

**SPECIAL ANNUAL MEETING OF THE
REDEVELOPMENT COMMISSION**

January 6, 2021

The Special Annual meeting of the Redevelopment Commission of Greensboro (RCG) was held on Wednesday, January 6, 2021, via Zoom satellite. The following members were present: Patrick Johnson, Trisha Adams, Amy Murphy, Marcus Thomas, Pamela Turner and Doug Heberle. Staff present was Hart Crane, José Colón, and Russ Clegg, Planning Department. Andrea Harrell, Counsel for the Commission.

Mr. Hart Crane called the meeting to order at 5:00 pm and thanked everyone for attending the meeting. Mr. Crane presented the agenda and advised the only thing that would need to be approved was the minutes. The rest were procedural and annual items to be taken care of at this Special Annual Meeting. Two long time Commission members, Chair McQueary and Former Vice Chair, Clinton Gravely terms have ended. Their official last meeting was December but were present to help with the transition and to ensure nothing was missed. Two new members, Doug Heberle and Pamela Turner, are present and have taken their oaths to serve on the Redevelopment Commission. Chair and Vice Chair positions now need to be filled.

Former Chair McQueary thanked all of the Commission members, all of staff, Bob Chapman, and all of Mr. Chapman's people that have been introduced and worked with the Redevelopment Commission. Former Chair McQueary stated this has been a joyful experience for him personally, and has learned a lot from being able to work with each member. Chair McQueary stated he looks forward to particularly the results down on South Elm. Former Chair McQueary thanked everyone again. Former Vice Chair Gravely stated he really enjoyed working with Mr. McQueary, and working with staff and the rest of the Commission, and Bob Chapman. He concluded by wishing everyone good luck.

Mr. Crane advised to commence the election of Officers, specifically for the Chair and Vice Chair positions. He advised that the other positions, Secretary, Assistant Secretary, and Treasurer positions historically held by staff. Chair and Vice Chair are held by Commission members themselves. Mr. Crane opened the floor for Commission members to make any motions for the Board Officer positions.

1. Election of RCG Officers

Amy Murphy made a motion to nominate Patrick Johnson as Chair of the Redevelopment Commission; seconded by Trisha Adams. The Commission voted 5-0 (Ms. Adams, Ms. Murphy, Mr. Thomas, Ms. Turner and Mr. Heberle). Patrick Johnson was voted as the new Redevelopment Commission Chair.

Chair Johnson made a motion to nominate Trisha Adams as Vice Chair; seconded by Doug Heberle. The Commission voted 5-0. (Chair Johnson, Ms. Murphy, Mr. Thomas, Mr. Heberle and Ms. Turner). Mr. Crane stated he had spoken to Chair Johnson before the meeting of the three remaining positions that are typically staff held positions and Chair Johnson will make those motions. Chair Johnson made a motion to nominate Sue Schwartz to continue as Secretary of the Redevelopment Commission; seconded by Ms. Adams. The Commission voted 5-0. (Chair Johnson, Ms. Adams, Ms. Murphy, Mr. Heberle and Ms. Turner). Hart Crane advised that motion passed and Schwartz will remain as Secretary of the Redevelopment Commission. Chair Johnson made a motion for Hart Crane to be the new Assistant Secretary for the Commission; seconded by Ms. Murphy. The Commission voted 5-0. (Chair Johnson, Ms. Adams, Ms. Murphy, Mr. Heberle and Ms. Turner). The motion passed and Mr. Crane will be the new Assistant Secretary. Mr. Crane advised Vera Thunderburk is a staff in the Neighborhood Development Department who handles treasury for most of the Boards and Commissions that Planning is responsible for and she has done that position historically and will continue to do so in the future. She should be renewed as treasurer. Chair Johnson made a motion for Vera Thunderburk remain as Treasurer for the Commission; seconded by Mr. Heberle. The Commission voted 5-0. (Chair Johnson, Ms. Adams, Ms. Murphy, Mr. Heberle and Ms. Turner). The motion passed.

Mr. Crane expressed his appreciation in going through that process.

