take less in taxes, in his opinion. By state law, because the property is being held by the City of Greensboro or the Redevelopment Commission, it is non taxable property. Once conveyed to an entity that is subject to taxes, Mr. Kelly did not think the tax assessor in Guilford County has any legal mechanism to waive his ability to collect taxes. Ms. Arkin stated there are programs that do have moratoriums on property tax, but did not think any were in North Carolina.

Chair McQueary thanked everyone for their comments. He is hoping the Redevelopment Commission will not still have 72 pieces of property next year at this time.

6. Staff Updates

Heritage House Redevelopment Area: Mr. Kelly advised the hearing that was scheduled to be heard last week was continued. The complaint was amended and the hearing is scheduled for the week of November 4. The judge will also at that point schedule a trial the week of that same date, should it be necessary. Nothing else has changed. Chair McQueary inquired if anyone other than Mr. Gravely and himself were served papers. Ms. Arkin stated she was as well.

Ms. Arkin advised there is no update on the Ole Asheboro redevelopment area. The Prestwick projects are still in progress and moving forward, but there is no specific update at the present.

Ms. Arkin stated there are two fliers for each Commissioner regarding Bruce Katz, speaker on The New Localism, which is basically taking ownership of creating your own city and making the local assets work for you. Mr. Katz is also one of the folks working very hard on helping municipalities understand how to best leverage opportunities within Opportunity Zones. The talk is free to the public on Monday, September 23, and there is a luncheon event on Tuesday. The Planning Department will sponsor Commissioners if they would like to attend the luncheon event. Ms. Arkin requested that anyone interested contact her and she will get them signed up. Ms. Arkin asked if the Commissioners would share the fliers in their networks and communities.

Mr. Clegg stated he believes Mr. Katz will be a strong speaker and advised Mr. Katz will be selling and signing books at the Monday evening event.

7. Additional Business

No additional business.

8. Adjournment

Chair McQueary thanked everyone for coming and with no other business, the meeting was adjourned at 6:31 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Sue Schwartz Planning Director

SS: cgs

APPROVED
REGULAR MEETING OF THE
REDEVELOPMENT COMMISSION
OCTOBER 2, 2019

The meeting of the Redevelopment Commission of Greensboro (RGG) was held on Wednesday, October 2, 2019 in the Plaza Level Conference Room of the Melvin Municipal Office Building, 300 West Washington Street. The following members were present, Chair Charles McQueary, Wayne Durham, Patrick Johnson, Dawn Chaney, and Clinton Gravely. Staff present was Dyan Arkin, José Colón, Russ Clegg, and Dan Curry from the Planning Department. Andrew Kelly, Counsel for the Commission, City Legal Department.

Chair McQueary called the meeting to order at 5:00 pm and welcomed everyone to the meeting.

1. Approval of Meeting Minutes (Approved)

a) Minutes of the September 11, 2019 Special Meeting.

Ms. Arkin stated Ms. Chaney's name was spelled incorrectly in the minutes. Mr. Johnson advised that under item 1a he abstained from voting but in the count of approvals was included. The minutes will be amended to indicate both changes. Mr. Johnson moved to have the minutes be approved as amended. Second by Mr. Gravely. (Ayes: Chair McQueary, Mr. Gravely, Ms. Chaney, Mr. Johnson, and Mr. Durham. Nays: 0.)

2. Willow Oaks Redevelopment Area

a. Builder Prospectus and Proposed Revisions to Development Program

Mr. Colón presented the builder prospectus and proposed changes to the design guidelines to the Commission. Mr. Colón advised the Commissioners that the prospectus also included the proposed guideline changes as Exhibits D and E. Staff will be happy to address any questions or concerns.

Mr. Curry provided a brief history regarding the Willow Oaks Redevelopment area. Mr. Curry stated prior to 2010 the Greensboro Housing Authority (GHA) was the lead entity in charge of the Hope VI project. The GHA hired a lead developer, Mid-City Urban, to do most of the pre-development work for the project and coordinated the development of the first housing development which consisted of approximately 200 townhouse units and over a 100 single-family homes. Due to the housing recession, a change in the lead developer was made in 2010, with Mid-City Development no longer overseeing projects. GHA entered into an agreement with the Greensboro Housing Development Partnership (GHDP) to assume the lead development role for the project and transferred the properties to GHDP. At the same time, the Redevelopment Commission entered into an agreement with GHDP that stated how the properties would be sold and how revenue from the lot sales would be allocated and executed notes and deeds of trust. Staff is working with GHDP to develop the remaining these properties. In 2018 a new redevelopment plan and a neighborhood plan were approved. The City issued a Request for Proposals (RFP) this past year for development, but did not receive any proposals.

Chair McQueary asked if Mr. Curry could comment on why there were no proposals. Mr. Curry responded the feedback obtained by staff indicated the key item was the considerable amount of work a developer would need to put together an RFP, with no assurance they would be selected. Other concerns were the financial feasibility of the individual parcels as designed in the redevelopment plan. In working with GHDP up to this point, the focus is how to phase the work and present it in a more palatable format to the development community. The prospectus is for single-family lots; staff will present some of the larger parcels in the other zones of the community at a later time.

Chair McQueary asked if going to single-family housing first before going to multi-family was the preference of the neighborhood. Mr. Curry responded there are single family lots laid out that are basically builder-ready lots with utilities and building pads in place. The prospectus describes a simpler method of how lots will be sold without

using RFPs. It will be an ongoing, revolving process rather than a competitive process, so a builder can submit a proposal at any time if they are interested in a lot. The larger parcels that are intended for multi-family are more complicated development deals. Staff is looking at ways to add additional incentives on those parcels before going out to the development community, so it will be easier for the development community to respond. Staff feels there is a strong interest currently in the home ownership market.

Chair McQueary asked if the RFP specifies size and/or price points. Mr. Curry stated the prospectus does not. It will be up to the builders. There are incentives that might direct a person to a home smaller than 1500 square feet, such as reductions in capacity use fees, but size is primarily based on the market.

Chair McQueary inquired if the builders carry their own financial load until the house is sold. Mr. Curry responded that the City is looking at the possibility of a construction financing program, but it is not in place, so is not in the prospectus. Staff is proposing to subordinate the lot cost, so the builder would not be out of pocket during construction. When these programs are worked out through, they will be included in the prospectus.

Ms. Chaney inquired if there was financial banking from banks and credit unions to support some of the costs until a building was built and then sold. Mr. Curry stated there have been discussions with a number of lenders, but there are no formal commitments, and they are about four to six months away from builders being ready to start the construction financing process. Staff is hopeful there will be financing through one or more lenders for the both builders and home owners. Mr. Curry stated the North Carolina Housing Finance Agency (NCHFA) has home ownership incentives if applicants go through one of the approved lenders for their financing. There are several lenders participating in that program. Mr. Curry did not know if the city ownership program has partnerships with specific lenders. Staff has reached out to some lenders and will be reaching out to more as it gets closer to when the builders looking for financing.

Mr. Colón stated that this is an introduction to the prospectus with no action required.

Mr. Colón stated all of the lots listed in the prospectus currently are owned by the GHPD, and staff will update the Commission on marketing, the disposition strategy, and how GHPD strives to redevelop the area on behalf of the Commission. Mr. Colón stated the proposed design guidelines are part of the Willow Oaks Neighborhood Plan, not the redevelopment portion of the plan. Staff does recognize and acknowledges that the neighborhood plan is essential to implement redevelopment activities in Willow Oaks. Mr. Colon provided a map indicating the outline of the Willow Oaks redevelopment area that highlighted zones B and E indicated in the prospectus. Some changes in the design guidelines will be applicable to all areas of Willow Oaks, primarily the addition of premium vinyl as an exterior siding option. There will be changes within the design guidelines applicable to a specific area or a group of areas. Exhibit E indicates the design guidelines anticipated for each areas. Mr. Colón stated the intent is to offer this opportunity as an ongoing application process as opposed to a more structured RFP. Mr. Colón stated items to be submitted by a homebuilder seeking approval are listed on page 4 of the prospectus. There will be restrictions on how many lots can be reserved at a time, as well as the location of the lots to each other and how any lots can be developed at once.

