

**APPROVED**

**SPECIAL ANNUAL MEETING OF THE**

**REDEVELOPMENT COMMISSION**

**January 13, 2020**

The Special Annual Meeting of the Redevelopment Commission of Greensboro (RGG) was held on Monday, January 13, 2020, in the Plaza Level Conference Room of the Melvin Municipal Office Building, 300 West Washington Street. The following members were present: Chair Charles McQueary, Clinton Gravely, and Marcus Thomas. Staff present was Dyan Arkin 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.

**1. Election of RCG Officers**

Mr. Gravely made a motion to keep the Chair and Vice Chair as they are currently, seconded by Mr. Thomas. (Ayes, Chair McQueary, Mr. Gravely, and Mr. Thomas. Nays: 0.)

**2. Approval of Meeting Minutes**

**a) Minutes of the December 4, 2019 Regular Meeting.**

It was noted that Mr. Thomas was not noted as present in the December 4, 2019 minutes, which will be amended to indicate he was at the meeting. Mr. Thomas made a motion for the minutes to be approved as amended, seconded by Mr. Gravely. (Ayes: Chair McQueary, Mr. Gravely, and Mr. Thomas. Nays: 0.)

**3. South Elm Street Redevelopment Area**

**Additional Business**

Ms. Arkin stated Elizabeth Link, the Brownfields Specialist for the City, had prepared the NC Department of Environmental Quality year end certification for Chair McQueary to sign for the Brownfields Agreement for the South Elm Street Redevelopment area property.

**a) Proposed Development of West Block.**

Ms. Arkin reminded Commissioners at the December meeting they voted to send a letter to Greenline Holdings and the South Elm Development Group (SEDG) notifying them they were not in compliance with the Sales Development Agreement and that they had 30 days to show diligent efforts to remedy the non-compliance. The letter was sent certified and received. Greenline, as the component developer responsible for remedying the non-compliance, has not responded regarding the non-compliance. Mr. Kelly stated Greenline did contact him to request payment for reimbursement for the monies they spent trying to develop the site, but have not responded in a formal letter explaining how they planned to remedy what was outlined in the letter and must be done per the agreement.

Chair McQueary asked if the Commission would need to respond or if the City of Greensboro would respond. Mr. Kelly stated the Commission has sent the 30-day notice that they were not in compliance with the agreement and that failure to comply may result in termination. Mr. Kelly stated he did speak with their attorney who suggested that perhaps this could be amicably resolved and submitted what they thought was fair compensation to them, for roughly \$85,000. Mr. Kelly stated he is bringing that to the Commission and stated it was his opinion since they are not compliant that the agreement could be terminated. If someone were to pay them after the fact, whether it is

the Redevelopment Commission or the City of Greensboro, it would be a separate matter. The 30-day notice has been sent, there has not been a remedy, and the agreement can be terminated.

Chair McQueary asked if there was any public understanding of the interaction between Andy Zimmerman and anyone else who may have been involved in that discussion. Mr. Kelly stated he did not know other than that there was no partnership between the entities as far he knew. Ms. Arkin stated the South Elm Development Group was prepared to be fair with Greenline. The Master Developer Agreement is with SEDG, so all component developers go through them. SEDG could continue to work with Greenline on a new plan even if the Commission were to terminate the agreement. Chair McQueary stated that if the Redevelopment Commission were to terminate the relationship with Greenline Holdings, it would not carry any sort of promise that SEDG would have with them or not. Mr. Kelly reminded the Commission that they had approved that the property could be graded for potential development or surface parking. He stated as long as the agreement is still in place and not terminated, someone could claim they have the ability to build on this property rather than it being a surface parking lot. Chair McQueary clarified that the legal recommendation was for termination. Mr. Kelly stated that was correct if they want to move forward with surface parking. The termination does not need to be mutual and could be unilateral.

Ms. Arkin stated if Greenline were to produce work products that the Commission could use in the future, there may be a willingness to reimburse them for some of the work. She stated she has nothing in her possession that could be used going forward that is not already the property of the Commission or the City. The primary expenses Greenline had are related to the variety of site plans they put together while attempting to present a possible development scenario. There is no reason to believe that any of that work could be used by any other developer. Greenline has not made a formal request for reimbursement. Mr. Kelly advised the first step was the 30-day notice, and then the Redevelopment Commission could take action to terminate the contract.

Mr. Thomas moved to formally notify Greenline that based on the 30-day notice of non-compliance of the terms and conditions of the Sale/Development Agreement with no response, the Commission will terminate the contract, seconded by Mr. Gravely. (Ayes: Chair McQueary, Mr. Gravely, and Mr. Thomas. Nays: 0.)

**b) Update from Master Developer – South Elm Development Group.**

Ms. Arkin introduced Robert Chapman of the South Elm Development Group (SEDG) to provide an update to the Commission.

Mr. Chapman advised the Commission SEDG has met with a prospective commercial tenant spoken with Mr. Zimmerman regarding his needs for temporary parking. A permit fee has been paid.

Mr. Chapman plans to speak with Ms. Arkin and the City of Greensboro to determine how much the City will be able to participate in solving the parking question. SEDG will have the development team at the meeting in February outlining all of the details. Mr. Chapman has also been in contact with a proposed builder, Katerra Corporation, headquartered in Silicon Valley and architect Lou Oliver. A large amount of time has been devoted to crunching numbers. Rea Ventures' plan is to build approximately 210 apartments, the public Union Square Plaza at the corner, and a coffee shop as their retail with a passage way going over to Union Square Campus. Mr. Chapman advised he is happy with the drawings and everything appears to be moving in the right direction as long as the City is amenable to issues related to how the decks will be paid for.

Mr. Chapman stated the biggest question now is how to deal with parking. The temporary parking lot could actually be helpful because there are 219 spaces for Union Square Campus currently and everything needs to be staged to avoid not having parking available for people already at the site. Mr. Chapman stated ultimately the expectation is for two parking decks, one on the west side and the other is on the east side. SEDG has also been in contact with the adjoining neighbor to the south about working with them. The cell tower company lease is going to expire in May 2022. Currently everything is in progress.

Chair McQueary stated at the last meeting Eric Robert brought up the issue of parking being open to the public and that it needs to be thought through and asked if that would be a City function. Ms. Arkin stated she agreed and it is under discussion.

#### **4. Willow Oaks Redevelopment**

##### **a) Sale of Property at 1600-1602-1604 McConnell Road**

Ms. Arkin explained that José Colón requested this item be tabled to the February meeting as more details are under discussion. They are moving forward but there are a few details in the language of the agreement still to be finalized.

#### **5. Staff Updates**

##### **a) Heritage House Redevelopment Area**

Mr. Kelly stated that he, Vice Chair Gravely, and Ms. Arkin toured the Meridian Center site, and the owner has stated anyone is welcome for a tour. There are ongoing talks with them to attempt to find common ground. One of the challenges with redevelopment is there is a site plan last updated in 2005 or 2006, which indicates the parking calculation was such that they are in compliance. Currently there have been indoor renovations that may change those requirements. Mr. Kelly stated it was more like a convention center space that contains large ballrooms and small ballrooms, which has an impact on the parking requirements. They are exploring what their parking requirements should be and what would be left for redevelopment on the site. They are waiting for a final plan, which Mr. Kelly has not received to date.

##### **b) Ole Asheboro Redevelopment Area**

Ms. Arkin advised she spoke with Hart Crane, project manager for the Ole Asheboro Redevelopment area. Mr. Crane is working with the Prestwick Development Group, which has proposed redevelopment in Ole Asheboro. Ms. Arkin reminded the Commission the Prestwick Group is from Atlanta and had anticipated getting Low Income Housing Tax Credits for a portion of the development they had proposed doing. The tax credits were not awarded to Prestwick, and they have decided not to reapply as they do not feel they are competitive given that they are out of state and there is so much competition. Prestwick has been exploring other financing options. Prestwick will be meeting with staff in the next few weeks to discuss how the next proposal will be different than the previous proposal. Staff anticipates presenting an update at the February meeting.

Chair McQueary stated the words low income housing and affordable housing have been used frequently and asked if there was a clear definition that could be used when talking about this type of housing. Ms. Arkin responded this terminology related to the Low Income Housing Tax Credit program awarded through the state, and she believes the threshold is below 60% of Area Median Income (AMI).

Chair McQueary expressed his concern regarding the need to have the terms clear in order to determine what needs to be done to help move properties in the community. Ms. Arkin stated the range of definitions for affordable and low income can be shared. It depends on what funding source is being discussed. For the purposes of South Elm, it is 80% of AMI or below, and only a certain percentage of residential units would be required to be that. Mr. Kelly added it is also project specific. In regards to the tax credit application, Mr. Kelly felt there would be more points awarded to projects with a greater number of units at the lower percentage of AMI. Ms. Arkin stated it is a very competitive process and Prestwick did not rank well in the process. Mr. Clegg stated staff has talked about housing affordability as there is a wide range of incomes for people who cannot afford to purchase a home. There is an anticipation for 60% or slightly more for low income senior housing on one of the sites and doing a mixed use residential on another site. Prestwick is a strong company with many options for financing being discussed.

Mr. Clegg suggested having someone speak to the Commission regarding some of the tools available and programs for housing development. A suggestion was made to have a housing “cheat sheet” describing the different scenarios. Ms. Arkin stated the scenarios are pieces of a puzzle and those pieces look different in every project. Chair McQueary stated the Commission has land and felt the process should be made as easy as possible for builders to understand. Chair McQueary stated when speaking about affordable housing, square footage enters into the cost of homes whether they are expensive or low cost housing. Chair McQueary felt tiny housing represents smaller footprints and felt the City needs to define the parameters and reasons for affordable housing or an alternative. Ms. Arkin stated there are Housing Planners for the City of Greensboro and will arrange to have someone speak to the Commissioners.

**c) *PLANT* GSO – Comprehensive Plan Update**

Mr. Clegg stated staff is still working on refining the draft and will have a meeting to discuss final issues and will meet with people within the community. The Comprehensive Plan will be presented to the Planning Department at their meeting on January 15, 2020.

**6. Additional Business and Adjournment**

Chair McQueary stated with no other business, the meeting was adjourned at 5:59 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Sue Schwartz Planning Director

SS: cgs

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

**February 5, 2020**

The regular meeting of the Redevelopment Commission of Greensboro (RGG) was held on Wednesday, February 5, 2020, in the Plaza Level Conference Room of the Melvin Municipal Office Building, 300 West Washington Street. The following members were present: Vice Chair Clinton Gravely, Patrick Johnson, Marcus Thomas, Patricia Adams, Amy Murphy, as well as Councilwoman Nancy Hoffmann (City Council). Staff present was Dyan Arkin, José Colón, Hart Crane and Russ Clegg, Planning Department. Andrew Kelly, Counsel for the Commission, City Legal Department.

Vice Chair Gravely called the meeting to order at 5:03 pm and welcomed everyone to the meeting. Vice Chair Gravely welcomed new members Patricia Adams and Amy Murphy to the Commission.

**1. Approval of Meeting Minutes (Approved)**

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

Vice Chair Gravely stated since there were not enough members present from the last meeting to approve the minutes, the minutes would be tabled until the next meeting.

**2a. South Elm Street Redevelopment Area**

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

Ms. Arkin reminded the Commissioners of the possibility of a component developer being ready at this meeting to present their program, terms of conditions, and strategies for a development agreement. Since the last meeting there have been very positive developments that threw a very good monkey wrench into what had been worked on and they were requesting more time to work through that. There are very positive things going on in that area and the developer was trying to make sure they are incorporating all of the good development into their plan. Ms. Arkin stated at this point, it is anticipated the component developer will be at the March meeting. Mr. Isner will be speaking about other things going on with the redevelopment.

Mr. Bob Isner, 1707 Willowick Drive, one of the developmental partners of the South Elm Development Group. Mr. Isner stated the development is 7 acres on South Elm Street, south of Gate City Boulevard and will be expanding to Eugene Street. Mr. Isner depicted the areas and Union Square Campus on a projected photograph and advised things are moving very well on the east side of the area where Union Square Campus is located. There is a component developer from Atlanta, Rea Ventures, who is very experienced in multi-family development and will be in Greensboro the week of February 17 to meet with Ms. Arkin and staff to go over the project particulars. It is anticipated Rea Ventures will speak at the March meeting. Mr. Isner stated the cell tower lease expires May 15, 2022 and is very important. Talks are underway with cell tower personnel regarding ways to move the tower off the parcel or to buy their contract out, which would free up the land where the potential parking deck will be placed. Mr. Isner stated there will be paperwork for approvals. It has been determined the middle lot will have a temporary parking lot to accommodate future construction. There has been a request from Andy Zimmerman to help out with parking for tenants of his Gateway Center project. Plans have been completed and paperwork needs to be processed through the state and approved by the City, or this Commission, to move forward. Mr. Isner stated the plans have been completed and he is ready to go out with a bid package. There has been a lot of interest from various developers regarding the middle parcel but it will be awhile until the parking on the east side is completed.