2. Approval of Meeting Minutes (Approved)

1a. Minutes of the December 2, 2020 Regular Meeting.

Mr. Crane then asked if there were any major changes or comments to the minutes, a motion could be made to approve. Chair Johnson advised he had a couple of typos that are administrative in nature and very minor. Chair Johnson stated he would approve a motion to approve the minutes, subject to the minor edits. Chair Johnson inquired if any of the Commissioners had any other comments.

Ms. Harrell advised the corrections may be minor but without everyone knowing what the changes are, it may be better to send the changes, recirculate them, and vote after that.

The minutes will be approved at the February meeting.

3. Ole Asheboro Redevelopment Area & Prestwick Development Updates

Mr. Crane advised Edrick Harris representing the Prestwick Development group will also be speaking on these updates. Mr. Crane provided a brief background regarding these properties. The Commission and the City entered into a 3 party agreement with Prestwick Development out of Atlanta in January of 2019. The agreement stipulated that Prestwick would build approximately 72 affordable senior living, multi-family units, within the Ole Asheboro Redevelopment area. Specifically what are noted as the priority areas in the TN Plan for the Redevelopment Area. This is an update to an agreement the Commission had approved in the past and the activities outlined in that agreement have not come to fruition. This presentation will tell the Commissioners where they are now and what then next steps are for that agreement. Since there are some new people present, it may be beneficial to step back and provide an overview about what Ole Asheboro is and some general facts about Asheboro that will contextualize the conversation.

The plan that was adopted in 2004 and was depicted for the Commissioners. There were five goals primarily aimed at neighborhood stability and investment. The plan specifically speaks to providing a diverse scale of development opportunity to link in the community's surrounding assets, develop well defined implementable initiatives throughout Ole Asheboro. The plan was aimed at neighborhood stability, connecting it, and making it a resource for the whole city, as well integrating it with existing infrastructure such as the downtown Greenway. In 2011, an addendum to that plan was adopted, titled the Martin Luther King, Junior, Drive, North, Traditional Neighborhood plan. Primarily the addendum did three things; at its core, it reemphasized the goals in the first plan but additionally to that was it laid specific design principles, defined some zone and site standards. But perhaps most importantly it identified priority development properties within the redevelopment area boundary. A property within the redevelopment area the Commission owns, and the addendum plan highlighted some of those properties and said these are the most important to be developed.

Mr. Crane indicated on the right of the drawing a map of Ole Asheboro and indicated the full redevelopment area. North is East Gate City Boulevard, south is Florida Street, east is Bennett, and west is Arlington St. It is one of the larger redevelopment areas. The priority areas that are being spoken all occurred within the somewhat middle north block. The plan identified priority areas as A1, A2, A3, and A4 parcels identified in the plan as the parcels to be developed first. The A1 parcel is where the new Zion Church was developed and is there today. A2 is across from the church and owned by the Greensboro Housing Development Partnership which is aligned with the Redevelopment Commission does similar work. South of A2 is A3. The A3 parcel is owned by the city and is 1.6 acres. A4 parcel are the parcels owned by the Redevelopment Commission and make up 1.12 acres and with 3 parcels combined to make the A4 parcel. When Prestwick did the initial project, in the original agreement they had agreed to build 72 affordable senior multi-family units on A3 and A4. Prestwick was going to build those and have the one project across these two sites. Photographs were depicted indicating what A2 and A3 look like currently. A2 has been vacant for a number of years. A3 is flat and green and currently fenced in. A4 owned by Redevelopment was depicted behind the Family Dollar.