Mr. Colón stated the price currently for a single-family lot is \$20,000, and the new lot prices will be determined by the square footage of the lot. Small lots will be approximately \$10,000; larger lots will be \$25,000. The majority of the lots will be in the \$15,000 - \$20,000 range. Exhibit A contains the pricing and dimensions of the lots. Mr. Colón stated the current lot price is reflected in the 2007 Sales Development Agreement between the Commission and GHA. Staff is working with GHDP legal counsel and City legal staff to amend that Agreement to incorporate the new pricing scale and will present it to the Commission when completed.

Mr. Gravely asked how the pricing was determined. Mr. Curry responded that market analysis had been done and continues to be done to identify comparables in the area, which is difficult because these lots are essentially builder-ready whereas others are not. Mr. Curry said they listened to the builders to come up with a base price that can be reduced depending on certain criteria included in the construction. Staff expects most of the lots to be sold less than base price which will help builders and home buyers both. Mr. Curry stated there has not been a full appraisal done because of the lack of comparables.

Mr. Curry stated the intention is to provide opportunities for the lot price to be reduced if elements are added to a house that will add value to the property. One of the challenges in Willow Oaks is getting the homes to appraise at

a high enough level for the deals to work. Mr. Curry stated they are encouraged by the movement in the market currently, but it will be difficult for builders to build homes at a low enough cost. The incentives will be capped so lot prices will not fall below \$5,000 to ensure revenue will come back to GHDP to pay at least part of their expenses to do the work. Staff has worked closely with realtors and appraisals who assisted in determining some of the elements.

Chair McQueary asked if there had been any feedback from builders. Mr. Curry stated there was a builder focus meeting at Willow Oaks and staff walked through the incentives to the group. GHDP has several builders who are on their Board and have created a sub-committee to work with staff. Staff will be open to other incentives or revisions.

Chair McQueary asked how decisions are being made. Mr. Colón responded final decisions are up to the GHDP board. Mr. Curry stated GHDP is a private, non-profit organization able to work in a different manner than the City or the Commission. GHDP can be more flexible in working with builders and developers. GHDP is the lead developer, owns the property, and is offering them for sale. They will approve builder applications and lot reservations and so forth.

Mr. Curry mentioned that one of the changes is allowing the use of vinyl siding. The biggest question from builders was why they were not allowed to use vinyl siding. The original design standards did not allow it and almost everything has been built with HardiePlank siding. Some of the wood trim on porches has maintenance issues currently. Staff met with the neighborhood with a good turnout of residents. There were a lot of questions, some concerns, but it was a unanimous decision by the residents that they supported this change and are onboard with it. Mr. Curry stated a lot of the changes were to update the guidelines to reflect what current construction standards. Due to the maintenance issues, wood is no longer allowed for front porch railings and balustrades. It will be a vinyl product or a composition product. Mr. Colón stated the change would be applicable to all the areas within Willow Oaks. An existing homeowner will have a choice to change siding from hardy board to a premium vinyl.

Chair McQueary asked when the next update will be. Mr. Colón responded updates will be provided monthly. Mr. Colón stated staff is working with legal counsel to draft new agreements between GHDP and the Commission, which may take a couple of months.

Mr. Colon told Commissioners that Jeff Guernier of True Homes was not able to attend this meeting, so the Sale/Development Agreement will be brought to the November meeting. Chair McQueary stated if there was anything the Commission could do to assist, they would like to know as soon as possible.

3. South Elm Street Redevelopment Area

a. Update from Master Developer – South Elm Development Group

Ms. Arkin explained that neither Bob Chapman nor Bob Isner of the South Elm Development Group could make the meeting, so she provided an update based on conversations with them and work done together.

Ms. Arkin stated the master development team will be present for the November meeting and intend to bring a draft of a development agreement, or a development program and terms and conditions of the anticipated agreement with Rea Ventures. She has spoken with both and they are moving ahead at a very good pace. Their market studies indicate a need for the types of units proposed to be built, so they are very comfortable moving forward. They are working closely with financial advisers and institutions, and there are several financing options available. Ms. Arkin spoke with the project manager from Rea Ventures regarding some of the financing options and how they would work in conjunction with City processes and how the City might participate in the project. City participation potentially involves assistance with a parking structure and with affordable housing. Rea Ventures plans to develop the east block where Union Square Campus is, then come back to the Commission with a request to purchase the property between the railroad tracks and Eugene Street on either side of Bragg. They are fully committed to the project and are excited to start.

Mr. Gravely asked if there was an update on relocation of the storm line that encroaches on 741 South Elm Street. Ms. Arkin responded design is still in progress as part of the package being designed for the infrastructure, improvements along South Elm and West Gate City Boulevard.

Ms. Chaney strongly suggested the developer get in touch with Mr. Gray as the developers need to approach it when the whole land area is being developed. Ms. Arkin felt the developers intend to but are being strategic in their approach.

b. Update from Component Developer – Greenline Holdings, LLC

Milt Rhodes, 1134 Parish Street, stated his objective was to let the Commission know where he believes they are headed on the proposal that they are working on with Mr. Zimmerman. There are continuing discussions regarding site development and what their partnership looks like. The focus is on more residential density and 8-12,000 square feet of commercial space along Gate City Boulevard. They are looking more in the 240–260-unit range for multi-family as opposed to the for sale townhome product initially proposed that has fallen flat.

Chair McQueary asked Mr. Rhodes to be more precise in what more density means. Mr. Rhodes responded it is the center of south Greensboro. A lower density product should not be placed in the center of town. Having more housing is really important. Townhomes could be built but would not meet a perceived density need in this sub-market of downtown Greensboro.

Chair McQueary asked if rental and density go hand in hand. Mr. Rhodes responded there is a rental component to it. It happened before the recession with a lot of rental units and setting them up for future ownership, which is called a condo conversion in a rental building.

Mr. Rhodes stated they are looking at how to structure buildings for a district that is ready to convert over. In addition, they are attempting to satisfy both the parking demand and additional parking demands for the larger district. Mr. Rhodes stated the timeline working through this project and other decisions need to be discussed, along with a number of things outside of their control as component developer pertaining to the west block. Mr. Rhodes was reluctant to speak regarding what the future time line would be as it is dependent on what occurs on the east block. Mr. Rhodes stated they are eager to stay involved and eager to participate. They are in it for the long haul. There is a significant amount of money invested in the project and they have gone through a number of variations to get to a point of an achievable project. The goal over the next month is to solidify the partnership agreement, solidify the development program, and send to Ms. Arkin so it can come before the Commission for review to see how it fits within the other plans and move forward in a proper direction. Mr. Rhodes expects to have Mr. Zimmerman and Mr. Chapman with him for the presentation at the next meeting.

c. Update from Staff – South Elm Street

Ms. Arkin stated previously it was anticipated that the west block would develop before the east block, but is becoming clear that the east block will be ahead of the west block.

Ms. Arkin reminded the Commission that Centric Brands announced they would be bringing over 200 jobs to the Greensboro area in the Gateway Building on West Gate City Boulevard. The property is owned by Andy Zimmerman and his company and directly across from the west block of the South Elm Street Redevelopment area. The salaries for those jobs average about \$50,000, which are good jobs, desirable, and in the downtown area. She explained that the City of Greensboro agreed to work with Mr. Zimmerman to identify locations where people working within the building could park. Mr. Zimmerman thinks by the end of the year there will be over 300 people working in the building Gateway Building and is feeling the pressure of not having enough parking. The building has 45 spaces available, and there is no requirement for them to add on-site spaces as they are within the central business district.

Before the August RCG meeting, the Arden Group and Mr. Zimmerman met with the City Manager and others to propose that the west block be used as surface parking for this purpose. City Manager and City Council were amenable to the idea and asked staff to look at how that might work.

Ms. Arkin spoke extensively with both the Master Developer and the proposed component developer Rea Ventures. They were in agreement that it could work out very well, as it allows the east block to be developed before the west block, and allows for a permanent parking solution to be fully developed on the east block. The intention of the Redevelopment Plan was always there would be 700 or 800 structured parking spaces on these two blocks somehow. Rea Ventures is willing build additional parking to provide parking for Union Square Campus and possibly add enough spaces to relieve some pressure in the greater development areas. Ms. Arkin

explained that it has not been determined what amount or form of assistance from the City would be required to do so.