Vice Chair Gravely asked how this varied from the initial plan. Mr. Isner stated the biggest difference currently is on the option piece at the corner of South Elm Street and East Gate City Boulevard. The anticipation was for a commercial building and currently what is planned is for residential with a mix of uses. Interest had been expressed by two entities but they did not respond quickly enough. They were told time was of the essence if they had an interest and would need to act quickly and have not responded.

Ms. Arkin stated it is a different game plan that what is on the approved master plan that the development team brought in a couple of years ago. They had anticipated recruiting a hotel at the location and due to the length of time to this point, other downtown hotels are being built, so it is no longer a viable option. Rea Ventures is primarily a residential developer, but they do mixed-use development also. Staff is talking with several developers who are interested in doing office space. There may be a partnership as a result of those talks in the next month or so.

Vice Chair Gravely asked if financing has been thought out. Ms. Arkin stated they are not going through the Housing Finance Agency. There will not be a low income housing tax credit, but there is an opportunity for tax credits through the Brownfields program. The majority of the financing is completed for the residential part. Staff is setting up a time for the developers on February 20 and 21 to submit the details of their programs for both the affordable housing component and for the parking structure component that is part of the development there. Staff will be setting up meetings with the various departments to discuss if there is a request for additional funding assistance from the City. Staff anticipates there will be. There are bond funds associated with this project to fill in gaps in a development financing. Staff anticipates details to be completed within the next couple of weeks.

Vice Chair Gravely inquired if there were any other questions. There were none.

### **3. Willow Oaks Redevelopment Area**

#### **3a. Approval for Conveyance of 2503 Everitt Street**

Mr. José Colón introduced himself to the new Commissioners. Mr. Colón stated he is handling the Willow Oaks Redevelopment area and a disposition project at 2503 Everitt Street in the Cottage Grove neighborhood. Mr. Colón referred to a map depicting the property. Reverend Woodard of Living Hope Missionary Baptist Church, 2501 Baptist Street, is attempting to purchase property to build a church and playground. The Commission approved the sale in January of last year with the agreement being Reverend Woodard would share building and landscaping plans, evidence of funding for construction, and a timeline for construction. All of those documents have been provided and are contained within the agenda packet. Mr. Colón asked if there were any concerns regarding the documents.

Vice Chair Gravely inquired as to when the Reverend anticipated starting. Mr. Colón stated they hope to close in February or March. Mr. Colón referred the Commissioners to the back page which indicated the timeline for construction.

Vice Chair Gravely stated everything appeared to be in order. Mr. Johnson asked if staff had any concerns or questions for the Reverend with respect to the design or the design characteristics in the neighborhood that are similar. Mr. Colón stated not currently. Before coming to the Commission, Reverend Woodward had a meeting at Development Services and is aware of the requirements.

Mr. Thomas made a motion to approve the requirements submitted for closing. Seconded by Mr. Johnson. The Commission voted 5-0. (Ayes: Vice Chair Clinton Gravely, Patrick Johnson, Marcus Thomas, Patricia Adams, and Amy Murphy. Nays: 0)

### **Staff Updates**

#### **Heritage House**

Mr. Kelly provided an update on the Heritage House Redevelopment area. Based on talks with the commercial unit, an agreement was reached to appoint a 2.1 Judge. There will be one judge going forward to handle the entire case rather than having different judges and explaining the complicated process over and over. Currently staff is

scheduling responsive pleas to be filed, discovery requests, how and when motions will be made. There are rules with respect to briefings and things of that nature. They will not cease talking and trying to negotiate but to this point, there has been no discussion regarding a settlement.

Vice Chair Gravely asked if there were any questions or comments. There were none.

### **Ole Asheboro**

Mr. Hart Crane introduced himself as the Redevelopment Planner primarily for the Old Asheboro redevelopment area. Mr. Crane provided a brief background and stated the City has been actively marketing properties within Old Asheboro, which are identified as the priority areas in the Redevelopment Plan, for a number of years. Mr. Crane stated they were denoted as A2, A3, and A4 on a projected photograph. A2 is where the Greenway has gone through and indicated East Gate City Boulevard, and the bridge going into Old Asheboro.

Currently the Greenway goes through the property and connects where Murrow Boulevard is now being reconstructed. Mr. Crane indicated on the photograph where Nettie Coad Apartments were located within A3 and depicted a combination of lots denoted as A4. Old Asheboro has been marketing these properties for a number of years. A developer responded to an RFP in 2018 indicating they wanted to do a multi-family senior living tax credit project. Early last year GHDP, Redevelopment, and the Developer entered into an agreement with Prestwick Development to develop lots A3 and A4, to build approximately 83 senior living, multi-family units on those parcels. The primary funding for the project was to have come from Low Income Housing Tax Credits, but they were not awarded those tax credits. For the past couple of months, staff and Prestwick, have been attempting to determine what else can be done to keep the project moving forward. Within the executed agreement, it was stated that Prestwick is able to reapply for this year's round of tax credits. The contract is still a living document as staff had anticipated Prestwick may not be awarded the tax credits in the last cycle, so the opportunity is there to reapply. There are options being examined as to how Prestwick wants to move forward, such as partnering with certain organizations and looking at creative ways to make the project work.

The other site is where the Greenway is located, the area was always anticipated for market rate with commercial at ground level and residential above. Prestwick is starting to think creatively and perhaps making it one project. It may not be market rate or senior living. Prestwick will be in Greensboro to have a staff workshop and see what can be worked out. It may be that the property will need to be remarketed, but staff is hopeful Prestwick can figure it out. If it cannot happen with Prestwick, staff will be looking elsewhere.

Vice Chair Gravely asked if Mr. Crane was familiar with the deficiencies within the first application. Mr. Crane responded it is a highly competitive process and was the first time for Prestwick applied in North Carolina. Typically NC Housing Finance Agency (NCHFA), the body that approves the application, prefers local developers. Prestwick knew it was a challenge. Prestwick scored as high as they could and it came down to a tie breaker for the NCHFA on different qualifiers. It is indicative of the competitive process where it comes down to the preference of the NCHFA. Prestwick is not opposed to reapplying but the process is significant and expensive. Staff will encourage Prestwick to reapply. Prestwick was just ranked Top 20 Affordable Housing Developer in the nation and in the previous year were in the top 20. Staff wants to work with Prestwick as they are committed and have not given up on the site. Prestwick wants to invest in Greensboro and wants to build. There are bond funds for the area that could be committed to Prestwick. Staff is trying to think creatively on how to make this project work. If it cannot work, staff would need to think realistically about remarketing the property to try to get it developed.

Ms. Hoffmann asked if there has ever been a local developer interested in this property. Mr. Crane responded no. In 2016 there was a developer from Charlotte looking at the property. Mr. Crane stated he has been working and marketing these properties for about 5 years and those are the only two development entities interested at that level. The developer in Charlotte just walked away after substantial talks. Prestwick has been great to work with, are committed, and want to be in Greensboro. Staff is fully committed to working with them to accomplish that goal, but are realistic about the future and what is desired by the people within the community.

Vice Chair Gravely inquired of any other questions. There were no further questions.

### **Comprehensive Plan**

Mr. Russ Clegg provided an update on the *PLAMIt* GSO Comprehensive Plan process. Mr. Clegg depicted on a projected slide the current web site indicating the main part of the plan, the values, vision statement as well as goals and strategies. Next step is to present a final draft to the City Manager's Office. Staff has continued to meet with small groups to discuss the Plan and the anticipated growth maps. Mr. Clegg stated going forward in the next phase is education about the Plan. Staff anticipates having the Plan online and receiving feedback online about the draft and anticipate being at the City Council work session. Mr. Clegg stated staff hopes to be before the Planning Board for a public hearing and then City Council for a public hearing in the months following. Staff expects to have a complete draft of the plan in near future and start receiving feedback about what the entire package looks like.

### **Affordable Housing**

Ms. Arkin stated at the last meeting Chair McQueary had emphasized that more information was needed by the Commissioners in understanding Affordable Housing, Housing needs, and desires of the City of Greensboro. Staff requested the Neighborhood Development Department personnel for a presentation and discussion with the Commissioners at the meeting in March. They will be prepared to show what they have been doing and will have good information for the Commission.

Vice Chair Gravely asked if there has been any further discussion regarding tiny houses. Ms. Arkin responded there have not been discussions with the tiny house people. Ms. Arkin believed the tiny house group is currently working in High Point and have not asked to revisit any of the properties that were discussed previously. Staff will follow-up with them if it is the desire of the Commission.

### **Additional Business**

Ms. Arkin stated going back to the South Elm project one of the things that had to be done was an application was submitted to NC Department of Environmental Quality, which manages the process of erosion control on properties that are over an acre within the city limits. Staff had to go through the state to obtain permission to disturb what is a two-plus acre site. One of the things asked for was an agreement between the land owner, the Commission, and the South Elm Development Group. Staff has prepared a document with the assistance of the legal department and requested the Commission to approve the Vice Chair executing the document allowing staff to complete the application process for work on the site.

Vice Chair Gravely inquired of the exact language. Ms. Arkin responded she did not make copies for everyone and read the agreement aloud for the Commissioners. Mr. Isner has signed the document. Staff would request to have the document signed by Mr. Gravely in order to move forward.

Vice Chair Gravely asked if there were any questions. Having none, Vice Chair Gravely requested a motion.

A motion was made by Mr. Johnson to sign the agreement. Seconded by Mr. Thomas. The Commission voted 5-0. (Ayes: Vice Chair Clinton Gravely, Patrick Johnson, Marcus Thomas, Patricia Adams, and Amy Murphy. Nays: 0)

### **Eastside Park**

Mr. Kelly updated the Commission regarding the Ken Wheaton Academy, Eastside Park Community Center. Mr. Phil Barnhill is a board member at the community center and reached out to Mr. Kelly regarding issues in obtaining liability insurance for property damage. A limit was set because the value of the property was not high enough. Mr. Barnhill is requesting a replacement value for the property. Mr. Kelly stated he did not have an issue with the request and has brought it before the Commission to ask if it was reasonable to the Commission to consider the Academy maintaining insurance on the property as replacement value. Mr. Kelly clarified for the Commissioners the Ken Wheaton Academy is termed as an alternative school for children in middle school and high school and will start with one class, adding more as it develops.



Mr. Johnson asked if a motion was made for the change of value, would further action be required. Mr. Kelly responded no.

Mr. Johnson moved to approve the adjustment to the insurance provision to replacement value in the agreement as opposed to the standard set previously. Seconded by Mr. Thomas. The Commission voted 5-0. (Ayes: Vice Chair Clinton Gravely, Patrick Johnson, Marcus Thomas, Patricia Adams, and Amy Murphy. Nays: 0).

**Absences**

The absence of Chair Charles McQueary was acknowledged as excused.

**Adjournment**

Vice Chair Gravely thanked everyone for attending and welcomed the two new members. With no other business, the meeting was adjourned at 5:40 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Sue Schwartz Planning Director

SS: cgs

**FINAL**

**REGULAR MEETING OF THE**

**REDEVELOPMENT COMMISSION**

**MARCH 4, 2020**

The regular meeting of the Redevelopment Commission of Greensboro (RGG) was held on Wednesday, March 4, 2020, in the Plaza Level Conference Room of the Melvin Municipal Office Building, 300 West Washington Street. The following members were present: Chair Charles McQueary, Clinton Gravely, Patrick Johnson, Marcus Thomas, Patricia Adams, Amy Murphy, as well as Councilwoman Nancy Hoffmann (City Council). Staff present was Dyan Arkin, José Colón, Hart Crane, City Planning Department. Andrew Kelly, Counsel for the Commission, City Legal Department.

Chair McQueary called the meeting to order at 5:00 pm and thanked Clinton Gravely for carrying forward while he was absent. Chair McQueary welcomed Amy Murphy and Patricia Adams to the Commission. Chair McQueary recognized the contributions Ms. Dawn Chaney made to the Commission and enjoyed working with her during the time she was on the Board. Chair McQueary thanked Councilwoman Nancy Hoffmann for nominating Ms. Murphy to the Commission.

Ms. Arkin advised there are two meeting minutes to approve as there was not a quorum who had attended the January meeting. Mr. Kelly advised no one has to abstain from voting if they were not present for the meeting.

**1. Approval of Meeting Minutes (Approved)**

**1a. Minutes of the January 13, Special Annual Meeting.**

Mr. Gravely moved to approve the January 13 Special Meeting minutes, seconded by Ms. Murphy. The Commission voted 5-0. (Ayes: Chair Charles McQueary, Clinton Gravely, Patrick Johnson, Patricia Adams, and Amy Murphy. Nays: 0).

**1b. Minutes of the February 5, Regular Meeting**

Mr. Johnson moved to approve the February 5, Regular Meeting minutes, seconded by Mr. Gravely. The Commission voted 5-0. (Ayes: Chair Charles McQueary, Clinton Gravely, Patrick Johnson, Patricia Adams, and Amy Murphy. Nays: 0).