Mr. Crane stated he is speaking today to update the Commissioners about why this development has not moved forward, what the next steps will be, and to obtain the Commissioners review and consideration of the direction for staff and the development have moving forward. In 2019, The Redevelopment Commission and Prestwick

entered into a development agreement for senior living multi-family units. It was to be one multi-family project spread across the A3 and A4 parcels as shown. The intent was this would be the first phase of a larger project, with the second phase being a market rate project on the A2 parcel. All three parcels have been shown with the initial scope being A3 and A4 on the southern portion and then the second phase of A2 at a later time. The project included funding through low income housing tax credits, contingent upon an award from the North Carolina Housing Finance Agency. It was a typical funding mechanism that can greatly subsidize development budgets, contingent upon some affordability requirements and things a developer would have to do regarding the project itself. It was one of the main ways that projects will be funded to allow it to go forward. Prestwick did not receive that in 2019 and did not apply in 2020. The agreement itself was constructed so that the land would not be conveyed to them unless they were awarded this project. The City and the Commission saw it as Prestwick needing the tax credits to have the project move forward. Prestwick was envisioning the project originally was to have 40 to 45 units on the A3 portion and 30-35 on the A4 portion. Prestwick has been working with staff to expand the scope to include the north A2 parcel. The thought process was the numbers work better when all of this is completed at once in 2021. It now makes more sense for Prestwick to do all three of the sites all at once. It will entail another party and adding some additional land to that previous agreement. Prestwick is seeking to expand their development footprint which would require letting the previous agreement expire and implementing a new agreement. Mr. Crane stated he was prefacing the background to the Commissioners and letting them know that this proposal is on the horizon. They would like to add the A2 parcel to the agreement and add the Greensboro Housing Development partnership as a party, because they are the owners of the A2 parcel. The scope of what would be done would change. The scope from the original approximately 80 senior living affordable units to approximately 160 units, with approximately half being senior and half work force. Prestwick wants to do it over one phase across all of the three sites. The previous agreement is being used as the basis of the new agreement, but would now include this additional property and additional party. Ultimately, the agreement is contingent upon their award of low income housing tax credits. If the Commissioners are favorable of this direction, staff will continue working with the City's legal department and GHDP's attorneys, to look at this previous agreement and make necessary changes to have in a form that Redevelopment can look at and review. The previous agreement and these conversations regarding how to change have occurred with the City's legal department and with GHDP's legal department, and are looking at the contract and seeing if it all makes sense. It does appear from the first take; from a legal perspective it makes sense to add the land and the additional party, and then to re-execute the contract to have the project move forward. A similar update will be provided to GHDP. Redevelopment met before GHDP and heard the information first. GHDP is very privy to this development group and always aware that they would be the second phase. Prestwick has met with them. GHDP is very transparent and work with the members on that board.

Mr. Crane anticipated GHDP will be excited to get the project moving forward, but there will probably be kinks to work out in terms of the contract and things of that nature. The ultimate hope is to bring the new four parcel sales development agreement to the Redevelopment Commission for their approval at an upcoming meeting. This was an informational update to let the Commission know what staff is working on and what to expect in the coming months. Staff was very excited about the potential of this project moving forward. Mr. Crane stated it was a lot of information and was open to any questions and the developer was also present to answer any questions.

Mr. Heberle asked what was the reasoning behind having this contract lapsing and creating a new contract versus amending the existing contract. Mr. Crane responded with the first being an old agreement, there is old information. There are certain terms, certain deadlines, that need to change in regards to the low-income housing tax credit application timeline and processes that would be needed to back out and shift. Mr. Crane stated his initial perspective was to just modify the current contract, came to the realization that it was more involved. Adding GHDP as a party to this is a fundamental change to do a new one because a new party is being added. After those conversations, it seemed doing a new one was more practical as opposed to attempting to shoe horn the old one. The old was favorable and approved by Council and everyone has that buy-in, using it as a foundation to add what is needed and then re-executing it is a safer process. Legal is present and would be able to speak to that question. Ms. Harrell advised she agreed. Due to the number of changes and the fundamental nature of those changes, the document will be sounder if it is only supplanted by a new agreement. Chair Johnson asked

to have a slide shown again to enforce his understanding of the new proposed potential transaction regarding amending the scope and the 160 units of senior/work force. Mr. Crane responded there will be an affordable component. One of the key points is that there will be affordability requirements, so there will need to be a spread of affordable units across the total unit count. Mr. Harris stated they are still working through the final but 100% of the units will be from 50% of AMI to 80% of AMI with everything averaging back to 60%. Chair Johnson asked if with the tax applications, would it be for the two applications. Mr. Crane responded he believed it would be one application. Mr. Harris responded everything will be submitted as one application package. Chair Johnson stated the real gist of his question was whether there would be some added complexity on the application side to be aware of or would be similar to the prior application, but larger in scope. Mr. Crane responded there may be. Mr. Harris and staff will be working together. There may be hiccups but that is the nature of contracts. Two lawyers are looking at it and the legal mechanism of the contract is the key piece. Things look very good, better than they were for the development world last time the agreement was executed, and staff is very hopeful for this project.