Ms. Arkin stated it appears to be workable for all of the parties involved, so staff has been working with various city departments to create a strategy for grading the site and creating a temporary gravel lot.

Chair McQueary fully understands the logic in what is being talked about to be done, but did not understand why the City did not promote providing bits and pieces of parking that would have solved this problem before now. Ms. Arkin stated there are a lot of surface parking lots downtown. Mr. Zimmerman had proposed purchasing a golf cart to shuffle people around. Mr. Zimmerman was the lead on trying to find locations for potential parking. The aggregate number of spaces that were put together did not meet the needs. The proposed temporary surface parking could meet the needs of Mr. Zimmerman's tenants and help to relieve some of the pressure for Union Square Campus as the east block is developed. It is not a permanent solution. It is a very short term solution.

Ms. Chaney stated what she recalled was that Mr. Zimmerman was taking the first corner of Gate City Boulevard and South Elm for about 33 parking spots on that corner and asked is it now being extended all the way down. Ms. Arkin responded on the west block, yes. Ms. Chaney stated that never came before the Commission. Mr. Kelly stated that is what they are being asked.

Ms. Chaney asked will it go all the way to Bragg Street. Ms. Arkin responded that was correct. Ms. Chaney asked about next door, across the tracks, if the corner up there could be developed as parking because the Redevelopment Commission owns it. Ms. Arkin stated it was not as desirable for the Union Square Campus folks. Ms. Chaney understood, but thought Mr. Zimmerman will need 300 or close to that many and would allow additional parking there. Ms. Chaney's concern is the timing of the east side to build a parking garage. Mr. Kelly stated once construction starts, probably two years. Ms. Chaney asked if the problem with the tower has been resolved. Mr. Kelly stated the lease is up in May of 2022. Ms. Arkin advised there are ongoing conversations with the owner of the tower, and the Master Developer has a meeting with that group up north at the middle or end of October to discuss the possibility of them moving off of that tower earlier in order to move on to the top of one of the buildings that will be constructed. This conversation has been ongoing for a number of years and the owner is interested and open to the idea, which would expedite the removal of that tower. Ms. Chaney is concerned over continuous delays because this needs to move expeditiously.

Milt Rhodes, 1134 Parrish Street, stated when this project was started looking at the west block, there was no Gateway Building, no Centric, nothing was there, and he is excited that the 39 apartments and townhomes originally proposed by Arden were not built. It is a good thing they were not in the middle of construction because the opportunity came up to get the Gateway Building populated was really to get jobs. Union Square uses the land currently for parking during events. Mr. Rhodes stated before the early part of the summer, he was prepared to bring to the Commission a packet to close in on the property and move forward with buildings and then it was paused to think strategically about what needed to happen effectively. As the east block moves along for the civic purpose and for the other purposes around there, it is important to keep having a dialog on it and continue to work. As he is putting his plan for a building, there are some unknowns that are both City, Union Square, and other related. Talking needs to continue as they work through a final plan.

Chair McQueary asked when will the City make a decision about what it is going to do specifically as providing parking for Mr. Zimmerman. Ms. Arkin stated they will be moving in within the next six weeks. The parking cannot be completed in that timeframe. The initial design work will be done in a week or so. Mr. Zimmerman and the City together have located spaces around town and there are options that can be used temporarily.

Mr. Rhodes stated when he brings the plan in November, it is very likely he will be able to complete the task regarding the new information. They will continue working as closely as they can as new information is presented.

Mr. Kelly stated the Commission is going to be asked to lease the parking space property for a length of time until an alternative parking arrangement is completed.

4. Staff Updates

a. Heritage House Redevelopment Area

Chair McQueary inquired if anything needed to be done regarding the papers served to him and other members of the Commission. Mr. Kelly responded they do not need to do anything. Attorneys are meeting with the property owner.

b. PLANIT GSO – Comprehensive Plan Update

Mr. Clegg stated, as part of the speaker series, former HUD Chair under President Clinton and Mayor of San Antonio, Henry Cisneros, will be speaking in Greensboro on the 29th and 30th of October. Information will be sent. The 29th will be a community presentation at the History Museum and on the 30th, a luncheon.

Ms. Arkin provided flyers regarding the Opportunity Zone website to the Commissioner.

5. Additional Business

Ms. Arkin displayed a new plat the city survey crew and engineering department put together combining approximately nine properties on the west block. Staff would like to go ahead and combine them to be one parcel. As staff was working through the different pieces of the greater project, one of the engineers stated there are some calls that don't match up and it is not working out the way that it looked on the previous plat and suggested to make it all into one parcel. Survey personnel put together a new plat and staff is asking the Commissioners to authorize the Chair to sign to be recorded.

A motion was made by Mr. Durham to authorize Chair McQueary to sign the plat, seconded by Ms. Chaney. The Board voted 5-0). Ayes: Chair McQueary, Mr. Gravely, Ms. Chaney, Mr. Johnson, and Mr. Durham. Nays, 0.)

6. Adjournment

Chair McQueary thanked everyone for coming and with no other business, the meeting was adjourned at 6:17 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Sue Schwartz Planning Director

SS: cgs

APPROVED
REGULAR MEETING OF THE
REDEVELOPMENT COMMISSION

November 6, 2019

The regular meeting of the Redevelopment Commission of Greensboro (RGG) was held on Wednesday November 6, 2019 in the Plaza Level Conference Room of the Melvin Municipal Office Building, 300 West Washington Street. The following members were present: Chair Charles McQueary, Sondra Wright, Patrick Johnson, Dawn Chaney, Clinton Gravely, and Wayne Durham, as well as Councilwoman Nancy Hoffmann (City Council). Staff present was Dyan Arkin, José Colón, and Russ Clegg, Planning Department and Andrew Kelly, Counsel for the Commission, City Legal Department. Chair McQueary called the meeting to order at 5:00 pm and welcomed everyone to the meeting.

The regular meeting was delayed due to a closed session held from 5:00 to 5:51 p.m.

1. Approval of Meeting Minutes (Approved)

a) Minutes of the October 2, 2019 Regular Meeting.

Mr. Johnson moved to have the minutes be approved. Second by Ms. Chaney. (Ayes: Chair McQueary, Mr. Gravely, Ms. Wright, Mr. Johnson, Mr. Durham and Ms. Chaney. Nays: 0.)

2. South Elm Street Redevelopment Area

a. Update from Master Developer – South Elm Development Group.

Bob Isner, 1707 Willow Wick Drive, a partner in the South Elm Development Group. Mr. Isner stated they have been diligent in looking at other options for the development currently as some of the things have changed. Temporary parking for Andy Zimmerman's group is a hot topic. They have been talking to deck builders as eventually that will need to be in that area. Mr. Isner advised they are looking at the far west parcel area and there will be a meeting to see what the next steps are moving forward.

b. Update from Component Developer – Greenline Holdings, LLC

Ms. Arkin advised the Commissioners there is a memo in their packet summarizing the last few meetings to refresh memories of the August meeting where the Redevelopment Commission allowed for a 90-day extension moving towards closing in order to allow the Arden Group to work with Andy Zimmerman and his companies to determine a better development plan. Mr. Rhodes will provide an update.

Milt Rhodes, 1134 Parish Street, stated he is with the Arden Group at 11 Brookstown Avenue in Winston-Salem. Mr. Rhodes referred to a request and a letter attached to the request which summarized his experience on the project and the point where it is currently. With the changes that have occurred in the last 30 days, he is unable to complete the task set out for him to come to the November meeting with a 90-day report. Mr. Rhodes stated he did not know what kind of project to present as he does not have a timeline on the use of the property that was expected to be closed on and does not have any terms associated with what will happen on that property.