**2a. South Elm Street Redevelopment Area**

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

Ms. Arkin advised the Commissioners she had let Mr. Isner off the hook as the information was not very different from the last meeting. Rea Ventures is still working on their proposal for the east block. Rea Ventures has been to Greensboro several times working directly with City Staff, the City Manager's Office, the Finance Director, and the Department of Transportation to nail down how the structure of the parking will work. Staff has asked Rea Ventures to provide additional parking for the area, over and above what they need for their own tenants of the apartments they are planning to build. Along with additional parking is additional subsidiaries. Staff has been working with them to determine how that will work and if it will be a long term lease, some up-front assistance with the construction of the parking, or some type of combination. There are associate bond funds from the 2016 Community and an Economic Development Bond Referendum associated directly with the South Elm project. Those funds were always anticipated to go into the project in some way to assist with infrastructure and/or development assistance, and there is a broad definition of what it could be used for. Staff anticipates using those and possibly additional funds from the Department of Transportation for assistance with the parking.

Grays on the Greenway are in serious negotiations with the development team regarding participating in the project by bringing their land in as their equity investment. Lawyers are involved in talks. There have been several successful meetings between Rea Ventures and the Gray family, of Grays on the Greenway, and feel they

are close to an agreement on how that would work. It will make for a much better project that allows for the full block to be developed at the same time.

Chair McQueary asked what was the acreage. Ms. Arkin responded it is 9/10 of an acre.

Mr. Gravely asked if anything has been worked out on the encroachment issue related to the storm line. Ms. Arkin responded there is an easement agreement with the Grays for that property currently and the City pays them monthly to encroach upon their property. One of the problems has been every time a solution is found regarding infrastructure improvements in the area, there has been a developer who has a plan that we need to be working with and Redevelopment is at that point again. There is a design for the infrastructure. It doesn't quite fit with what Rea Ventures wants to do and are slowing it down to try to sync up with development of the site. There is a design for removing the encroachments from the Gray property but are not currently going out to bid with that and are trying to find the "sweet spot" of having the development ready to go and having that be part and parcel of the bigger projects.

Councilwoman Hoffmann asked what did the encroachment actually consist of. Ms. Arkin responded there are two things the Grays consider encroachments. There is a steeper slope than what was anticipated running down onto their property, about 20 feet. It is a problem in that if they wanted to do something, a retainer wall would have to be built. If it is done as part of the bigger project, the City would grade it and make as smooth as possible. Ms. Arkin stated the Grays believe it is not favorable for them to market the property with the encroachment. There is also a storm sewer pipe in on their property of about 10 feet. The City has acknowledged there should have been better agreements upfront. Hopefully with this agreement between Rea Ventures and Grays on the Greenway there will be a comprehensive project that makes sense for both all parties.

Moving forward there is temporary parking on the west block and is out for bidding currently. The bids should be coming in shortly and will be able to issue a Notice to Proceed and start the project.

Chair McQueary asked what is Andy Zimmerman doing in the interim regarding parking. Ms. Arkin did not know. Mr. Zimmerman has parking on the front and where he already had parking of about 45 spots. There is also parking in a portion of what Union Square Campus uses. If there is overflow, Ms. Arkin was unsure what was being done.

Staff is currently pursuing the cell tower issue at 508 Arlington. The property is owned by the Redevelopment Commission who leases a portion of the lot to American Tower Company who leases it to Verizon. The lease is up in May of 2022, later than Rea Ventures would like. It is anticipated that the parking structure would be located in the same location and would take that land the tower is located on. In order to move quicker than the two years to move the tower, there needs to be alternative plans. It has been suggested that American Tower could move a smaller facility on top of the parking structure which would have challenges of sequencing regarding how and where. Ms. Arkin stated she has worked with a consultant that does cell tower consulting for municipalities who have stated they do not think there is much leverage to get them to move on top of the building as it probably is not a desirable choice for them and would probably prefer the lease to run out. There are two options, redesigning the parking structure to pull it back off of Arlington Street, leaving enough land along Arlington to fill in after the tower is gone or looking at what the potential value to the project as a whole would be to remove the tower off sooner rather than waiting until the termination period. The developer is working on those two alternatives. If they come back with an amount that is rational and could conceivably offer the cell tower company to remove the cell tower early, staff would move forward with that.

Chair McQueary asked if anyone knows what the feasibility is for placing the cell tower on top of the Union Square building. Ms. Arkin responded they have thought of that as a possibility and could be part of the sequencing or could be an alternate to place on the parking. Ms. Arkin stated her understanding with the cell tower consultant was putting a tower, a cell facility on top of the building would not be a desirable for them. If it were and it was a desirable location, they would be actively pursuing alternatives with them instead of ignoring. American Tower is looking at other properties to potentially build another cell tower but there is not a big need for a tower to be located there. Ms. Arkin stated they have informed American Tower that the Redevelopment

Commission does not have an interest in renewing the lease at the location and need to be prepared to move on when the lease terminates.

Chair McQueary asked when the lease is terminated, was it clear in the lease to take the tower down and dispose of it. Mr. Kelly responded the timeline is not clear but does require they return the property to its condition immediately previous to the lease beginning. Ms. Arkin advised there is an estimate of the cost to demolish the tower which could be part of the negotiations.

Chair McQueary stated the key point is Redevelopment is not in a holding pattern for two years for the lease to expire as there is a backup plan. It is a path that could move forward. Chair McQueary asked if there were any further questions or comments.

### **3. Willow Oaks Redevelopment Area**

#### **3a. Disposition of 1548, 1600, 1602, 164 McConnell Road**

Mr. José Colón provided a brief update for the new members of the Commission. John Guernier of True Homes, project manager, was unable to be at the meeting but did provide hard copies of the purchase order in the event of approval for this project. True Homes is proposing to purchase the properties located at 1548, 1600, 1602, and 1604 McConnell Road, located in the Willow Oaks Redevelopment area. The Redevelopment Commission owns 1600, 1602, and 1604, 1548 is a City owned property managed by the Engineering Department. The purchase order will be done as a full package and Redevelopment would be authorizing the sale of the 3 lots owned by the Redevelopment Commission. The City owned property was acquired in 1994, 1600 acquired in 2004, 1602 and 1604 were acquired in 2013. True Home is offering \$20,000 for all of the properties. Mr. Colón advised mowing and maintenance expense on the Redevelopment properties are approximately \$781 a year.

Mr. Colón advised this property is located west of US 29, fairly close to the central Willow Oaks area to the east. There are four options that may go with each property. Terms and conditions were highlighted for the Commissioners. The property is being purchased for the development of four single family homes, owner occupied dwelling units over four years. The plan is to build a home per year. True Homes is working with the North Carolina A&T students in their construction to the model youth program. The purchaser agrees to commence site improvements within 120 days of closing.

Chair McQueary asked if there were any terms and conditions on the square footage. Mr. Colón responded there was not. The homes will be approximately 1200 to 1400 square feet. There will be a required completion date for each home. The first home is expected to be completed by the end of 2020 and each home moving forward at the end of the next year up to 2023. The property will only be sold to persons who intend to occupy the home. Prior to closing, the purchaser will bid and submit detailed site plans, site elevations, and proof of financial capacity to be approved by the Commission. It is anticipated those will be presented at the next meeting. The seller shall have the authority to re-enter and take possession of the property in the event of failure to close, commence the project, and failure to complete the project on time. All of those terms are referenced in Section 11 of the Agreement. Closing will occur no later than 90 days from the date of the agreement and the purchaser will have 30 days from the date of the agreement to complete title issues. Mr. Colón asked the Commission for approval of sales for the 1600, 1602, 1094 properties on McConnell, along with 1548 McConnell Road to develop single family homes, contingent in the offset bid and City Council approval.

Mr. Gravely asked if Redevelopment was in compliance with the 80% appraised value. Mr. Colón responded that was for the city lot. The properties were appraised \$8,000 per lot. The 90% rule does not apply to the Redevelopment Commission on lots. It applies to the City only.

Chair McQueary asked if Redevelopment was being asked for approval to proceed. Mr. Colón responded that was correct. Chair McQueary inquired if there were any questions or comments for Mr. Colón.

Chair McQueary asked if this action would take 3 lots off of the Redevelopment inventory of properties. Mr. Colón responded that was correct. Mr. Johnson asked if it was correct the maintenance cost for the 3 lots was \$781. Mr. Colón responded that was correct.

Ms. Adams asked if the True Homes minimum home requirement of 2 bedroom, 2 bath was in keeping with the standards of other homes in the neighborhood. Mr. Colón responded there is no standard for a minimum number of bedrooms. It is part of the agreement as that is what they are building. There is not a requirement for 3 bedrooms or more in that neighborhood. Ms. Adams stated she was thinking long term for rezoning or attraction to the neighborhood that possibly True Homes could be asked for the minimum to be 3 bedrooms as it would be more attractive to the neighborhood if the goal is to attract families. Mr. Colón stated True Homes is not here today and he was not sure if they would be willing to do that. They have established plans for the homes and was not sure if they would be willing to agree to that. These will be for sale. Originally True Homes wanted to do private dormitories and transitioned to single family homes. Mr. Colón provided examples of what the homes will look like.

Mr. Johnson asked if the proceeds from the sale of each home was going back into the program to raise capital to continue other sites. Mr. Colón responded that was correct. The city purchased some of the properties, specifically 1600 and 1602 with CDBG funds, Section 108 and would come as program income. Mr. Colón stated the proceeds of the sale will go towards scholarships for construction technology students.

Chair McQueary stated what is on the table is the question of bedrooms and asked what is proposed to deal with that issue. Mr. Colón responded if the Commission feels the agreement is not up to par due to the bedrooms, that can be discussed and will take back to Mr. Guernier for discussion.

Ms. Arkin stated this has been brought to the Commission several times. There are new Commissioners with their own thought processes and their own ideas. Discussion has been held previously and if there was a concern about it might have been something to bring up earlier. It is somewhat late in the game for True Homes to get their project constructed this year. Ms. Arkin advised there has just been a very extensive, deep dive into the trends. Given what is happening in the City of Greensboro, going forward and moving to a time when there will be more single person households or two person households. If this were a project with 20 homes or 30 homes it would be a concern that more variety was not being provided. This is only four homes and a good project for the neighborhood.

Chair McQueary stated it has attractiveness and having A&T more heavily engaged in the community is a good thing. Good for the community and schools. Mr. Colón stated he is hopeful that this program is extremely successful and True Homes comes back for more properties after 2024. Chair McQueary stated Mr. Colón should ask True Homes are they going to consider 3 bedrooms or would they consider 3 bedrooms. Ms. Arkin stated it is possible the plans have a 3 bedroom possibility. Mr. Colón indicated a photograph depicting 3 bedrooms and there would be a mix.

Mr. Johnson made a motion to approve the plan to move forward as presented by Mr. Colón. Seconded by Ms. Murphy. The Commission voted 5-0. (Ayes: Chair Charles McQueary, Clinton Gravely, Patrick Johnson, Patricia Adams, and Amy Murphy. Nays: 0).

Mr. Colón requested for Chair McQueary to sign the hard copy agreement.

### **Staff Updates**

**Heritage House:** Mr. Kelly advised Richard Gottlieb of Forsyth County has agreed to be the 2.1 Judge going forward to handle the case. They are continuing talking, trying to negotiate, and also are preparing legal arguments for the series of motions coming up throughout this year. Mr. Kelly suggested a closed meeting to address all of the issues with new counsel and the new Commissioners. Mr. Kelly provided the background information regarding Heritage House to the new Commissioners and how it was acquired by the Redevelopment Commission.

**Ole Asheboro Redevelopment Area:** Mr. Crane stated they are continuing to move forward. The financing Prestwick had sought last year was not provided to them and they are working together to determine how to move this project forward. This is a multi-family development in Ole Asheboro and are looking at possibly up to 160 units on the priority areas in Ole Asheboro. Prestwick will be applying to the North Carolina Housing and Finance Agency for tax credits. Staff is hopeful that there will be multi-family units in Ole Asheboro.

**Planit GSO:** Ms. Arkin introduced the final draft document titled GSO 2040, the City of Greensboro, Comprehensive Plan. The plan has been provided to City Council and was well received.

Ms. Hoffmann stated the old plan was voluminous and was terrible. The new plan is very good. Ms. Arkin stated the bulk of the plan was done in-house. Many of the graphics was done by José Colón. Councilwoman Hoffmann stated she believed the plan will be a model for other cities.

Chair McQueary asked if there was follow-on activity to create the taxable plan that goes for 2020 and the next 20 years from now. Ms. Arkin stated that is being worked on currently. There have been discussions regarding what the steps are to put together an actual implementation plan. There is a plan online, the final section has the strategic implementation plan that is being worked on currently. There were 6 big ideas identified through the public process and are in the process of putting them in actual action steps and the associating timeline. There will be public hearings before it is adopted. It will be presented to the Planning Board on March 18 for a public hearing. City Council will review the final public hearing on April 21. If City Council chooses to adopt it, the effective date of the new plan will be July 1, 2020. Between the time of April adoption by City Council and the effective date, the implementation plan will be crafted. There are ordinance changes associated with having a new Comprehensive Plan and some of those will be worked through during that time process, as well as the implementation plan. Mr. Crane stated the web page is [Greensboro-nc.gov/planitgso](http://Greensboro-nc.gov/planitgso). There is a survey there as well. Ms. Arkin encouraged the Commissioners to take a look. If anyone has questions, there is contact information there. Russ Clegg is the primary contact; Hart Crane has also been very involved with it.