4. South Elm Redevelopment Area – Sales Development Agreement Update

José Colón advised there was no action being requested from the Commissioners at this meeting. The goal is to set a special session with the Commissioners later to bring the finalized sales development agreement for consideration. There are new members on the Commission and wanted everyone to have information to be able to review and consider the upcoming sales development agreement.

Mr. Colón provided an overview of the South Elm Street Redevelopment area. This redevelopment is bounded by Gate City Boulevard to the north, Norfolk Southern Rail line west between Eugene and Elm Streets. To the east is Arlington Street and Bragg Street at what is now the southern portion of the downtown Greenway to the south. A timeline was also presented of the South Elm Street Redevelopment area from its inception. City Council pursued an assessment of this area in 2002. Master Planning of the Redevelopment area started in 2004 and ultimately the South Elm Street Redevelopment Plan was adopted by City Council in 2007. After adoption, business relocation, demolition, and remediation efforts took place for the following two years. Early in 2010, the City of Greensboro released a request for proposals for a master developer for that area. South Elm Development Group, otherwise known as SEDG, was selected. In 2012 and 2013, the legal framework was put in place for SEDG to act as the master developer with various agreements. The development of the South Elm Street Master Plan and Guidelines were created to further establish the overall vision and esthetics of the area. In 2013 Union Square Campus site was selected within the area. The Union Square Campus is a state of art facility which resulted from a partnership between Cone Health, GTCC, North Carolina A&T University, and UNCG to create a nursing program for students. The construction of that project commenced in 2013 and completed in August of 2016. Photographs were depicted of the site in 2009 up to the opening day in 2016. Mr. Colón stated there were development proposals in 2015 and 2017 but those developments did not make it to the finish line. Presently Rea Ventures from Atlanta has brought their development proposal for discussion at this meeting. A map of the project site at the eastern block of South Elm Street Redevelopment area and included a cell tower site was shown to the Commissioners. Mr. Colón described the development programs. The improvements are approximately 248 rental apartments, a public plaza, 2000 square feet of commercial space and a parking structure with a minimum of 500 spaces. The sale price of the land is approximately 1.2 million established through the Master Development Agreement. The timeframe for the improvements to be completed is a 3 year timeframe of closing. There is room for a one year extension. A preview of the terms and conditions from the Sales Development Agreement was presented. A final site plan and survey, a final development program, a proposed development budget with sources and uses, a marketing plan for the residential units, drawings and specifications relating to the exterior architecture facades, will all be required prior to closing. It will include the interior layout of all building improvements, any other matters pertaining to the proposed construction of improvements and the projected costs of such improvements, evidence of financial ability, documentation of terms and conditions of conveyance of plans from the Master Developer to components with the developer. A phasing schedule and an agreement with the City regarding potential development and assistance can be up to 4 million dollars which are from the bond funds; specifically for the construction of a parking deck which is part of the package. Mr. Colón turned the

presentation over to Breck Kean and asked the Commissioners to hold any questions until the end of the presentation.