Mr. Rhodes stated the next presentation may help him learn some. Mr. Rhodes stated in the letter presented, he is asking very specifically that the Commission hone the terms of their contract to do the work on the West Block, when there is some certainty known about what will happen with the West Block. Currently it is a vague notion of temporary parking. In working with Andy Zimmerman over the past 90 days, neither of them has come up with a partnership because they do not know what type of project could be done on that block. Their intent is do a high

quality mixed use project and have put a lot of money and time trying to determine alternatives. In July they had asked for a delay in order to reach a solution but the developments in the last 35 days or so have changed that. Mr. Rhodes stated he does not know how to approach that until he has definition and is requesting the Commission to help, to honor the terms of the contract currently, and to work towards a new agreement when the time is right. They would like to be there first in order to do that.

Chair McQueary stated since the Commission has just received it, they are not prepared to respond. They will review the details and will respond as soon as they can. Mr. Rhodes stated that was fair and thanked the Commission.

c. Consideration of Temporary Parking on West Block

Ms. Arkin stated this is a request by the City of Greensboro requesting utilization of the west block for a proposed temporary parking area. The suggestion was originally made by the Arden Group and Mr. Zimmerman that this area be used as a temporary parking facility while a potential parking structure was built on the east block as part of that development on the east block. This request came in order to provide parking for the Centrix Brand group which has moved into 620 West Gate City Boulevard, the building owned by Mr. Zimmerman. The City of Greensboro is amenable to placing temporary parking there as there are benefits to the whole project in doing that. One is it would free up the opportunity to construct on the east block the development Rea Ventures will bring forward which will include a parking structure. The thought was the west block project would move forward more quickly and then the east block would follow. The Commission is being asked to let the City move the temporary parking across the street to provide parking for the Centrix Group and whoever else will be in the 620 West Gate City Boulevard building and will provide the opportunity for development of the east block.

Ms. Arkin indicated on a projected picture where the proposed parking area would be. It would be 288 spaces and indicated where the existing temporary parking was located. Staff is suggesting the temporary parking be extended all the way down and would be gravel with wheel stops. Included in those 30 spaces already created, there would be 288 spaces with 12 ADA component spaces included. It would be installed under a participation agreement or a reimbursement agreement with the South Elm Development Group. There is an agreement currently in place with them and some work has been done under that agreement. This work could be done through that same avenue. Consideration of the agreement by City Council will be on November 19, 2019 if the Commission agrees this use is acceptable. During construction, staff would like to ask that the Commission allows the City to dedicate approximately 80 spaces and indicated on a projected diagram where those spaces would be for the Centrix Group.

Ms. Arkin stated it was thought there would be an agreement on the terms of the lease received. AZ Development, doing business here as ZCDF, LLC, has asked for the right to lease the parking once it is constructed for the use of the tenants within the 620 West Gate City Boulevard building. Staff is in the process of negotiating terms of what that lease might look like to bring to the Commission for consideration. The time period for this parking area would be during the construction of the work on the east block. There is not a clear timeline and staff is moving to present a clear timeline to the Commission at the next meeting, along with the sales agreement with Rea Ventures.

Chair McQueary asked to be shown where the 288 parking was. Ms. Arkin indicated on the diagram the spaces. Ms. Arkin indicated 40 spaces at the top of the diagram that are in existence and the east side parking that is already in existence.

Chair McQueary asked if that was largely being used by the Union Square. Ms. Arkin responded it is largely being used by Union Square and probably exclusive as no one else has known it is there, but it is a public parking area. The City would like to designate a small portion of those spaces for use by Centrix to allow their folks access to parking. Ms. Arkin advised Mr. Merrill, representing Union Square, was present and although not completely comfortable with it, they are willing to be good neighbors and to share. Mr. Merrill stated for the most part that was correct. Ms. Arkin stated everyone involved understands there is not enough parking for everybody.

Chair McQueary asked how many spaces were there on the east side. Ms. Arkin responded it was about 225 and 35 would be taken from that. Chair McQueary asked why Mr. Zimmerman needed 288 spaces, plus another 35 when the number of advertised employees is 200. Ms. Arkin responded it would be 288 spaces total. Mr. Zimmerman would have the ability to use the west side spaces until and area (indicated on the diagram) is constructed which should only be a few months. Ms. Arkin stated the building is anticipating being up to 250 by the end of the year. Mr. Zimmerman has also informed staff that he is in negotiations with other companies and anticipates that his building will house over 300 people by the end of the year. They are not assuming everyone will park there, but are trying to ensure there are other options available. The lease agreement will come before the Commission at the next meeting. Mr. Isner stated temporary parking lot is really a place holder that will be needed if there is ever a structured parking deck built next to the Union Square building.

Chair McQueary stated his concern is agreeing to lease all the parking spaces before knowing there will be a sufficient number of people using them and then for whatever reason is not used, negotiations would have to be done to get spaces for Union Square or other places. His thought is it would be more logical to agree to some kind of lease that provides all the spaces needed based upon what is known for a fact currently, with an understanding that the Commission will agree to negotiate additional spaces as the number of people in the building increases. Ms. Arkin stated everyone is still working through the terms and conditions of that lease and will take that into consideration as discussions continue. Chair McQueary stated he felt the Commission has an obligation to Union Square and to not lose sight of their obligation. Ms. Arkin advised Mr. Merrill and the Union Square Board the City of Greensboro is not losing sight of its social obligation. It is an amazing building with amazing people working there. Staff is trying their best to determine the parking needs of the area with the Master Developer, the new developer coming on board, Mr. Zimmerman, and Mr. Merrill. Chair McQueary referenced Ms. Chaney's statement if the parking structure people get in quickly and get it done, there would be less problems. The key to making all of this fit together is to get a parking deck in place. Ms. Arkin advised the City's Department of Transportation and the planners have been working very closely with the Master Developer and Rea Ventures to integrate the building into their development. It would be the first component built. There are a lot of moving parts and staff is trying to solve some short-term issues without creating more issues for development. There are some long-term issues that cannot be solved currently.

Ms. Chaney recommended the Commission go across the tracks that the City owns for additional parking rather than going to the east where the new parking garage will be going up. Ms. Arkin stated all of the details have not been worked out in how Union Square will be supported but the intention is to make it work. The anticipated buildout of the area is the eastern block will build out first. Rea Ventures are interested in building out to the far west block also but they will sequence the work so that parking will continue to be available while the construction is being done.

Mr. Gravely stated after hearing all of this, he would like to hear how this is affecting Mr. Rhodes.

Mr. Rhodes stated when they pushed to look at an alternative, it did not stop them from wanting to proceed from acquiring the property. At the time the temporary parking lot was presented, the expectation was Arden would continue to close on the property, they would build the temporary parking space with a lease agreement to a user adjacent and proceed to redevelop the property. That was what he had expected to bring to the Commission at the 90-day presentation. At some point in the last 35 days, it went from Arden having a role in the execution of this part of the jigsaw puzzle to Arden not having a role. He is trying to push pause to continue on that piece of property but cannot do it forever. Mr. Rhodes stated he needs to make sure the contractual obligations that each other has been working on is honored to a degree that is satisfactory to both sides. Thinking about the use of the property, it makes total sense. There is a clear piece of property with nothing on it. The temporary problem needs to be taken care to provide for growth and be able to transition to other blocks where it makes sense to go vertical with what needs to go vertical and bounce back. At that point in time if successful, the Commission's other ventures and growth of the South Elm buildings will make redevelopment on the west block that much more possible. Perhaps at that point the second garage will be built that is needed for the growth of the whole district.

On this timeline of events where there is a period of time on the west block and a period of time on construction on the east block, and then come back to the west block, it may be a 4- to 5-year period. At the end of the day, there is some really good civic infrastructure that allows for growth the right way for the rest of the district. Arden wants to stay involved, to contribute their expertise and relationships to make it happen. Mr. Rhodes stated it was a good thing this was not closed back in January or there would be a bigger problem and feels it is important for Arden to keep a seat at the table until such time there is no longer a reason to be at the table.

Mr. Gravely asked if the change affected Arden related to time and money spent. Mr. Rhodes responded it is six figures that have been spent under thinking Arden would be moving forward with the project in the very near future. It is definitely in his interest to try to capture some of that moving forward and would hate to not be able to do that. Mr. Rhodes stated the taste in his mouth from things happening around the site is not great and wants to make sure it gets better. Mr. Rhodes stated this absolutely affects Arden and puts an unknown delay in a growth plan for his company and a project that was seen as valid. At this point the project is probably no longer valid because the work that will happen on the east block at the same time as a garage. It creates a serious delay.