Chair McQueary asked if there was an estimate number of citizens who participated. Mr. Crane responded in the plan it was stated as over 6,000 reached and over 10,000 unique or individual comments.

#### **Additional Business**

Ms. Arkin stated there was a desire by the Commissioners for clarity on what is meant by affordable housing, how staff is addressing affordable housing. Staff is moving from the term of affordable housing to housing affordability which helps to clarify. There has to be a house affordable to anyone. All types of housing have to be available somehow. There is a 10 year plan for moving towards an affordable housing program and series of programs that the Neighborhood Development Department has been working on. Staff has invited them this meeting for a presentation, but they have requested to attend the April meeting as they are taking an almost complete plan through the City Council process and will bring that to the Commission and will be able to talk about a more definitive set action items, instead of recommendations. It will be a very impactful plan.

Ms. Arkin advised she has distributed a flyer for Wheels on the Greenway to all of the Commissioners. The Greenway goes through several of Redevelopment properties. The Greenway group has chosen to their Wheels on the Greenway event on the corner of South Elm and Bragg Street. The Greenway group invited the Commissioners to attend. Ms. Arkin advised they may need to park on property that is owned by the Commission as there may be a conflict with the temporary parking in place there as Union Square Campus may also be holding an event the same day. The group is reaching out to the New Zion church that has a large parking lot also.

#### **Absences**

There were no absences.

#### **Adjournment**

Chair McQueary thanked everyone for attending. With no other business, the meeting was adjourned at 5:59 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Sue Schwartz Planning Director

SS: cgs

**REGULAR MEETING OF THE  
REDEVELOPMENT COMMISSION**

**May 6, 2020**

The regular meeting of the Redevelopment Commission of Greensboro (RCG) was held on Wednesday, May 6, 2020, via Zoom satellite. The following members were present: Chair Charles McQueary, Clinton Gravely, Patrick Johnson, Marcus Thomas, Patricia Adams, Amy Murphy, as well as Councilwoman Nancy Hoffmann (City Council). Staff present was Dyan Arkin, José Colón, Dan Curry, Hart Crane and Russ Clegg, Planning Department. Andrew Kelly, Counsel for the Commission, City Legal Department.

Chair McQueary called the meeting to order at 5:02 pm and thanked everyone for attending the meeting. Chair McQueary advised of the procedures in place for voting.

**1. Approval of Meeting Minutes (Approved)**

**1a. Minutes of the March 4, 2020 Regular Meeting.**

Ms. Arkin asked for the minutes to be considered with one change as Marcus Thompson was counted in each of the votes and should be removed and the voting status changed as Mr. Thomas is an alternate.

A motion was made by Chair McQueary to approve the minutes as amended, seconded by Mr. Johnson. (Chair McQueary, Ms. Murphy, Mr. Gravely, Mr. Johnson, and Ms. Adams. Nays: 0).

**2a. South Elm Street Redevelopment Area**

**2a. Resolution to Support HUD 221(d)(4) Application for Rea-South Elm, LLC**

Ms. Arkin advised Mr. Robert Chapman was present representing the South Elm Development Group. Rea Ventures was represented by Mr. Breck Kean. Ms. Arkin turned the meeting over to both parties to explain what was included in the packet and the request for resolution. Mr. Chapman stated Mr. Kean would take the lead and present for any questions.

Breck Kean, Rea Ventures Group, stated Rea Ventures is based out of Atlanta, GA and have partnered with the South Elm Development Group to develop a multi-family housing development and parking deck on the main road of the block surrounding the Union Square Campus. Mr. Kean stated he would be giving very brief updates and was asking for the Commission's support with the additional steps needed to go forward within these challenging times. Mr. Kean stated with Ms. Arkin's guidance and help, there were very productive meetings and conversations with the City and various City staff departments, including the City Manager and the Commissioner. Conceptual designs have been advanced for where it is today which is a 248 unit housing development wrapping around a 784 space parking deck. A brief overview was presented of the property sketching the layout that was proposed. Productive meetings with the Gray family were held and there is an agreement in principle in that the Gray family will contribute .09 acre parcel to the development site bringing the total development site to approximately 3.2 acres. In exchange for contributing that land they will be partners or have an equity position within the ownership of the development. Everyone is excited about the developments and are proposing approximately it will be \$57 million development in today's dollars. The development is highly dependent upon the City of Greensboro's investment and participation. Mr. Kean stated Corvoid19 sidetracked everyone and the investors and investments still need to be worked out. Rea Ventures wants to advance this project. The financing for the project is through the Housing Urban Development 221(B)(4) program. It is not affordable housing financing. It is a multi-family apartment financing in both market rate and affordable. It does not have to be an affordable development to be obtain the 221(B)(4) financing. They are still in business and talking to developers that are still accepting underwriting deals and want to initiate the process with HUD. It is a 3 step process. Step 1 being a concept meeting to lay out the concept of the development, the sponsorship, the locations, and the financing. The 221(B)(4) is the most attractive both in family financing in the market and will

probably be one of the few vendors that are still in business currently. Almost all lenders in the capital markets have put their pencils down and are not entertaining any underwriting or new business. Mr. Kean would like to advance with HUD and have this project in front of them to preserve their place in the line to be ahead of potentially competing projects when the world does come back to the new abnormal. Rea Ventures stated a very simple resolution of support to provide to HUD at the concept meeting to know that the City of Greensboro and the Redevelopment Commission are aware of the project and supports this project. Mr. Kean stated having the support of the Redevelopment Commission and participation is very important to HUD based upon the initial conversations with them. Mr. Kean stated he is available to answer questions and stated his appreciation for support going forward.

Mr. Gravely asked if there was a dollar amount related to the application that the City would be obligated for. Mr. Kean advised as of this time there is not. There is a development budget but the dollar amount has yet to be negotiated or worked out with the City, the Grants Department, Ms. Arkin and the other decision makers at the city level. Mr. Kean stated the premise behind the request is without the city's investment and participation this project would not go forward. The cost of the parking deck and the equipment on a small site cannot be supported by the rents at this point in time. The level of investment by the City hopefully will generate the returns that are necessary to track to capital and are necessary to this make project continue forward. At the last meeting with the City, the numbers were in the 5 to 6 million range. Those are the preliminary estimates subject to further underwriting and development by them and the city.

Chair McQueary asked if Mr. Kean could comment regarding a timeline between the discussions with the city and when something would be submitted to HUD to provide the Commissioners with a feeling of what the sequence of events will be and the amount of time allows. Mr. Kean advised the concept submittal will be submitted more than likely within the next two weeks. From that point it continues to another 90 to 120 days for a formal submittal to HUD. It is probably 120 to 150 days out before a more complete full application to HUD. Regarding the timeline with the City, they are ready and anxious to sit back at the table or have a Zoom meeting to continue those conversations. Ms. Arkin and city staff will tell them when they are ready to continue conversations.

Chair McQueary asked if Rea Ventures was asking from the Redevelopment Commission was support for the HUD application. Mr. Kean responded that was correct. A simple resolution has been prepared showing Redevelopment's support. Chair McQueary asked if any Commissioners had any further questions and if not, requested to have a motion to vote on providing support for the application to HUD.

Mr. Gravely moved to support the HUD application, seconded by Mr. Johnson. (Chair McQueary, Ms. Murphy, Mr. Gravely, Mr. Johnson, and Ms. Adams. Nays: 0). (Chair McQueary, Ms. Murphy, Mr. Gravely, Mr. Johnson, and Ms. Adams. Nays: 0). Chair McQueary advised Mr. Kean Rea Ventures has approval for the resolution as requested.

Mr. Kean stated it was greatly appreciated and looked forward to being able further updates in person.

Marcus Thomas joined the meeting in progress.

### **3. Willow Oaks Redevelopment Area**

#### **3a. New Willow Oaks Single Family Home Sales/Development Agreement**

Mr. José Colón, advised Dan Curry will be covering 3a and he will be covering 3b and 3c and turned the meeting over to Mr. Curry. Mr. Curry stated they are very excited to be before the Commission to present the Sales and Development agreement for the consideration of the Redevelopment Commission. It has taken time to present and hope this is the beginning of reengaging into development committee in the Willow Oaks community. This agreement comes from the Greensboro Housing Development Partnership Board. They reviewed it at their regular meeting in March and was sent with their approval. There is a memo included in the Commissioners' packet. Mr. Curry provided a brief history of the property that started approximately 20 years ago and is a Neighborhood Redevelopment activity focused on creating new mixed-use, mixed-income community. The original Redevelopment plan was adopted in 2000 and included both the original Morningside homesite and eventually



was expanded to include approximately 200 acres of property in eastern Greensboro. The original development included the Morningside homesite and property the Redevelopment Commission had assembled. It was added to this development in agreement with the Greensboro Housing Authority in 2007. Over the next 5-7 years, a 133 new single family homes were built and over 200 townhomes were built. Only a few houses were built in the late 2000s due to the housing recession. The last construction was in 2013.

The agreement before the Commission currently deals with the next phase of Willow Oaks and focuses on what are called Zones B and E on the eastern section of Willow Oaks. A map was depicted for the Commissioners indicating zones B and E. The agreement addresses 32 properties within those zones that are interspersed with homes already built in the two zones and would complete the development in the two zones. The expectations are future agreements will be brought to the Redevelopment Commission that would cover additional properties in zones C and D. Currently there is no schedule and due to the current housing market, is unsure what the schedule might be for bringing future development sites forward. Mr. Colón and Mr. Curry are confident and excited that they will be able to entice some builders to build in zones B and E. There are currently two builder proposals in hand for becoming approved builders for the zones.

Mr. Curry stated there are a lot of items in the new agreement that are carryovers from previous agreements. The intent of the new agreement is to clarify a number of agreements that were executed back in 2010 between the Commission and the Greensboro Housing Authority and the Greensboro Housing Development Partnership. Mr. Kelly and the Greensboro Housing Development Partnership attorneys recommended the best approach would be to create a new agreement replacing a number of the previous agreements for clarification and simplify how this property will be developed. Mr. Curry stated GHDP does own the 32 properties given to them by the Greensboro Housing Authority in 2010. The Greensboro Housing Development Partnership is responsible for planning the construction oversight on these lots. Any lot revenues from the sales of these properties are due back to the Redevelopment Commission. GHDP does have the ability to retain a development fee for each lot which can equal the greater of \$2000 or the actual cost incurred by GHDP in managing the development and sale of the properties. The Redevelopment Commission would still retain the responsibility for the issuance of Certificates of Completion and would hold the deed of trust on all the properties. Each time a lot is sold to a home buyer, the previous agreements and this current agreement require the Commission to actually issue a lien release, releasing that property from the overall deed of trust.

Mr. Curry stated some of the new items are revisions to the original agreements. The main difference is GHDP plans to sell lots directly to home builders. Originally lead developers leased the properties from PHA and then sub-leased properties to the home builder resulting in some advantages and some disadvantages with that process. The new approach is more typical in action. GHDP will sell the lot directly, the house will be built and then sell to a home buyer. Mr. Curry referred the Commissioners to Exhibit F of the agreement which contained the lot prices that are based on the size of each lot, ranging from \$10,000 to \$25,000.

Mr. Curry advised Mr. Colón will be speak to the Homebuilder Incentive program which allows the homebuilder to obtain a reduction in the lot cost if they implement certain elements in the design and construction of the home. It would also be an incentive to home buyers to add items that would increase the value of the properties long term. Mr. Curry stated the amount of development fees for the Greensboro Housing Development Partnership can retain is capped at \$100,000 for the 32 lots.

Chair McQueary asked what were the positives and any negatives of going down the path proposed. Mr. Curry responded he felt the positive was simplifying and clarifying responsibilities as it was confusing in the previous agreements. Mr. Curry also felt the pricing and incentives related to the lots will attract home builders to the properties and also be beneficial to the home buyers. Mr. Curry stated the City of Greensboro has a very strong down payment assistance program available at this point in time providing up to \$15,000 of down payment assistance available to homes built in this area. The City of Greensboro indicated their willingness to consider additional assistance as needed for home buyers in the Willow Oaks community. Mr. Curry felt it is a very positive commitment from the City of Greensboro to support home ownership opportunities for these properties. Mr. Curry stated clarification has been done on the financial arrangements between the Commission and GHDP.

Having the very clear financial transactions between the Commission and GHDP is something this agreement does. Mr. Curry did not know of a negative as they tried to cure any issues seen.

Mr. Colón stated the only negative thing he could think of was there would need to be new agreements for future cases as this agreement is only for this section of Willow Oaks and was not discussed with the GHDP attorneys. This will be a model for future cases. Mr. Curry added toward the bottom of the memo there is a list of some items they are requesting that are usually approved at staff levels. It was done to ensure to have things move in a timely manner and meet the requests of home builders and buyers should they put in proposals that are time sensitive.