Breck Kean stated Rea Ventures and SEDG, Bob Chapman's group were introduced over 2 years ago and have been working together to bring this project to fruition, with several iterations involving efforts to involve the Gray Property to the south end of the block. Those efforts have been abandoned and are now focusing their efforts on the remainder of the site that the Redevelopment Commission owns outright. As Mr. Colón stated, their scope of work is 248 units, 500 space parking deck, the plaza, and a small component of about 2000 square feet of commercial space. It will essentially wrap around the Union Square Campus building representing approximately 51 million dollar investment in the south end of the Greensboro. It is hoped with the Commissioners' approval of the development agreement, everyone will move diligently and full steam into schematic design and financial due diligence in underwriting. The timeline is dictated by the cell tower site as it has a lease that expires in May of 2022. Efforts have been made to work around them, it would be very costly to try to do so and have to wait until the cell tower is gone. Many efforts have been made in attempting to communicate with the cell tower people to expedite the arrangement and they are very hard to communicate with. We will continue to make those efforts but will have to work on the assumption that this development will get underway in May of 2022 when the cell tower lease expires and the remnants can be removed. Mr. Kean introduced the architectural team members from Atlanta, Ga., that have a lot of urban experience. There is also a local civil engineering firm that they are working with as well. The financing of the property is proposed to go through HUD via the 221D4 program, which is not limited to affordable housing development and market rate development. Mr. Kean stated the units will have a 20% affordability component as required by the city. The 20% comes from the city's previous use of HUD funds to acquire this land to make initial improvements to this land many years ago. The affordability component is set at 80% of the area medium income. The project scope was depicted on a slide. The land purchased from the Redevelopment Commission is 2.474 acres with 248 units. A conceptual unit mix was depicted, 50 of the units will be at the affordability level of 20%. The market rate versus affordable rents was depicted. The 500 space parking garage will service both the residents and the adjoining Union Square campus. There will be a public plaza with retail and restaurants subject to all of the covenants or restrictions of the Redevelopment Commission. A slide was depicted indicating the site itself but did not incorporate the land at the south end of the block that belongs to the Gray family. Mr. Kean depicted a conceptual site plan, a parking deck, incorporating the area of the site where the cell tower is, residential units wrapping the corner with the public plaza and the commercial space on the corner. Several slides were shown depicting several reiterations or different levels of the proposed development.

Mr. Kean stated the next step in the process once the architecture and design teams will be to take this to a much more schematic or conceptual level which will probably take 3 to 4 months to fully develop the schematic scheme. The real matter of business with the Commission is to request approval of the sale of the land and the finalization of the sale and development agreement. The 1.2 million dollar sales price is based upon a formula that was within the original Master Development Agreement dating back to 2013. The agreement includes an inflation factor and the price will be further calculated based upon the 2021 inflation factors and will be close to the number sale price will probably be based upon that formula. The sale is to SEDG who is the Master Developer and then SEDG will put that into the partnership prior to the full closing with the financial partners. SEDG will deliver a promissory note to the Commission which will be subject to HUD approval and secured by a subordinate deed of trust. The loan would be forgivable if all of the obligations under the sales and development agreement are met. Rea Ventures is continuing discussions and negotiations with staff and counsel regarding the term of that forgiveness. It is their position that in about 5 years, once the loan has been closed, constructed the improvements, completed, leased, and stabilized the property and have met all of the obligations involved with the Commission, the loan would be forgiven per the agreement. A slide was depicted indicating the sources and uses. A slide was shown depicting the breakdown of nearly a 51 million dollar development project that would include construction, development costs. Mr. Kean stated construction hard cost is hard number to pin down right now and are working diligently with contractors to get those numbers accurately estimated to refine and progress the plans to pin those numbers down. The thought is the total development budget will be in the 51 million dollar range. They are requesting from the City of Greensboro the 4 million dollar assistance which comes from city

bond funds that were dedicated to the South Elm area. Mr. Kean stated Rea Ventures is very excited for this opportunity and believes strongly in the vitality of the downtown Greensboro housing market and the exciting activities going on there. This will be a great enhancement and improvement to the southern downtown redevelopment. With an improved sale and development agreement, they were prepared to make very substantial investments to move this project forward and hopefully be underway on or before May of 2022.