Ms. Arkin stated staff did not have an opportunity to see this letter prior to the meeting. Included in the packet to the Commissioners, is her memo regarding what she understood was being asked by the Arden Group, which was for a right of first refusal. Ms. Arkin presented slides reviewing what had been anticipated from Greenline at the August meeting and what was asked of them to bring back to this meeting. A slide reiterating the original sales development agreement terms and conditions was also shown. Ms. Arkin stated she had anticipated going through the slides and then asking the Commission's attorney to talk about what the options would be for the Commission in relation to the sales development agreement currently with the Arden Group and Greenline Holdings. Ms. Arkin stated the letter somewhat changed that because she did not know what was in the letter yet.

Chair McQueary stated it was best to wait until everyone has had a chance to digest the contents of the letter and not talk about an interim step of what it was thought to be. Chair McQueary asked for it to be placed on the agenda for the next meeting.

Ms. Arkin asked Mr. Kelly if the Commission needed to take action on the request for the City of Greensboro for the use of this area as a temporary parking lot. Mr. Kelly responded his recommendation was to look at the lease that will be completed. Ms. Arkin responded the construction of the parking is separate from the lease. Ms. Arkin advised if this does not continue moving forward with approvals and construction, the parking may not be ready for many months. Chair McQueary asked if it could be dealt with as a two-piece approval from the Commission to agree to have the City convert it into a temporary parking lot.

Mr. Kelly stated he read quickly through the letter and advised the Commission take the time to read it thoroughly. Mr. Kelly stated he has some immediate concerns with what is in the letter and the Commission moving forward with authorizing parking construction on this site. Mr. Kelly felt Mr. Rhodes was saying that he cannot move forward with his projects if the Commission does this. To Mr. Kelly, it was opening a door that would say the Commission was in breach and that Mr. Rhodes was unprepared to close on his deal because this manifested at around the same time. Mr. Kelly stated as he reads it, the letter says that Mr. Rhodes was not able to close on the deal because of the parking. This could have different implications to the Redevelopment Commission, and he would like the Commission to be fully informed before taking action.

The Commission was in agreement that there would be no action taken at this time.

3. Eastside Park Redevelopment Area

a. Consideration of Community Center Sublease Agreement

Ms. Arkin stated within the Commissioner's agenda packet was the previous sublease agreement for the Community Center. Ms. Arkin received from Phil Barnhill the required approvals of the Fire Marshall and Building Inspection group which is what the Commissioners were looking for in order to consider the lease. Mr.

Kelly advised the Commission previously when considering certain deals, a motion for approval once it is demonstrated that there is insurance as dictated by the lease would be needed. Ms. Arkin stated at the last meeting, the Redevelopment Commission did ask for the inspections to be completed and approval to be demonstrated. That has been done but do not currently, as of this meeting, have the insurance.

Phil Barnhill, 1921 New Garden Road, stated the only main difference in the agreement were errors in terms of an incorrect name and other minor things. Nothing of substance was changed in the agreement.

Mr. Gravely asked if he had to go through a change of use with the City. Mr. Barnhill responded the Fire Marshall realized this was not going to change the building. That made it easier to go back through the second time. The concern was if that was going to be an issue in allowing the use of the facility, he was going to stop the process because the use of the building cannot be changed. Mr. Barnhill stated in terms of the insurance issue, the agreement has not been signed. It was waiting to see if the Commission was willing to accept an agreement, making sure the terms would meet the Commission's standards and then would proceed from there. Part of the agreement requires copies and documentation of insurance first.

Chair McQueary asked if Mr. Kelly had examined the document. Mr. Kelly responded it has not come to his attention to date. Mr. Kelly asked Mr. Barnhill if he had a proposed time line. Mr. Barnhill stated the lease starts in January. Chair McQueary asked Mr. Kelly if he needed time to review the document to determine if it has all of the terms and conditions previously stated by the Commission were needed. Mr. Kelly responded it is an option for the Commission to decide to not move forward until it has been reviewed by him. Chair McQueary asked if this approval could be decided for the use subject to legal review and agreement that contains the necessary terms and conditions. Mr. Kelly stated he preferred the Commission not do that. Ms. Chaney asked if this could be brought back to the December meeting and still meet the deadline for January. Mr. Barnhill did not see any problem with that. Chair McQueary stated it has been agreed that this document or its variation will be reviewed by the City Attorney and a recommendation made to approve by the Commission at the next meeting.

4. Introduction to the Sustainability Resource Center

Ms. Arkin introduced Paula Sieber, Executive Director of the Sustainability Resource Center, a project of OPEAT, Inc., to the Commission.

Ms. Paula Sieber, 2226 Oak Hill Drive, stated she is the Executive Director and there are a lot of projects they are working on. The main focus is obtaining clean, healthy food and clean housing to those who may not otherwise have access. Ms. Sieber stated they have the tiny homes project on Causey Street and one on Hay Street in High Point. In particular she wanted to speak with this Commission regarding an idea that would be sustainable and providing good healthy clean food. They would like to have an ongoing event out of the Willow Oaks redevelopment area. Ms. Sieber stated Dr. Deborah Barnes is the Chair and requested her to speak.

Deborah Barnes, 701 Beckwith Drive, Chair of the Anti-Poverty Community for the North Carolina NWACP State Convention. Dr. Barnes stated their signature project for the state is to work toward mitigating food disparity and food insecurity. A three-prong project has been implemented called Fishes and Loaves. The first part of the project was a series of community gardens with the intent of having small community gardens in every community versus one large one that people have to travel to. They ran into trouble trying to make that happen and went to a larger, centralized gardening project which was going very well until the storm Michael came through and all of the crops were drowned. It was interesting information to have about why people shop instead of growing their own food because weather can wipe you out in a heartbeat. They moved after that to the second part which has two components. One is to keep black and brown farmers at work and on their lands. They are losing their farmland at an expediential rate through numerous governmental shanigans. The farmers that they deal with do not grow a sufficient number of crops in order to be in grocery stores. The farmers bring their food directly to the consumer in what people call food deserts. She made that distinction because a desert is a natural occurring phenomenal. Starving people out by denying grocery stores, is not natural. The strategy is to bring food

into those communities directly so they can be purchased from those farmers. That is the second part they are in now and is the part they are trying to implement in the Willow Oaks area. It is much more than just providing food. It is an attempt to build community, to try to get people to understand the impact of food and nourishment, why you need to eat healthy and have intergenerational, interracial interface contact. Willow Oaks appears to be a perfect place for them and is on the road to North Carolina A&T's farm. It is a mixed income community. It is adjacent to student housing from A&T which will help to entice younger people to eat healthy. It is juxtaposed to low income areas, the fringes of what used to be a middle-class area, and other low-income housing within walking distance. It is key for people to be able to get to the places where the food is. They know about the problem with the transportation in this area and want to place this in a centrally located area where a lot of different kinds of people could gain access to it. That is why that area is being looked because it is at the crossroads of so many different things and allows for passer by traffic which would encourage people.

They are bringing people together in part by offering health and wellness contacts. There will be nurses that will do blood pressure and blood sugar checks. There will be free flu shots and that early sort of triage. They will have nutritional education, cooking demonstrations, activities for children. If they are in that area, the intention was specifically to bring the Book Mobile there and have literacy projects with children. Dr. Barnes stated she teaches at North Carolina A&T and stated there is a big difference now in the way that young people read. The desire has to be stimulated for people to read. That has been built into the project that is being done.

The third prong of the project is entrepreneurial. To get people who, for whatever reason, have been denied access to traditional market economies and those who cannot get jobs, such as being disabled or formerly incarcerated, or veterans. They want to put them to work and give them the ability to support and sustain themselves and are encouraging people to think of food production and processing as entrepreneur options. That is why they have the gardens. The intention was for people to grow food. There are so many other opportunities where people can get started working on these kinds of entrepreneurial projects that are already built into the system which could lift them out of poverty or at the very least to feed their own families. They have partnered with Ms. Sieber's project in part because of the tiny homes are always surround a garden. The people living in those homes are encouraged to grow food not only for themselves but for the community at large. They are interested in helping them and other people to consider food production as part of their opportunity for the future.