Councilwoman Sharon Hightower, stated Mr. Colón was correct, there are no negatives. Councilwoman Hightower is a member of the GHDP Board and a lot of time was spent going through the agreement. The Board felt it was made as clear as possible so homebuilders will find it easier to work with and move quickly to get houses built. There has been no building activity for a few years and the Board feels this will spur activity and interest in that area with having more affordable housing in this community and creating a mixed use. The Board is 100% behind making sure this is a positive way to do business. Councilwoman Hightower expressed she thought there will be good things coming from this, GHDP supports this and staff has done a great job, to include Mr. Curry.

Chair McQueary thanked Councilwoman Hightower for her comments. Chair McQueary the agreement appears to be straight forward and a very good agreement. In particular in looking at the sales and making it attractive for builders to build homes for people in the community. Chair McQueary asked if what was being asked today is for him to sign the agreement on behalf of the Redevelopment Commission. Chair McQueary asked if there were any further questions or comments from the Commissioners. If not, Chair McQueary requested to have a motion for approval for him to sign the document on behalf of the Redevelopment Commission.

Mr. Kelly advised Chair McQueary the Commission is being asked to approve this agreement. Mr. Curry mentioned they will ultimately ask the Redevelopment Commission designate a staff member. In this case, a secretary would have authorization to release certain lots to home builders, issue the Certificates of Completion in the release of liens. Mr. Kelly spoke with Mr. Colón briefly regarding that and it was his recommendation to come back to the Commission with a check list to be reviewed by everyone and feel comfortable that it is taking into account everything the Commission wants. GHDP is checking off their list that this is approved and are ensuring those things happen. At this point, the Commission is agreeing that it's ready but was not sure if the Commission was ready to designate an individual to approve these processes down the road. Mr. Kelly advised his opinion was there was time to build that type of checklist before GHDP is actually ready to do any of these things. Chair McQueary asked if he was saying that the Commission didn't have to vote on that issue but rather to vote on signing of the agreement. Mr. Kelly responded that was correct.

Ms. Adams asked if the builders that are coming in, would it still be an area needing incomes for potential buyers that come in or was it open for all persons. Councilwoman Hightower responded that the discussions did not limit the income level. The Board wants to create a mixed-use community for people who have an interest in that area but there will be affordable housing and is the reason for a robust down payment assistance program. Ms. Adams asked if was just on fair market value of the potential houses that are being built or they are trying to keep them affordable for the area. Councilwoman Hightower responded the Board was looking at what the builders are offering also. The Board will not be looking at \$300,000 homes in that area. The Board is attempting to make sure they are affordable and attractive in the market. Ms. Adams stated it was important to bring a different demographic of people to the area to boost the home sales and increase the property values in the area.

Mr. Kelly asked if Mr. Curry would like to highlight some of the builder incentives for the Commission. Mr. Kelly stated he believed builders can get certain incentives for adding perks to the home that would draw a mixed income clientele as a perspective buyer. Mr. Curry responded Mr. Colón would be discussing that and it is the next agenda item and will walk the Commission through what the incentives are.

Ms. Arkin advised the Commission can vote on this item and then hear about the Home Builder Incentives and vote on that or defer voting on both items until after hearing from Mr. Colón on the next item. Chair McQueary

stated that was acceptable to him. Mr. Kelly advised he did not see any issues with waiting to hear about the incentives and then voting.

### **3b. Willow Oaks Homebuilder Incentives**

Mr. José Colón advised staff has developed an incentive program for home builders specifically for this development phase. The incentives were provided as a separate attachment to the Commissioners. The incentives range from interior, exterior, site and accessory features, such a ground floor master bedroom, hardwood or laminated floors, attached storage room. Mr. Colón stated these were a few but the Commission does have the full incentive list within their packet. Including these features would result in a dollar for dollar reduction in the home prices. The features are listed with their corresponding rebates. A builder can include all of these features and the minimum would be \$5,000. The goal was to not fully pay for the features but to partially cover that feature to make it financially feasible to be included by the builder. A lot of the features will be given to the builder automatically for including those features.

Chair McQueary stated it is very positive to add features that upgrade the appearance and quality of the home. Having no further questions from staff, Chair McQueary requested a motion to authorize his signing of the agreement.

Ms. Murphy made a motion to approve the signing of the application submitted for closing, seconded by Mr. Gravely. The Commission voted 5-0. (Ayes: Chair McQueary, Clinton Gravely, Patrick Johnson, Patricia Adams, and Amy Murphy. Nays: 0).

Chair McQueary thanked staff for all of the work that was put into this project and the presentation. Ms. Arkin inquired if a separate vote needed to be taken regarding the home builder incentives or because they are a part of the entire package, it would be a single vote. Mr. Kelly asked Mr. Curry and Mr. Colón if it was preferred to be separate approvals. Mr. Curry responded they would like to have separate vote. The actual list of incentives is not part of the agreement and was done specifically because there may updates to the incentives from time to time and wanted to have more flexibility without having to amend the entire agreement. Mr. Kelly asked that they've been referenced but are not an exhibit. Mr. Curry responded that was correct.

Ms. Murphy made a motion for amendment the previous motion to include items 3a and 3b, seconded by Mr. Johnson. The Commission voted 5-0. (Ayes: Chair McQueary, Clinton Gravely, Patrick Johnson, Patricia Adams, and Amy Murphy. Nays: 0).

### **3c. 1600, 1602, and 1604 McConnell Road – True Homes Project**

Mr. Colón advised item 3c is related to the properties located at 1600, 1602, and 1604 McConnell Road. The Redevelopment Commission entered into an agreement with True Homes at the March meeting. Mr. Colón advised bidding ended April 26, 2020. The next step is for the Commission to approve the remaining items agreed with True Homes. One is a site plan and the other was the financial capacity to complete the project. Mr. Colón advised those items have been submitted and included True Homes National Housing Quality award. This will be presented to City Council at their June meeting and closing would be scheduled as soon as possible after that meeting.

Mr. Johnson stated all four of the homes appear to have the same footprint and asked if they all have the exact footprint with one design. Mr. Colón responded the site plan is more conceptual and there will be different models. The size will be the same as a concept but there will be different plans. Ms. Arkin asked Mr. Colón to speak to the documents that were provided to staff verifying proof that they have the capacity to build these new homes. Mr. Colón stated True Homes submitted a reference letter from Pinnacle stating they do have financial capacity. Jeff Guernier, the representative for True Homes, he did not want the letter to be public and is not included within the packet. It has been presented to staff and verified.

Chair McQueary stated A&T is a part of this but the school year is in turmoil and asked if there was a schedule stating they have to finish at a certain time or was there leeway in that based upon the unknowns being faced currently in dealing with the Corvid19 issue. Mr. Colón responded True Home has not slowed down. They want

to purchase these properties and the virus issue is not changing their schedule. Mr. Colón was unsure how it will play out but staff will be in discussions with Mr. Guernier regarding flexibility with A&T in this project.

Mr. Kelly advised in the agreement True Homes did ask for a provision regarding being able to extend any kind of deadline which could come into play here which would be a force majeure which addresses anything out of their control there would be flexibility in moving the timelines.

Chair McQueary stated it sounds very encouraging and is hopeful it will continue as it is a great opportunity.

### **Consideration of 2019-2020 RCG Annual Report**

Ms. Arkin advised each year the Commission provides a report to City Council on activities completed in the prior fiscal year and is a public record. This is normally done after the end of the fiscal year but staff was asked by the City Clerk to do it early in order to get the information to City Council. Staff has addressed it as a partial year report with some assumptions being made. There are several mentions within the report that there are activities that will be completed by the end of the year. It is anticipated that a minimum of two additional regular meetings will be held before the end of the year and would be incorporated into the report for the upcoming fiscal year. Ms. Arkin advised there was one revision to the report. On the second page, there was an error made in the number of meetings attended and meetings absent for Commissioner Gravely and would like to change it to reflect 8 meetings attended and 0 meetings absent for Commissioner Gravely. Ms. Arkin was not sure where those numbers came from but has double checked and these numbers were correct.

Chair McQueary clarified if the request is for approval to issue an interim report to City Council. Ms. Arkin responded it was the actual report for this fiscal year. Another report will not be issued for the last couple of months. Language will be incorporated into the next fiscal year report addressing that this report was done early and will make sure those activities are captured. The Redevelopment Commission report is more involved than some of the other Commissions and Boards do. The Redevelopment report is more descriptive of what types of activities are occurring in a particular redevelopment area, how much funding was associated with those activities, and what the upcoming activities will be. It was set up that way because the majority of projects undertaken in redevelopment by the Commission are multi-year. City does not have an issue with it and is a document that can be shared with the public for their information.

Chair McQueary asked if there was any further discussion. Seeing none, Chair McQueary requested a motion. Mr. Johnson made a motion to approve the annual report to be sent to City Council, seconded by Mr. Gravely. The Commission voted 5-0. (Ayes: Chair McQueary, Amy Murphy, Clinton Gravely, Patrick Johnson, and Patricia Adams. Nays: 0).

### **Staff Updates**

Mr. Kelly advised the Commissioners the City Attorney received a letter from the attorney for Meridian Convention Center. It is approximately 27 pages and was received recently. The letter is framed as a settlement proposal but has a lot of persuasive argument throughout it. Mr. Kelly wanted to bring this to the Commission even though it was not addressed to the Redevelopment Commission, the Commission is involved in litigation with Meridian. Mr. Kelly advised there are separate claims involving the City and this defendant. Mr. Kelly stated it is challenging to bring this up at a Zoom meeting as he felt it would be appropriate to take this matter under consideration in a closed session. Mr. Kelly wanted to have the opportunity to provide some of the persuasive arguments for the new commission members, as they do not know all of the history with the case that Chair McQueary and Vice Chair Gravely have had. Mr. Kelly asked that the Commissioners think of a time of what may be the best time for them of an hour out of the day where a special meeting could be done solely for a closed session and discuss what the Commissioners want to direct their attorneys to do for Redevelopment in light of this 27 page letter. Supreme Court Justice Beasley has extended the closing of courts until June 1. They are preparing litigation assuming the June 1 date is not extended again. There are no further updates. Mr. Kelly reiterated meeting sooner rather than later to have a closed session meeting to meet with all of the attorneys to answer any questions the Commissioners may have and ultimately provide direction for the attorneys.

Ms. Arkin will speak with the Commissioners to determine a time when the meeting could take place.

Chair McQueary asked since the Commission is a smaller number if there was a way to separate themselves by the 6' requirement easily in a room or is it more appropriate to have the meeting by Zoom. Mr. Kelly responded at this point it is challenging, it would be best to heed the representatives of City Council and the City of Greensboro to definitely try to accomplish it by Zoom. If it turns out it is not working, then an alternative would need to be looked at it. Mr. Kelly will discuss that will Ms. Arkin further but his instinct is to say since there is authorization for the remote meetings to try to have the meetings via Zoom. Mr. Kelly advised he will look into Chair McQueary's question. Ms. Arkin stated it may be dependent on when the Commission can get together. Ms. Arkin will be in contact with the Commissioners to determine the time and date.

### **Old Asheboro**

Mr. Hart Crane advised the Commission the Prestwick project is still moving forward in the redevelopment area. There have been conversations about what the partnership would look like and how they see the numbers for that site moving forward. Prestwick is moving forward optimistically. Staff has received recent interest in multi-family development in Old Asheboro on some lots and the Commission will need to be involved in conversations going forward in the process. Prestwick and staff are optimistic in moving forward.

### **Additional Business**

Mr. Russ Clegg provided stated at the last meeting, there was a survey online and a final draft of the comments. They were anticipating going to the Planning Board in March and City Council in April. There were some edits to the plan based on feedback received. There will be a new draft with some minor changes very shortly. Currently they are planning to go to the Planning Board on May 20 and then hope to go before City Council sometime in June. Schedules have been pushed somewhat but notifications will be sent soon notifying regarding moving forward with the change in the timeline of a couple of months.

Chair McQueary recognized Councilwoman Hoffmann as he had not realized that she was present at the meeting because her name was not shown on his screen. Chair McQueary thanked Councilwoman Hoffmann for being a part of the meeting. Councilwoman Hoffmann thanked Chair McQueary.

### **Absences**

There were no absences.

### **Adjournment**

Chair McQueary thanked everyone for their participation in the meeting. With no other business, the meeting was adjourned at 6:25 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Sue Schwartz Planning Director

SS: cgs

**APPROVED**  
**SPECIAL MEETING OF THE**  
**REDEVELOPMENT COMMISSION OF GREENSBORO**  
**May 13, 2019**

The Special Meeting of the Redevelopment Commission of Greensboro (RGG) was held on Wednesday, May 13, 2020 virtually via Zoom. The following members were present, Chair Charles McQueary, Clinton Gravely, Patrick Johnson, Patricia Adams, Amy Murphy and Marcus Thomas. Councilwoman Nancy Hoffmann (City Council) was also present. Staff present was Dyan Arkin, Sue Swartz, Hart Crane, and Russ Clegg. Andrew Kelly, Counsel for the Commission, City Legal Department and Chuck Watts, City Attorney, City Legal Department were also present. Mr. Robert Boydoh and J. Scott Hale, Boydoh & Hale, LLC, Attorneys were also present.