Dr. Barnes stated she did not come to this project accidentally. When she returned back to the Greensboro area, she was on the Greensboro Food Test and worked with the out of the garden project for three years. She wanted to acquaint herself how the Greensboro area was dealing with this problem of hunger. One of the things this project also does is try to encourage people to rethink the food system that is being used. The food system is based on waste and there is a lot of waste which is recycled into poorer communities. The Anti-Poverty Community feels the best way to ensure human dignity is to not only offer people food but to give them the opportunity to have a first run at fresh food and not someone else's waste. It is a key point as it is a big part of how poor people are fed. This project is designed not only to nourish bodies but to reclaim humanity and spirits.

Dr. Barnes hopes the Commission will allow them to use Willow Oaks in this way. They set up and break down. People know where to find them. Dr. Barnes stated the property next to Irving Ministries would be a good place for an outdoor garden, vertical gardens. An edible forest where people that are forced to live in the streets can eat.

José Colón asked if the Commissioners had any questions. Chair McQueary asked what was needed from the Commissioners to do. Mr. Colón responded this was not an agreement before the Commission, it is the first step to introduce the project to the Commission and for Ms. Sieber and Dr. Barnes to learn about the Commission.

Chair McQueary asked if Ms. Sieber and Dr. Barnes had been introduced to all of the properties that are under Redevelopment and if could possibly be made to fit. Mr. Colón responded Ms. Arkin and he had met with Paula Sieber and had a conversation regarding how this could be more than a series of events. Her mission to place community gardens in every neighborhood could align with Redevelopment's assets and are having those discussions. Ms. Sieber advised she has spoken with Andy Zimmerman and he has offered a rooftop to do a

rooftop garden and that type of thing. Chair McQueary stated the Commission has a relationship with A&T. Mr. Durham stated he has worked with Ms. Sieber and is highly knowledgeable regarding putting community gardens in and thanked Ms. Sieber for doing that. Mr. Durham thanked both for wanting to help with this issue. Ms. Sieber advised the Commission the Nussbaum Center has almost four acres that is undevelopable and are not able to sell it. They tried to give the property back to the original owner who will not take it back. They can use that area for an urban farm. Michigan Urban Farming Initiative is mentoring her and they have four acres they use and are providing a 100, 000 pounds of fresh food to families year round for free. It is needed in a lot of places. Not just one organization can run, everyone needs to work together and they would like to be a part of Redevelopment's efforts.

Chair McQueary thanked them in what they are doing and it is very much needed. Ms. Sieber stated they are doing this project on a smaller scale in the Historic District on Washington Street in High Point.

5. Staff Updates

Ms. Arkin provided a brief update on the Willow Oaks area. Nothing to report regarding Asheboro. Prestwick is still working on their revised proposal. There is nothing on the Comprehensive Plan update. They are still working and moving forward on that.

Mr. Colón advised they are working on a contract with True Homes and need more time to establish deed restrictions to ensure the homes have ownership requirements. The first home will probably be built at the end of the fall semester and the Commission will see this on the agenda for next month.

Ms. Arkin advised there was no additional business from staff.

Chair McQueary stated he would like everyone to begin thinking what message the Commissioners should be taking out of the community to talk about. He feels the Commission should be talking about things that are doing well and things in the community that need help. Chair McQueary asked staff if there was someone in marketing that could advise on what could be done in the community. Ms. Arkin responded the City does have a Communications Department and can be of assistance if need be.

6. Adjournment

Chair McQueary thanked everyone for coming and with no other business, the meeting was adjourned at 6:17 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Sue Schwartz Planning Director

SS: cgs

APPROVED
REGULAR MEETING OF THE
REDEVELOPMENT COMMISSION

December 4, 2019

The regular meeting of the Redevelopment Commission of Greensboro (RGG) was held on Wednesday December 4, 2019 in the Plaza Level Conference Room of the Melvin Municipal Office Building, 300 West Washington Street. The following members were present: Chair Charles McQueary, Patrick Johnson, Dawn Chaney, Marcus Thomas, and Clinton Gravely, as well as Councilwoman Nancy Hoffmann (City Council). Staff present was Dyan Arkin, José Colón, and Russ Clegg, Planning Department. Andrew Kelly, Counsel for the Commission, City Legal Department. Chair McQueary called the meeting to order at 5:03 pm and welcomed everyone to the meeting.

Chair McQueary welcomed new member Marcus Thomas to the Commission and advised the Commissioners Wayne Durham resigned from this Board and has joined a new Board. Sondra Wright also resigned from the Board as she has moved into another district. Two additional board members will be added in the new year.

1a. Approval of Meeting Minutes (Approved)

1a. Minutes of the November 6, 2019 Regular Meeting.

Mr. Johnson moved the minutes be approved, seconded by Ms. Chaney. (Ayes: Chair McQueary, Mr. Gravely, Mr. Johnson, Ms. Chaney and Mr. Thomas. Nays: 0.)

2a. South Elm Street Redevelopment Area

2a. Update from Master Developer – South Elm Development Group.

Ms. Arkin advised Mr. Robert Chapman of the South Elm Development Group will provide the update and introduce Rea Ventures to the Commission.

Mr. Bob Chapman, South Elm Development Group, stated last spring the Development Group was introduced to Rea Ventures of Atlanta. Mr. Chapman first met with Mr. Rea and his staff and was very impressed with what they do. Rea Ventures was very eager to be involved with Greensboro and follow the improved master plan. Rea Ventures wanted a local partner and suggested for South Elm Development partner with them. They now have an LLC named Rea-South Elm, LLC which will be the contracting developer with 49% ownership and Rea Ventures will be 51% owner. Mr. Chapman introduced Jennifer Wilkinson of Rea Ventures who will provide company information and preliminary renderings.

Ms. Jennifer Wilkinson stated they have been working on this presentation for several months interacting with Mr. Chapman and Ms. Arkin to determine the needs of the Redevelopment Commission are and what Greensboro would like to see in this specific location. Ms. Wilkinson stated they have met with the City Manager and people in the public and are trying to make sure that what is seen on this project is something to be proud of. Slides depicting the first design of the building were shown. They plan to have a design charrette at the beginning of the year to move forward with the timeline being presented at this meeting. Ms. Wilkinson provided an overview of the four topics that she will be speaking to. Rea Ventures is located in Atlanta, GA and have been working on affordable housing work force development since approximately the early 2000s. Ms. Wilkinson stated Rea Ventures is located from Virginia around to Texas. Rea Ventures felt the Greensboro location was right in the middle of their wheel house as it is very easy to get to and they have come to know the partners and city individuals. Ms. Wilkinson showed renderings depicting the diversity and design of housing types Rea Ventures has worked on throughout the country. Rea Ventures has a staff person certified in Earth Craft Rebuilding who ensures they are building green, sustainable products as there will be a very long mortgage on the properties. Rea Ventures ensures women and businesses are taken care of and tries to use local individuals and companies as

much as possible. Ms. Wilkinson highlighted the awards that have been presented to Rea Ventures from both Georgia and North Carolina. Seth Harry was recognized as the architect Rea Ventures is working with. Mr. Isner was recognized as another partner in the South Elm Development Group.

Ms. Wilkinson provided a preliminary overview of the Union Square Apartments. Apartment garages are a key factor in what will be done. Currently there are 220 residential units starting at Studio South and commercial space will be included in the building. South Elm and Gate City Boulevard will have a parking area. Union Square students and faculty will have a place to enjoy. The parking garage is in the design stages and is a plus or minus currently with the number of parking spaces. The Greenway will be tied into the design as well. Ms. Wilkinson stated the project timeline will be tweaked but currently the start of the design and the meeting with everyone in January which would put construction starting the end of summer, beginning of fall and should be completed from October within 20 to 24 months.

Chair McQueary asked if there was a track record indicating this can be done as stated. Ms. Wilkinson responded Rea Ventures does have a track record.

Ms. Hoffmann asked how Rea Ventures defines work force housing. Ms. Wilkinson responded Rea Ventures defines work force housing as based on the income of the individual living in the actual unit. Currently they are anticipating to have 20% of this property as work force housing. The walkability of the location will be good for those who work within the neighborhood.

Ms. Arkin stated the property that this is proposed for was purchased primarily with community development HUD funds. One of the requirements from HUD is 20% of any residential rental housing needs to be affordable to residents or households at 80% or less of the area needing the income. The numbers are being worked on and moving forward there will be talks regarding what the range of the market rate housing is intended to be.

Chair McQueary asked what was the income that fits the model. Ms. Arkin responded it changes from year to year but works out to be for a family of 4 approximately \$36,000.

Ms. Wilkinson stated the construction process would start with the parking deck and while that was being built the apartments would begin. Ms. Wilkinson provided preliminary designs of housing within the neighborhood. Mr. Chapman stated there was a potential building being discussed with the Grays. Ms. Wilkinson provided renderings of various buildings ranging from high end to affordable housing. All buildings are built to market rates. A contact list was shown to the Commission. Mr. Chapman stated it has been a pleasure working with Rea Ventures. A previous charrette was done by Mr. Oliver and there is good chemistry between all parties.

Chair McQueary asked about the price range of apartments shown in a previous rendering. Ms. Wilkinson indicated on one rendering the rental was \$1000 for a one bedroom. A mixed-use rendering was shown indicating the range from an affordable component to market rate costs.

Chair McQueary asked what sort of timeline was being anticipated with the Grays building. Mr. Chapman responded there have been talks and the Grays have been well advised to do something now to coordinate. They are anticipating an immediate follow-on as the building is a good location on the Greenway. Mr. Chapman stated there is a contract currently coordinating with the Grays to have the right to pay at their expense for additional parking spaces in any deck built for their properties. There currently is no timeline anticipated.

Additional Business

Ms. Arkin advised this information is in-line with what has been discussed and should be heard now. Ms. Arkin stated the Union Square Campus, as part of their Sale Development Agreement, has an option in a parcel of land depicted on the slide. The Sales Redevelopment Agreement addresses that if the Redevelopment Commission has high confidence in an interested party purchasing that property, Redevelopment can notify Union Square Camp Interest, Inc., that there is an interested party and ask them to execute or notify the option will not be executed within 90 days. Ms. Arkin stated in consultation with Mr. Kelly, City Attorney, a letter was created to be sent to Mr. Merrill and asked the Commission to consider executing the letter and voting to go ahead and move forward to have the clock ticking on the 90 days so Rea Ventures will not be held up in starting on their project.

Ms. Arkin requested the Commissioners to read the letter before discussion of the letter. Chair McQueary stated he did read the letter and was prepared to sign if the other Commissioners approved.

Mr. Gravely made a motion to approve the letter as presented, seconded by Ms. Chaney. (Ayes: Chair McQueary, Mr. Gravely, Mr. Johnson, Ms. Chaney and Mr. Thomas. Nays: 0.)

2b. Update on Proposed Development of West Block

Mr. Johnson recused himself from agenda items 2b and 2c as a colleague within his law firm has representation to the parties involved.

Ms. Chaney made a motion for the recusal of Commissioner Johnson from agenda items 2b and 2c, seconded by Mr. Gravely. (Ayes: Chair McQueary, Mr. Gravely, Ms. Chaney and Mr. Thomas. Nays: 0.)

Ms. Arkin refreshed the Commissions regarding the Redevelopment Commission, South Elm Development, and Greenline Holdings of an agreement executed in August of 2018 to purchase approximately 3 acres within the south Elm Street Redevelopment Area for development of single-family and multi-family residential units. The first floor was for commercial retail space along West Gate City Boulevard. City Council at the August meeting approved the sale of the parcels under the terms and conditions of that agreement.

Greenline Holdings, the Arden Group had been working with the South Elm Development Group and staff for that year. The Arden Group planned to come before the Redevelopment Commission in August with a final proposal and plan for development and to request approval to move to closing. At the August meeting, the Arden Group asked for a 90 extension in order to rework their development program and work with AC Development on a partnership. The thought was to create a better plan with assistance of Mr. Andy Zimmerman of AC Development. Every month the Arden Group has provided updates to the Commission. Ms. Arkin requested Mr. Chapman to provide the information regarding how this development relates to the development of the whole South Elm Redevelopment area.

Mr. Chapman stated this parcel is the largest at 3 acres. There were title issues that were resolved with the Railroad Commission. The Arden Group was recruited due to his confidence with Milt Rhodes. They were within days of closing and Mr. Zimmerman initiated meetings with the Arden Group resulting in the Arden Group losing confidence in their plan. South Elm supported the request for a 90-day extension to present a revised plan which came and went. South Elm Development felt the opportunity for the Arden Group had expired. South Elm does believe it would make sense to keep in mind that the Arden Group is familiar with the area and have placed a lot of effort in it previously. If other proposals are submitted or requested, the Arden Group should be invited, although they are not ready to submit an alternative proposal at this point. Mr. Chapman stated Mr. Rhodes advised Mr. Chapman he would be satisfied with a Right of First Refusal, which Mr. Chapman felt would not be a good idea. No other developer would want to invest time and effort in creating a plan and then allow the Arden Group to step up and say they will execute that plan. Mr. Chapman believed out of fairness it should be stated, on the record, that no other plan would be accepted without giving the Arden Group a chance to submit a plan for consideration.

Chair McQueary asked if the bottom line was recommending termination of the agreement with a stipulation. Mr. Chapman responded as far as South Elm was concerned the contract has expired. Good faith was extended for the time requested and the Arden Group chose to not present a plan. Mr. Kelly stated there is a proposed letter to be sent to Milt Rhodes formalizing what Mr. Chapman and Ms. Arkin have summarized. The letter will set a time period under the current agreement in place now, Redevelopment can terminate the agreement after the 30-day formal notice. Mr. Kelly stated he is asking the Redevelopment Commission to send the letter because currently there is not a mutual resolution to say they are dropping out and both are going separate ways. In the absence of that, Mr. Kelly requested the letter be sent so the Redevelopment Commission is in a position where the ability to make a decision down the road to terminate the agreement.

Chair McQueary clarified that the letter was to advise 30 days for Greenline Holdings, subsidiary of the Arden Group, to produce a plan with termination if they opt not to produce a plan. Mr. Kelly responded that was correct.

Mr. Gravely made a motion to send a 30-day notice to Greenline Holdings, seconded by Mr. Thomas. (Ayes: Chair McQueary, Mr. Gravely, Ms. Chaney and Mr. Thomas. Nays: 0.)

2c. Consideration of Temporary Parking on West Block

Mr. Johnson had reclused himself from this item in a previous motion.

Ms. Arkin stated this was in consideration for temporary parking on the West Block, shown as vacant land on the slide depicted. There is a need in the area for temporary parking and the City is interested in providing that need while the development of the East Block by Rea Ventures is initiated. Ms. Arkin asked the Commission to provide staff the authority to move forward with site work on this particular site for preparation which would provide the baseline temporary parking situation that is needed or provide the baseline for new development. Currently there is only the Arden proposal and staff would like to start the grading and preparing of the land for whatever happens next.

Chair McQueary clarified that this request is to start building the parking lot but does not address the distribution of the leasing aspect until such time as the parking lot is completed. Mr. Kelly responded this was for purposes of creating for any future development because currently Redevelopment is still under an agreement with Greenline Holdings for the development of this site. After the 30-day period, Redevelopment will be in position to move forward with developing in either direction.

Eric Robert, 816 South Elm Street, asked if the Commission decides to move forward with the parking lot to make it a public lot. Currently that portion of the lot is a temporary parking lot but has been taken over by a private property owner with signs stating that no one else can park there and is only there to accommodate the tenant. Mr. Robert stated as an adjacent property owner, he is very concerned as he owns property on both sides of the lot. There is currently a shortage of parking in downtown Greensboro with people patronizing adjacent businesses in that area and using that parking with possible impounding costs ranging from \$100 to \$250 if impounded. Mr. Robert requested to the Commission to adhere to what the original intent was to benefit everyone within the central business district and the community.