Chair McQueary called the meeting to order at 5:03 pm and welcomed everyone to the meeting. Chair McQueary advised that the Commission needed to go into closed session and only those authorized to be a part of the closed session would be allowed to remain. Mr. Kelly stated the meeting should be approximately an hour or less.

Chair McQueary stated, pursuant to N.C.G.S. 143-318.11(a)(3), he moved that the Commission go into closed session in order to preserve its attorney-client privilege in the handling of settlement with its attorneys concerning the pending litigation in Guilford County Superior Court involving West Town Bank and Meridian Conventions, LLC, identified as case numbers 17 CVS 4458, 19 CVS 7862, 19 CVS 5882 and 19 CVS 5883. Seconded by Mr. Gravely. The Board voted 5-0. (Ayes: Chair McQueary, Mr. Johnson, Mr. Gravely, Ms. Adams, and Ms. Murphy, Nays: 0.) Chair McQueary turned the meeting over to Mr. Kelly.

The closed session was ended at 5:51 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Sue Schwartz Planning Director

SS: cgs

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

**June 10, 2020**

The special meeting of the Redevelopment Commission of Greensboro (RCG) was held on Wednesday, June 10, 2020, electronically through a Zoom meeting. The following members were present: Chair Charles McQueary, Clinton Gravely, Amy Murphy, Patricia Adams, and Councilwoman Nancy Hoffmann (City Council). Staff present was Dyan Arkin, José Colón, Hart Crane, and Russ Clegg, 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. Ms. Arkin advised Mr. José Colón will be speaking as this is his item. Mr. Colón and Mr. Kelly are the content experts regarding this item.

**1. Willow Oaks Redevelopment Area**

**a). Consideration of Use Agreement with Guilford Urban Farming Initiative (CUFI) for Farmers Market.**

Mr. José Colón thanked the Commissioners, staff, and everyone in attendance at this special meeting. The Guilford Urban Farming Initiative is requesting full use at the properties located at 1901 McConnell Road and 805 and 807 Willow Hope Place for the purposes of operating a small scale farmers market. Mr. Colón advised Paula Sieber and Dr. Deborah Barnes will be speaking on their proposal to operate a market at the same location where the Greensboro Housing Coalition offered their market the previous year. Mr. Colón advised the Use Agreement was sent to the Commission and is very similar to the one used for the Greensboro Housing Coalition outlining the terms. Ms. Sieber is hoping to operate the market from 10:00 am to 2:00 pm, every Saturday until the end of this calendar year.

Chair McQueary asked for clarification on the end date. Dr. Barnes responded December 26 is the last Saturday of the year. Chair McQueary on the map there was not a clear indication of what properties. Mr. Colón reviewed the map in question and advised that in the agreement there is language that refer to those lots which are adjacent to 1901, 805 and 807. Mr. Colón was not sure why the other lots were entered into the agreement. Mr. Colón will ensure the only properties for the market are 1901 McConnell Road and 805 and 807 Rea Hope Place. All of the properties are contiguous. Ms. Sieber advised the map used was a GIS data for the 1901 property and was looking for the Cottage Grove market. Chair McQueary stated it is a very clear map but is missing the street names. Mr. Colón stated they will make sure the addresses are stated on the agreement map. Mr. Kelly stated for purposes related to the map it is for the properties that are the three closest to the intersection. The vehicles depicted as parked is at 1901 McConnell. Adjacent to that is 807 Willow Hope and adjacent to that is 805 Willow Hope.

Ms. Sieber stated in the agreement it states if anything were to happen to notify the Commission within 24 hours. Ms. Sieber asked if the markets are on a Saturday, would that be 24 business hours. Mr. Colón stated he should be contacted directly and will then notify the Commission. Ms. Sieber advised there have been updates since the request was submitted and are in alignment with the agreement. The HUD regulations providing for low-income and variable income, and no jobs, are being followed. Ms. Sieber stated they would like to have several locations in Greensboro to provide food. Ms. Sieber advised she has spoken with Shawna Tillery and Charles Jackson with the Greensboro Parks and Recreation who identified two locations that would benefit. There has been good support and traction. Ms. Sieber feels the market will have a positive impact and be a great market.

Mr. Colón inquired if there were any questions related to the agreement. Chair McQueary inquired if Mr. Colón would be conveying to Ms. Sieber all of the various lots and things RCG has that may fit within what Ms. Sieber is planning to do. Mr. Colón stated at the last meeting ideas of how to dispose or utilize other properties was discussed. Ms. Sieber indicated she was interested in that property for the long term and does have plans for the possibility of permanent structure. Ms. Sieber hopes to come back to the Commission to resume conversation regarding the properties. Ms. Sieber requested Dr. Barnes to speak regarding Guilford County Health Department.

Dr. Barnes advised Tanya is the Director of Health Care Services at the Guilford County Jail. That group has agreed to support them with the Willow Hope market by offering health care screens. The intention was to check for high blood pressure, flu shots for children. It was hoped that Covid testing could be done in that community as it is one of the communities that may not make it out to wherever testing is being done. There is not a walk up market that Dr. Barnes is aware of. A lot of people living in that community do not have transportation and the reason why it is exciting this location will be on the bus line. The bus stop is literally in front of where the market will be. Health Care Services is committed in working with Guilford Urban Farming Initiative with the support of the Sheriff who is offering help and support services. Dr. Barnes stated Urban Farming will probably be done sequentially to allow services and for people to decide who they needed to talk to. The services will probably be offered separately to be able to avoid crowds gathering in one particular area.

Ms. Sieber added Urban Farming is working on EBT and SNAP benefits and felt very confident that will be completed. Urban Farming is working with several partners in having Snap benefits doubled and wants this to be as good as possible for the community. Ms. Sieber advised she has spoken with the Director at the Animal Shelter. Ms. Sieber did not know if it was essential but the Animal Shelter has offered to do free rabies shots in that neighborhood. Mr. Colón advised after speaking with legal, an amendment would be needed to address Covid testing and health assessments as there is a liability concern. Mr. Colón thought there was an alternative if vehicles for Covid testing could be parked on the right of way. The Greensboro Housing Authority does own property next to this property and currently that part has been taken out of the agreement.

Mr. Kelly stated his standpoint was ensuring if people were being brought in for health care screening, testing, things of that nature, the Commission and staff would have to make sure they were properly licensed and had the appropriate insurance to perform testing. The information was not readily available to him when reviewing the agreement. Mr. Kelly and Mr. Colón are supportive of the idea but without an entity to scrutinize the way a particular job would be done, it was difficult to agree for that type of activity. Normally when certain contracts are entered into or specifically authorizing particular activities, it is imperative the parties that are engaging in whatever activity are insured for that activity so that no one could come back to the Redevelopment Commission or the City of Greensboro and say it allowed for whoever to come out and do this and did not end well.

Dr. Barnes stated the people who Urban Farming are interfacing with are coming out of Guilford County jails and are the health care workers who work there in the jail system. Dr. Barnes felt this was an organization of health care workers who would be volunteering their time to do health care screening at the market as a public service. As far as Dr. Barnes knew, the workers were certified to work in the jail system and asked what type of certification would be needed to meet those requirements for screening. Mr. Kelly responded it sounded that Dr. Barnes was saying the workers are currently employed by a Guilford County system and that is where their medication liability coverage probably starts and ends. If they were to volunteer outside of that basis, whether or not it is for a non-profit organization to cover as a volunteer for that nonprofit organization, the coverage for that organization is what Mr. Kelly would be looking to see. He is not qualified to say he needs a Nurse Practitioner or a PA. Mr. Kelly is looking for a legitimate organization. Mr. Kelly referred to a case in Kentucky where cash was exchanged and upon investigation was discovered it was a scam to obtain money. There is a level of critique being achieved to find the right people to do all this. Regarding the volunteerism, it is what type of coverage would be obtained in the event something medically went wrong. Dr. Barnes stated that was a great question for



Urban Farmers Market to ask of the volunteers. Dr. Barnes did not think of asking that type of information as she has not done this before and also it was a sort of extension from the Sheriff's department. The Sheriff was volunteering people to work with Urban Farmer's Market in the hope they could be kept out of jail. Dr. Barnes stated it was a great question that she needed to ask and thanked Mr. Kelly for drawing that to their attention. Mr. Colón added once additional information and credentials are received, Urban Farmers Market can come back to RCG to add that to the Use Agreement. It was not an end all, be all.

Mr. Colón went over the edits to the agreement not already covered with the Commissioners. Produce trucks are the only vehicles exempt from parking on the property. Part 2 language was added that is required of all city contracts, but did not add the language within the use agreement that linked the terms and conditions. That will be added in the agreement that will be signed by Chair McQueary and covers the insurance requirement. Mr. Colón advised Chair McQueary that he will receive the correct agreement for signing. Mr. Colón inquired if there were any questions. Mr. Colón stated he was excited having a second market in Willow Oaks. The first market Greensboro Housing Coalition hosted was successful. The residents were very happy for that amenity and are just as excited having a second market.

Chair McQueary asked Mr. Colón to state what he was asking from the Redevelopment Commission. Mr. Colón stated they are asking for approval for Guilford Urban Farming Initiatives to lease the properties at 1901, 805, and 807 Willow Hope Place. Chair McQueary requested a motion to approve or not. A motion was made by Clinton Gravely to approve, seconded by Amy Murphy. A roll call was taken and the Commission voted 4-0. (Ayes: Chair Charles McQueary, Patricia Adams, Clinton Gravely, and Amy Murphy. Nays: 0):

Chair McQueary expressed his appreciation for everyone that worked on the Use Agreement. It will be a feature for the community and spoke highly of staff and everyone who worked so diligently. Chair McQueary stated the Commission was happy to be a part of the market and wished Guilford Urban Farming Initiatives the very best. Chair McQueary thanked Councilwoman Hoffmann for being present and being a part of the decision. Ms. Sieber stated her appreciation in working with Mr. Colón and the Commission. Dr. Barnes expressed her appreciation in being a part of this event.

Chair McQueary inquired if there was any further business. Ms. Arkin inquired if Mr. Clegg would like to speak on where they were with the Comprehensive Plan. Mr. Clegg stated the plan went before the Planning Board on May 20, 2020 and as a Board unanimously moved to have it go before City Council on June 16, 2020. They are working on updates for the Land Development Ordinance as there are some pieces that need to be adjusted in terminology and the processes. The effective date is December 1, 2020.

Ms. Arkin advised that was all that staff had.

### **Adjournment**

Chair McQueary stated with no other business, the meeting was adjourned at 5:25 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Sue Schwartz Planning Director

SS: cgs

**APPROVED**

**REGULAR MEETING OF THE**

**REDEVELOPMENT COMMISSION**

**July 1, 2020**

The regular meeting of the Redevelopment Commission of Greensboro (RCG) was held on Wednesday, July 1, 2020, via Zoom satellite. The following members were present: Chair Charles McQueary, Patrick Johnson, Marcus Thomas, Patricia Adams, Amy Murphy, as well as Councilwoman Nancy Hoffmann and Sharon Hightower (City Council). Staff present was Dyan Arkin, Hart Crane, and Russ Clegg, Planning Department. Andrew Kelly, Counsel for the Commission, City Legal Department.

Chair McQueary called the meeting to order at 5:02 pm and thanked everyone for attending the meeting. Chair McQueary advised of the procedures in place for voting.

**1. APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES (Approved)**

**1a. Minutes of the May 13, 2020 Regular Meeting.**

A motion was made by Mr. Johnson to approve the May 13, 2020 minutes, seconded by Ms. Murphy. The Commission voted 5-0. (Chair McQueary, Ms. Murphy, Mr. Johnson, Mr. Thomas, and Ms. Adams. Nays: 0).

**1b. Minutes of the June 10, 2020 Regular Meeting.**

A motion was made by Mr. Johnson to approve the June 10, 2020 minutes, seconded by Ms. Murphy. The Commission voted 5-0. (Chair McQueary, Ms. Murphy, Mr. Johnson, Mr. Thomas, and Ms. Adams. Nays: 0).

**2. STAFF UPDATES**

**2a. Willow Oaks Redevelopment Area**

Ms. Arkin stated Mr. José Colón advised that the 1520 McConnell parcel is under consideration by a developer.

**2b. South Elm Street Redevelopment Area**

Ms. Arkin advised HUD has approved the developer's application 221(d)(4) mortgage loan.

**3. HERITAGE HOUSE REDEVELOPMENT AREA**

Mr. Kelly advised there needed to be further discussion regarding Meridian and the Redevelopment Commission that should be held in closed session. Chair McQueary requested a motion be made. A motion was made by Mr. Johnson to move into a closed session, seconded by Ms. Murphy. (Chair McQueary, Ms. Murphy, Mr. Johnson, Mr. Thomas, and Ms. Adams. Nays: 0).