Chair McQueary asked if Mr. Robert was aware that this is a temporary parking lot, not a long-term parking lot, in order to facilitate development of the land is shown partially in blue on the depicted diagram. Mr. Robert responded he did understand but sometimes temporary becomes permanent for a long time, but would appreciate the Commission consider making it available to everyone in the community.

Ms. Chaney asked if the City of Greensboro would be paying for the preparations to make this a temporary parking. Ms. Arkin responded it is anticipated the City would be paying. Ms. Chaney asked if gravel was on the lot. Ms. Arkin responded that is what is intended but the design and approval process has not been completed to date. Mr. Kelly responded that at this point the lot is graded and gravel would be in the immediate future.

Chair McQueary inquired if the City has gravel or would it need to be purchased. Ms. Arkin responded the City does have some but more will need to be brought. Gravel is much less to purchase as opposed to millings. It will not actually be known until the bid comes in. Ms. Chaney stated her concern is making this a private parking lot that the City is doing and paying for it. Ms. Arkin stated if the lot becomes private, it will be under a lease agreement, otherwise it will remain open in the same way that the temporary parking on east block is where it is used primarily by Union Square Campus students and staff but is open to the public as well.

Chair McQueary asked if that would be discussed in detail after the parking lot is either finished or just before it is finished. Ms. Arkin was unsure of the timing and how it would play out.

Mr. Robert asked if the discussion is that the lot may become a private parking area. Chair McQueary stated it could be but that has not been decided as there are no agreements in place. Mr. Robert asked if the Commission would consider leasing spaces to adjacent property owners or only to one. Chair McQueary stated he was not prepared to offer an opinion regarding this topic. It is a new idea being discussed if it should be implemented to facilitate development of part of the property, indicated on the right of the picture, which is very important to the Commission to have developed. The Commission needs to do everything they can in supporting the City in facilitating the development of that land and is what the Commission is focused on.

A motion was made by Ms. Chaney in favor of authorizing the City, as presented by Ms. Arkin on behalf of the City, to proceed with the site development on the vacant land for temporary parking, seconded by Mr. Gravely. (Ayes: Chair McQueary, Mr. Gravely, Ms. Chaney and Mr. Thomas. Nays: 0.)

3. Eastside Park Redevelopment Area

a. Consideration of Community Center Sublease Agreement

Ms. Arkin stated the Eastside Park Redevelopment area is before the Commission for consideration of the Community Center Sublease Agreement. The Commission expressed support for the Eastside Park Community Center for a school program for middle and high school students. All of the requirements for insurance, fire safety, and building codes have been met and staff has copies of the documents in their possession. The lease addressed insurance issues and is in line with the insurance consultant for the City. Ms. Arkin reminded the Commission that they are the owners of the land leased to the entity that runs the Community Center, not the building itself. The Community Center is in compliance with the lease currently in place.

Mr. Kelly, Attorney for the Commission, stated he has looked at all of the documents and permits that are required per the agreement and everything is in order. Mr. Johnson inquired if there were any up-lifting involved in terms of a Fire Marshall. Mr. Kelly responded the Commission is not a party to that as the Commission does not own the building. His approach has been to ensure the Redevelopment Commission as an owner of the land is protected. To Mr. Johnson's particular question, Mr. Kelly could not respond to.

5Mr. Gravely made a motion to approve the lease, seconded by Mr. Johnson. (Ayes: Chair McQueary, Mr. Gravely, Mr. Johnson, Ms. Chaney and Mr. Thomas. Nays: 0.)

Council Woman Hoffmann left the meeting in progress.

Approval of 2020 RCG Meeting Schedule

Ms. Arkin stated the proposed schedule was in the Commissioners packet. Chair McQueary advised he would be out of town from January 15 until mid-February. Dates were discussed among the Commissioners. A decision was made that Ms. Arkin would poll the Commissioners separately and determine a date mutually acceptable.

Mr. Kelly recommended to adopt a schedule for the year. The January meeting did not need to be placed on the January schedule and when a date is agreed upon, a special meeting notice could be placed.

Ms. Chaney made a motion to accept the proposed 2020 meeting schedule and any changes to the schedule will be done according to directions from the City, seconded by Mr. Gravely. (Ayes: Chair McQueary, Mr. Gravely, Mr. Johnson, Ms. Chaney and Mr. Thomas. Nays: 0.)

Staff Updates

Mr. Kelly stated they have been working on trying to find a resolution. The Commissioners have been invited by Mr. Irving to his facility while it still being used to view the utility involved in his business with Greensboro. Dates suggested were December 13 and 14. Mr. Kelly strongly suggested the visit be during the work hours so staff can attend with them. Mr. Kelly suggested the Commissioners let him know when they would be available and he will advise Mr. Irving. Chair McQueary stated he would not be available. Ms. Arkin asked if the Commissioners were being asked a group or to attend by themselves. Chair McQueary suggested it may be beneficial for all of the Commissioners to hear the same story and have the same discussion. Mr. Kelly stated it was a good idea to go as a group but it does not mean all the Commissioners would have to be there. Mr. Kelly advised Mr. Irving was also asking City Council to attend.

Mr. Jeff Guernier, True Homes, 5313 Wayne Road, stated Mr. Colón will be presenting an update on the project. Mr. Guernier reminded the Commission the purpose of the program is to partner with NC A&T to build one house a year for the next 4 years in conjunction with one of their classes. The profits from the sale of that house will go to their grant funding the Student Chapter of NHB and if there are excess funds, to fund some

scholarships. This will be an educational tool and funding mechanism to continue with the development of residential construction management program within their construction management curriculum.

Mr. José Colón provided an update especially for the new Commissioners. This is an update within the Willow Oaks Redevelopment area and indicated the subject properties along McConnell Street. Mr. Colón stated there is one City owned and three Redevelopment Commission lots all adjacent to each other. The proposal is for 4 single family homes.

Mr. Guernier stated they are planning to offer homes from their uptown collection, developed for infield projects in Charlotte. Renderings were shown depicting an array of homes indicating the sizes and type. The one they feel would be appropriate to start with was the Harper II which is a 3 bedroom, 2 1/2 bath home that is narrow and would work well on the narrow lots. None of the homes will have a garage but there will be parking at grade parking which is typically in the rear or side of the home. Other homes were depicted from the collection. Mr. Guernier stated the first home they are targeting in the affordable range is \$150,000. He did not have all the costing information at this time as they are still working on that aspect. Mr. Guernier hopes to present the contract at the next meeting in January. True Homes plans to have gate surveyors and will probably need to have a re-condemnation plat. Mr. Guernier indicated a triangle are on a rendering that will be deeded back to the Redevelopment Commission. After the property is replated, new utility connections will need to be completed. The goal is to have the site prepared to initiate vertical construction at the end of next summer. Construction is anticipated to start in the fall that will coincide with the fall semester at A&T for the first home. The plan is to do that every year for the next four years.

Mr. Guernier provided back information on True Homes. True Homes was awarded the Gold Winner from the National Association of Home Builders in recognition of their high-quality home this past year. They are based in Monroe, North Carolina and will close this year on approximately 1600 homes at about \$375 million. Mr. Guernier stated he offered the information as contact survivability in executing the program being discussed. Mr. Guernier hopes to present the contract at the next meeting in January

Chair McQueary asked if the agreement with A&T is a formal agreement. Mr. Guernier responded it is not. True Homes is in the second year of a \$25,000 a year grant for four years to fund the Student Chapter. He has participated with a team of students that competed in a competition sponsored by the National Association of Home Builders. They will be in Las Vegas for their presentation in January. True Homes is engaging the students in the Residential Development Construction world because there is a great need for talent and A&T is uniquely situated geography to service True Homes markets.

Ms. Arkin advised there are no staff updates for the Ole Asheboro Redevelopment Area. Prestwick is working on the re-work of their proposal. Hart Crane will be present in January to provide an in-depth update.

There are no updates from Plant GSO or the Comprehensive Plan.

Adjournment

Chair McQueary thanked everyone for coming and thanked everyone for their work during the past year. With no other business, the meeting was adjourned at 6:17 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Sue Schwartz Planning Director

SS: cgs