Pursuant to N.C.G.S. 143-318.11(a)(3), I, Mr. Johnson move that the commission go into closed session in order to preserve its attorney-client privilege in consultation with its attorneys concerning the handling or settlement of the claims made in pending litigation in Guilford County Superior Court involving West Town Bank and Meridian Conventions, LLC, identified as case numbers: 17 CVS 4458; 19 CVS 5882; and 19 CVS 5883; seconded by Ms. Murphy. (Chair McQueary, Ms. Murphy, Mr. Johnson, Mr. Thomas, and Ms. Adams. Nays: 0).

**CLOSED SESSION BEGAN 5:14PM**

The Commission held a closed session in order to preserve its attorney-client privilege in the handling of settlement concerning the pending litigation in Guilford County Superior Court involving West Town Bank and Meridian Conventions, LLC.

**CLOSED SESSION ENDED 5:40PM**

Chair McQueary stated the Redevelopment Commission was out of the closed session and into open session to vote on the request by the Attorney. Mr. Kelly stated the motion. Mr. Kelly asked for a motion that the Redevelopment Commission authorize its attorneys to file a Quiet Title action with respect to the properties located at 310 and 312 West Meadowview Road. Mr. Johnson so moved, seconded by Ms. Adams. The Commission voted 5-0. (Chair McQueary, Mr. Johnson, Ms. Adams, Ms. Murphy, and Mr. Thomas. Nays: 0).

**ABSENCES:**

The absence of Mr. Gravely was acknowledged.

**ADJOURNMENT**

Chair McQueary thanked everyone for their participation in the meeting. With no other business, the meeting was adjourned at 5:49 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Sue Schwartz Planning Director

SS: cgs

**REGULAR MEETING OF THE  
REDEVELOPMENT COMMISSION**

**September 2, 2020**

The regular meeting of the Redevelopment Commission of Greensboro (RCG) was held on Wednesday, September 2, 2020, via Zoom satellite. The following members were present: Chair Charles McQueary, Patrick Johnson, Marcus Thomas, Patricia Adams, Amy Murphy, as well as Councilwoman Nancy Hoffmann (City Council). Staff present was Dyan Arkin, Hart Crane, José Colón, and Russ Clegg, and Planning Director Sue Schwartz of the Planning Department. Terri Jones, Counsel for the Commission, Deputy City Attorney was also present.

Chair McQueary called the meeting to order at 5:00 pm and thanked everyone for attending the meeting. Chair McQueary advised of the procedures in place for voting.

**1. APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES (Approved)**

**1a. Minutes of the July 1, 2020 Regular Meeting.**

A motion was made by Mr. Johnson to approve the July 1, 2020 minutes as amended to include the addition of a 5:14 pm start and the closed time of 5:40 pm end time. Seconded by Ms. Murphy. The Commission voted 5-0. (Chair McQueary, Mr. Johnson, Ms. Adams, Mr. Thomas, and Ms. Murphy. Nays: 0).

**2. SINGLE-FAMILY LOT INITIATIVE AGREEMENT RENEWAL AND UPDATE**

Hart Crane shared his screen to display various slides. Mr. Crane stated the Redevelopment Commission (RCG) and the Greensboro Housing Development Partnership (GHDP) have had a long standing agreement adopted in 2004. The two Boards agreed at that time RCG would convey lots to GHDP, which would sell those lots with the intent of single-family development and home ownership in Ole Asheboro. It has been extended a couple of times and expired in April of 2020. Since that time Mr. Crane has worked with the Legal department and with planning staff to update the program. Legal advised renewing the agreement rather than extending it again. As this is a renewal request, it is an approval item for the Commission and will go on to City Council. Staff explored options on how to improve the program and make the application process easier. The program currently has a three-step review process. For a developer to purchase a lot, they first submit a proposal to staff with a letter of interest, proposed development plans and schedule, and a financing plan. Staff ensures the developer has the capacity to do the project and that it meets the intentions of the program. Once that threshold has been met, the developers takes the proposal to the Ole Asheboro Planning Advisory Committee and introduce themselves and their proposal to the community. The proposal then is presented to GHDP for final consideration.

Mr. Crane explained the program started with 27 lots; a number of them were developed by the development arm of the Self-Helped Credit Union. Recently Community Housing Solutions, a local non-profit, built six homes through the program. Some properties have been transferred for rights of way and recombined with other city lots. Twelve remaining lots, shown on the map depicted on the Zoom screen, remain in the program. Most are isolated lots, but there is a cluster on Martin Luther King that has recently received interest. A builder has submitted an application and Mr. Crane is waiting to hear when community representatives can meet with them. There have been calls regarding these properties as well. Three lots on East Gate City Boulevard have also received recent inquiries.

Mr. Crane explained the agreement Commissioners are being asked to consider is the legal document that conveyed the lots from RCG to GHDP. Elements included in the agreement describe the property inventory and the obligations of GHDP. In the second part of the agreement, it is specified that GHDP will sell these particular lots per the terms and conditions of an approved Request for Proposal (RFP) process. Mr. Crane will be proposing a few changes to GHDP to make the process easier, more appealing, and streamlined for development such as removing the attachments from the main application. There is \$800,000 in 2016 Bond Funds specifically for the single-family lot initiative, which needs to be a more prominent component of the program marketing. Mr. Crane presented a slide depicting current program deed restrictions and addressed each of the issues. He asked if there were questions and reminded the Commissioners they are being asked to vote to renew the agreement. If RCG approves the renewal, the agreement will go before GHDP on September 28, 2020 and City Council probably in October or November.

Commissioner Johnson asked if the deed restrictions were taken out and compliance relied on zoning, would it change or influence RCG's rights should the developer violate the terms of their contract. Planning Director Schwartz provided a history on the deed restrictions, which originally were established by the neighborhood as an extra layer of recourse and explained that some of the restrictions had been around since 1974. She stated she had been with the City 32 years and has only seen four times that deed restrictions were enforced, and then only after a lengthy process basically as a last resort. The intent of the redevelopment plan was to stabilize the neighborhood by promoting home ownership. Mr. Johnson stated Ms. Schwartz's comments were very helpful. His point was to ensure that the community and RCG would have other means to enforce if it became necessary as a last resort.

Chair McQueary asked why the program is restricted to only single-family houses as opposed to multi-family housing. Mr. Crane stated the prevailing thought is that single-family home ownership has a stabilizing effect in an area. Ms. Schwartz advised that single family housing is what is designated on the land use plan for the adopted redevelopment plan, but that different housing types could be looked at.

Chair McQueary inquired if there were any other questions or comments before considering the request. Hearing none, he asked Mr. Crane to restate specifically what he would like the Commission to vote upon. Mr. Crane stated the Commission was being asked to consider the renewal of the single-family lot initiative agreement between RCG and GHDP. Ms. Jones advised the Commission would be authorizing the Chair to enter into this agreement with the City and GHDP. Mr. Johnson made a motion to approve the renewal agreement between GHDP and RCG for the single lot initiative. Seconded by Mr. Thomas. The Commission voted 5-0. (Chair McQueary, Mr. Johnson, Ms. Adams, Mr. Thomas, and Ms. Murphy. Nays: 0).

### **3. STAFF UPDATES**

#### **3a. Heritage House Redevelopment Area**

Ms. Arkin advised there have been no changes to the Heritage House redevelopment area since the last conversation held with the Commissioners at the previous closed session meeting. The contract is continuing to move forward regarding the scope of work for demolition and deconstruction to understand what needs to be done if and when that the Commission can move forward independently from the lawsuit. It is not known if that will be possible, but staff would like to be ready to move forward if it becomes possible.

Chair McQueary requested to have this item kept on the agenda each time to provide updates. Ms. Arkin assured the Commission updates will continue to be provided.

#### **3b. South Elm Street Redevelopment Area**

Dyan Arkin stated there are no specific updates. The developers are continuing to move forward. The developer was placed in a position in having to hire a new architectural firm and have been trying to move as quickly as possible toward getting them up to speed. The terms and conditions of a sale development agreement are being finalized. It is anticipated the agreement will come before the Commission at the October meeting as an item for discussion and then for consideration of approval at the November meeting. Everything is being done to have all

of the details ironed out regarding financing and design for the parking structure. Ms. Arkin felt the Commission will be satisfied with the terms and conditions of the sale development agreement. Chair McQueary inquired if there had been any further development on the discussions regarding parking in that area with Mr. Zimmerman and the Union Square Campus. Ms. Arkin responded there have not been detailed conversations with Union Square Campus Inc., the organization that runs the campus, or with Mr. Zimmerman regarding his building across Gate City Boulevard and the tenants there, and that staff has been working closely with the development group to come up with ownership and operation strategies for a parking structure. The developers will be contacting Mr. Zimmerman and Union Square Campus, Inc. to discuss leasing spaces in the parking structure to allow for the completion of their pro formas because they will be used as part of the project funding.

Chair McQueary inquired if there were any new developments with the cell tower owner. Ms. Arkin responded there have not been. The lease states that they are supposed to pay the property taxes, which are generated even though RCG is exempt from property taxes, because there is a revenue producing improvement on it, and a letter is being drafted requesting reimbursement of the taxable amount for the last few years. The cell tower company is looking at other land for relocation of the tower, but Ms. Arkin stated the clock is ticking and not much time is left. The developer's current plan shows them not starting construction on any components of the project until the cell tower is removed, but strategies for accelerating the timeline are under discussion.

Chair McQueary inquired if there were any other subjects to discuss and thanked Councilwoman Hoffman for attending the meeting. Ms. Hoffmann advised she met with Mr. Zimmerman in the past week and thought Mr. Zimmerman felt his current parking needs are being met by the city's completion of the temporary parking lot on the west block. Chair McQueary inquired if any Commissioners had any further input to provide.

### **Adjournment**

Chair McQueary thanked everyone for their participation in the meeting. With no other business, the meeting was adjourned at 5:36 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Sue Schwartz Planning Director

SS: cgs

**REGULAR MEETING OF THE  
REDEVELOPMENT COMMISSION  
OCTOBER 7, 2020**

The regular meeting of the Redevelopment Commission of Greensboro (RCG) was held on Wednesday, October 7, 2020, via Zoom satellite. The following members were present: Chair Charles McQueary, Clinton Gravely, Patrick Johnson, Patricia Adams, Amy Murphy, as well as Councilwoman Sharon Hightower (City Council). Staff present was Dyan Arkin, Hart Crane, José Colón, and Russ Clegg, Planning Department. Terri Jones, Counsel for the Commission, Deputy City Attorney, and Chuck Watts, City Attorney.

Chair McQueary called the meeting to order at 5:00 pm and thanked everyone for attending the meeting. Chair McQueary advised of the procedures in place for voting.

**1. APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES (Approved)**

**1a. Minutes of the September 2, 2020 Regular Meeting.**

A motion was made by Mr. Johnson to approve the September 2, 2020 minutes, seconded by Ms. Murphy. The Commission voted 5-0. (Chair McQueary, Mr. Johnson, Ms. Adams, Ms. Murphy, and Mr. Gravely, Nays: 0).

**2. SOUTH ELM STREET REDEVELOPMENT AREA**

**2a. Developer update on Sale Development Agreement, Terms and Conditions**

Ms. Arkin advised that Bob Chapman of the South Elm Development Group (SEDG) will provide an update on the South Elm Redevelopment area and present the terms and conditions for a Sale Development Agreement (SDA) to the Commissioners at this meeting. The Commissioners will have an opportunity to comment and discuss at this meeting what will be incorporated into a final set of terms and conditions for the SDA.

Ms. Arkin presented a brief presentation reminding the Commissioners the area being discussed with SEDG and Rea Ventures, a joint venture called Rea-South Elm LLC (Rea-SE), was the east block that includes the Union Square Campus as shown on the map. Ms. Arkin indicated where South Elm Street and Gate City Boulevard were located on the map. To the south was Bragg Street, which has a portion of the downtown Greenway, as indicated on the map. Ms. Arkin advised the Commissioners the SDA is the agreement between a developer and the Redevelopment Commission to purchase Redevelopment Commission-owned land under a defined set of terms and conditions. All City land sales are contingent on City Council approval, and the Redevelopment Commission ultimately is agreeing to the terms and conditions and recommending to City Council approval of the sale of the land under the specific terms and conditions as defined by the SDA. The SDA describes the responsibilities of the different parties, including specific activities that need to be done prior to the actual closing and conveyance of the land, outlines the timeline for development from the execution of the agreement to completion of construction, provides a framework for the closing and conveyance process, and designates the purchase price and the payment terms. It is an important document for defining what the project is going to look like. It is not a final approval of land sales, City Council does that. It is not the closing and conveyance itself but it is the Commission saying it agrees under these terms and conditions agree to sell the land to a developer, if City Council approves.

Ms. Arkin stated some things to be done prior to closing are the development team provides a final development program and phasing schedule, site plans, and final development budget with sources and uses. Rea-SE will be working through all of these details with staff and will provide much more refined and final documents to be approved by the Redevelopment Commission, prior to the closing and conveyance. For example, they will be providing a marketing plan for the apartments, all types of drawings, specifications, and other documents that will show the Commission and the public what the exterior and interior of the project will look like. Additionally, documentation as to the cost of construction and evidence of financial ability through capital contributions and other sources to complete the improvements in accordance with this agreement will be provided. The final item on that list is an arrangement with the City to execute one or more agreements for development assistance funding

which could take several forms and could look a variety of ways. Ms. Arkin turned the meeting over to Mr. Chapman to speak on the specifics of the project.

Mr. Chapman thanked the Redevelopment Commission and Ms. Arkin for all of their help on this project. Mr. Chapman stated they have selected a sub-developer for the project, Rea Ventures, Inc. of Atlanta. Rea Ventures is a very professional group totally committed to this project. A very positive and productive preliminary meeting was held with HUD regarding funding through a 221(d)(4) loan. Mr. Chapman introduced his colleague, David Olverson, and stated he is a tremendous asset for the project working in the Durham office. He asked Breck Kean of Rea Ventures to bring the Commission up to date on where this project is currently.

Mr. Kean stated their goal was to provide the Commission an update, introduce progress that has been made and to outline the terms and conditions of the SDA to hopefully obtain approval for the sale of the land at the next meeting. Mr. Kean explained that one of the cardinal sins in the development business is spending a lot of money on property you don't own or have control over. This is a very important step in the process in order for the developer to be able move forward with confidence. There will be significant amounts of monies spent on design, engineering, and due diligence in the coming months for the project to get under construction. Rea-SE is committed and has selected an architectural firm based in Atlanta, which will work in collaboration with Lew Oliver, a prominent architect for urban projects. Commitments have been made to CPT Engineering, civil engineer Chuck Truby, Seth Harry and Associates, which is a partner in SEDG. Mr. Harry has provided significant oversight and conceptual ideas for this project. Rea-SE financial partner will be HUD through the multi-family financing program called the 221(d)(4). It is not an affordable housing financing vehicle, but can be used for affordable housing and is the most favorable financing in the market currently for multifamily housing; even more important in the time of the pandemic and Coronavirus. HUD is still processing loans and looking for new opportunities. Rea-SEs held a concept meeting with HUD finance staff, who were supportive and excited by the project. HUD has knowledge and history with the Redevelopment Area and was very pleased to see this coming forward. Once the SDA is agreed to, Rea-SE will move full steam into the HUD application process.

Mr. Kean depicted the site on screen. It is 2.474 acres, excluding the Union Square Campus site and the Gray property on the southern end of the site. A rendering of a site plan depicting a potential execution of 248 apartments on the site was displayed. Mr. Kean advised it will change and improve. The massing may be similar. The renderings were only to provide an idea of what can be placed on the 2.474 acres to the Commissioners.

Mr. Kean provided updates on the project team. Interviews are being conducted with potential construction firms. There have been productive conversations with the Christman Company and John Merrill, who has provided great ideas and information. Rea-SE has not committed to Christman and are continuing to interview other firms. The most efficient execution of the site for parking, in particular without the Gray property, is podium parking. The parking garage will probably be a two-story garage with multi-family constructed on top. Previous concepts depicted a free standing garage with the multi-family units wrapped around the garage. Both are options still being contemplated, but the podium would be more efficient. Rea Ventures will own, develop, and operate the parking deck. After months of conversations and information exchanged, the Grays will not be participating in this development.

Mr. Chapman advised when first beginning to work on this project, one of the major issues was the Gray family who owned approximately one acre in the middle of the block, which would make it difficult for anything to work on the east side of South Elm Street. The Grays were not interested in selling the property, but were interested in a land swap. The Redevelopment Commission exchanged 9/10 of an acre on the south end of the block for the Grays' 9/10 of an acre in the middle of the block. As part of that, the Grays asked SEDG to cooperate with them in the development of their property. SEDG signed a five- page development agreement with the Grays. The Redevelopment Commission was not a part of that agreement, it was solely between SEDG and the Gray family, now known as Grays on the Greenway. One of the elements of the agreement was that the Grays and SEDG agreed to develop the Grays' property and the adjacent land in a cooperative manner. SEDG and Rea-SE continues to have a cordial relationship with the Gray family and will stay in close communication to try to look out for their interest in every way. An offer was made to the Grays to contribute their property to this project in



exchange for an ownership position equal to all the owners in terms of value contributed, but they decided they were not ready to move forward with that.

An alternative site plan incorporates the same number of units on the Commission-owned property north of the Grays' property and takes advantage of one element of the agreement, a 24 foot lane between the two parcels. The main change will be that the apartments may be up to six stories, including the podium for parking underneath. The building will have more presence and an urban feel.

The agreement also the possibility for the Grays to rent or construct up to 80 parking spaces for their use. At this time it is not known what they will chose to do, but the opportunities are open and none of this affects this project in a negative way. Rea-SE will stay in communication with them moving forward.

Mr. Kean stated the most important thing is that moving forward without the Grays has no negative impact on the scope of this project, the look of the project, or the execution of the project. Mr. Kean stated the cell tower lease expires May 15, 2022, so that is more than likely the start date for the project. It may sound like a long way off but the HUD underwriting process will begin in December or January and takes 12 to 14 months to get to closing. There have been numerous attempts to communicate with the cell tower representatives with little to no success. If something does change with that, the project could be expedited. The project is still anticipated to be a \$50 million plus project with 248 rental apartment units, approximately 2000 square feet of retail space, and an approximately 650 space parking deck. Of the 650 spaces, around 300 would be designated for the residential units, and the remaining spaces would be leased to the Union Square Campus and other users. There is a public plaza on the corner of South Elm and Gate City Boulevard and 20% of the units will be affordable to renters making 80% of area median, which is approximately \$67,000 for a family of four. The project will be subject to the Union Square covenants, conditions, and restrictions and the South Elm Street Redevelopment Plan, the Union Square Design and Green Development Guidelines. The project will be certified under the National Green Building Standard certification program, which is similar to LEED.

The SDA will hopefully be presented to the Redevelopment Commission at the next meeting. They are proposing that the 2.474 acres be purchased at fair market value and financed by a promissory note given back to the Redevelopment Commission. Discussions are still being held negotiating the terms of the promissory note. SEDG is buying that land as Master Developer and will convey the land to REA-SE in exchange for ownership equity. SEDG has land credit, but will not exercise that credit at this time. REA-SE will work with HUD to finalize a 221(d)(4) construction permanent mortgage on the property, which will provide about 85% of the project cost. The other 15% will come from private equity and the City of Greensboro's development assistance. Greensboro's development Assistance has not been formally committed, but Rea-SE have been advised there is \$4 million of bond funds from the 2016 bond issuance available for development assistance. One of the first reports HUD will require is a third party appraisal that HUD will engage. The appraisal will establish the fair market value and then the project will go through the upset bid process prior to being presented to City Council for final approval.

Chair McQueary inquired if the Commissioners had any questions or comments. Seeing none, Chair McQueary inquired if anyone else in the Zoom meeting had any questions for Mr. Kean. Seeing none, Chair McQueary thanked Mr. Kean for the very informative presentation. Ms. Arkin stated the development team has done a great job of bringing creative solutions to a very challenging project and appreciate them and their commitment to the city of Greensboro. They are very professional, very thoughtful, and very intentional and she expressed that she looks forward to working on this project with them. Ms. Arkin inquired if there were any additional questions for staff or Ms. Jones or anyone on the development team.

### **3. STAFF UPDATES**

#### **3. a. Heritage House Redevelopment Area**

Ms. Arkin advised there was a reply brief related to the motion to dismiss, regarding the Minimum Housing proceeding due on October 9, 2020, which they attorneys have been working on. The attorneys are looking to rebut Meridian's expert on title issues in the next couple of weeks. All parties to the legal proceedings have agreed to ask the Court to extend the current deadlines for discovery until after the Judge rules on the current motions to dismiss. Ms. Jones or Mr. Watts were available for any specific questions.

### **3. b Ole Asheboro**

Mr. Crane reminded the Commissioners of their approval of the agreement between the Redevelopment Commission and the Greensboro Housing Development Partnership (GHDP) regarding the Single Family Lot Initiative program at their last meeting. The agreement was brought to GHDP, and a few comments from the GHDP attorney are being incorporated into it, but overall they are fine with renewing the agreement and looking to move forward. There were no hiccups, just a few legal things being ironed out.

Mr. Crane introduced John Greene and Deena Hayes-Greene, two community members who live in the Gorrell Street Redevelopment Area, just north of the Ole Asheboro Redevelopment Area who are interested in some property in the Ole Asheboro area. Ms. Hayes-Greene stated she was on the Board of Ole Asheboro Street Neighborhood Association. They live in the neighborhood and were glad to be a part of the meeting. Mr. Greene, also a member of the Ole Asheboro Street Neighborhood Association, stated they chose to move in this neighborhood and started making improvements with their own money. The Greens would like to work with the Redevelopment Commission in the future and partner with the City to help their efforts in restoring properties in the area. Mr. Crane explained the Greens have worked on a number of houses in the Gorrell Street redevelopment area and are interested currently in 400 East Bragg Street, south of the New Zion Church. There are some things that need to be flushed out but the Greens are very enthusiastic to do great work in the neighborhood.

Chair McQueary stated the Commission appreciates the community interest, and the Commission would do everything they could to help facilitate things happening throughout Greensboro, but in particular the area where they own property.

Mr. Chapman stated he was very glad to have the opportunity to take the Organizing Against Racism course that Ms. Hayes-Greene founded as it was life changing for him and his family. Mr. Chapman also enjoyed speaking with Mr. Greene who was very much involved in building the Union Square Campus from the beginning.

### **4. ADDITIONAL ITEMS**

Ms. Arkin advised there are two Commissioners whose terms are up at the end of the year. Mr. McQueary and Mr. Gravely both have participated on the Commission for almost a decade. It is a lot to ask of someone and there is so much appreciation for people's time and energy to do this important work. Mr. McQueary has been the Chair and Mr. Gravely has been the Vice Chair. It will be an interesting transition with the two leadership roles being available. Ms. Arkin and Mr. Crane have asked Mr. McQueary to talk directly with Mr. Gravely and for both to reach out to their respective City Council people to discuss how a smooth transition can be affected. In order to maintain a full complement of Commissioners, the Commissioners are each asked to remain as Commissioners until their vacancy is filled by City Council. There should not be a gap in service but both Commissioners would appreciate a breather. This will be coming up in January of 2021.

Ms. Jones advised the Commissioners she has been on and off representing the Redevelopment Commission for the last 6 1/2 years and sometimes participating for the City's interest. Ms. Jones advised she is moving on from city service, effective 10/9/2020 and starting a new position with the town of Garner. One of the first tasks Ms. Jones had arriving at Greensboro was to help the Neighborhood Development department with the order to vacate the Heritage House. Ms. Jones moved on to acquire 150 of the units voluntarily on behalf of the City and transferred those to the Redevelopment Commission. Everything was turned over to Attorney Andrew Kelly. Ms. Jones was sad to say they have not been able to resolve the Heritage House issue since she has been with the City, but hopefully that will come to a resolution soon. Ms. Jones stated how much she has enjoyed working on the Redevelopment Commission projects from Union Square to some of the smaller conveyances of property and wished everyone well in the future.

Chair McQueary thanked Ms. Jones for her service and all she has done, not only for the Commission, but for the City as well and wished her the very best as she moves on. Ms. Arkin stated staff strongly echoed what Chair McQueary stated. Staff appreciated Ms. Jones tremendously as she is an excellent lawyer, very supportive and responsive. Ms. Arkin advised Andrea Harrell has been asked to be the next Redevelopment Commission attorney

and has accepted the position. Ms. Arkin and Mr. Crane have met with Ms. Harrell about Redevelopment Commission and other responsibilities she would have. Ms. Harrell is a great representative of the City legal staff.

Chair McQueary stated he will save his farewell speech until there is a replacement. This has been a very interesting experience for him. He has learned from being on this Commission that measuring progress is much easier if you look back to where you are and see where you have come to, rather than try to see where you are right now. It is very important to see where it started.

Chair McQueary stated all of them were given an opportunity to participate in the sensitivity course. The course is now being offered via videos and to those Commissioners who have not had a chance to attend or watch the video, encouraged everyone to do so as it is very worthwhile in understanding the vision and direction the City is going in. Chair McQueary felt it was beneficial in order to help everyone on how to do the job as Commissioners.

Chair McQueary asked Councilwoman Hightower if she had any comments. Councilwoman Hightower stated she was sorry to see Chair McQueary go and thanked him for his service. Councilwoman Hightower was also sorry to see Ms. Jones leaving. Councilwoman Hightower was the one that gave Ms. Jones the task of removing Heritage house and the removal of the Heritage House was one of the first things she wanted to do when she came into office. Ms. Jones took it on and did a phenomenal job. Ms. Jones has been very valuable and wished her well. It will take time to fill those shoes adequately. Councilwoman Hightower thanked the Redevelopment Commission for the good topics at this meeting and looked forward to the development of the Union Square apartments. Councilwoman Hightower stated her appreciation for all of the work Redevelopment Commission has done to change the landscape in the community.

Chair McQueary inquired if there were any other comments from the Commissioners. Hearing none, Chair McQueary thanked everyone for their participation in the meeting. With no other business, the meeting was adjourned at 5:52 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Sue Schwartz Planning Director

SS: cgs