Mr. Crane inquired of the Commissioners if there were questions for Mr. Kean or Mr. José Colón. Chair Johnson stated at the end it was expressed that they were hoping to be underway in May, if not sooner and asked if there were parts of the development that can begin prior to the cell tower company exiting that piece of the property or is it an all in composition from Mr. Kean's view. Mr. Kean responded it has been looked at it but they view it as all in which would be very problematic and costly to phase it around that cell tower. Chair Johnson stated there is preliminary site work and things like that and asked if at some level would they be able to get in there or is a wait them out till May of 2022 situation. Mr. Kean responded the real problem comes down to the financing. Lenders, particularly HUD, do not like developers or construction digging around on a site before having complete control over it. Mr. Kean stated they would like to come to an agreement with them and put them on top of the parking deck or figure out some temporary solution for them. It would be a good revenue source, but the cell tower folks have been very difficult to communicate with. Mr. Crane asked when was the last communication with the cell tower people. Mr. Chapman responded he had talked to their real estate person in Boston about 15 times. He had an appointment which he cancelled at the last minute. The cell tower has gone in absolutely a non-communication mode. Ms. Arkin attempted to speak with them with no result. They are a public company on the stock exchange and Mr. Chapman did not know what was going on with American Tower. American Tower is not interested in moving off that tower one minute before their lease expires as best they can tell. The City has given them notice that their lease expires and will not be renewed. American Tower is fully aware they have to be off at the end of their lease. Mr. Chapman stated there has been a lot of preliminary, pre-development work such as acquiring a Brownsfield agreement with the state of North Carolina which is very important in doing all of the environmental studies, surveys, topographic. A good deal of work has been done on the streetscape already and improvements. Currently it is simply a parking lot and a cell tower.

Mr. Crane inquired if there were any questions regarding South Elm. Russ Clegg stated there was mention of a special meeting and there was not a date set at this meeting, but Mr. Colón will follow up and arrange that special meeting for the Commissioners to review the agreement, given the complexity of other meetings happening in the City and availability of Commissioners and Development partners. Mr. Colón advised right now they are looking at the week of January 18 through the January 22.

5. Staff Updates

5a. Willow Oaks Redevelopment Area

José Colón provided background information and advised the Willow Oaks Neighborhood is located north of East Gate City Boulevard, east of 220 and south of Market Street. There are also properties along south English Street in that redevelopment area. Similar to Old Asheboro, this is a traditional neighborhood district. There is very traditional architecture, craftsman style, and Victorian colonial revival architecture. Most of the properties within the Willow Oaks Redevelopment area are owned by Greensboro Housing Development Partnership. There are some properties owned by the Redevelopment Commission. Currently there is a building opportunity in the southeastern portion of the Willow Oaks Redevelopment area near the corner of McConnell Street and south English Street. Mr. Colón indicated a map depicting the areas. This particular area is mostly developed but there are approximately 31 vacant lots and would ensure Redevelopment finishes that section of the neighborhood. Currently GHDP has approved two builders and staff is currently reviewing the house plans for the first home of each builder. It is anticipated more updates will be provided in the coming months.

5b. Eastside Park Redevelopment Area

Mr. Colón advised the East Side Park is north of Willow Oaks and south of east Market Street. There are a few Redevelopment Commission owned lots in this area and is a high priority to have these areas developed. Staff

received a request from a residential developer who is interested in acquiring the properties on Peachtree Street and Gillespie Street. They are proposing duplex and single family development. A proposal was received and staff is working with him with suggestions on that proposal that should be presented at the next meeting in February.

Mr. Crane inquired if there were any questions. There were none.

5c. Heritage House Redevelopment Area

Russ Clegg stated the Heritage House Redevelopment Area is located in south Greensboro along Meadowview Road, east of Randleman Road and north of Interstate 40. It is approximately 7 acres in size and includes an event center and a condominium complex. Originally this was a hotel and was eventually turned into condominiums with residences where the rooms were and the event center where the complex was. It was condemned in July of 2014 and designated blighted in September of 2014. A Redevelopment plan was developed and adopted in 2015. Since that time, Redevelopment has been in litigation with the owners of the event center which was not condemned and it still a functioning business. An aerial view was presented depicting an existing Assisted Living center on Meadowview Road and wraps around the corner of this property and does not have street access along Meadowview or along Randleman. The Meridian Center is the large white building and at one point had shared parking. Currently there has been legal conversations. Mr. Clegg advised the legal department did not have an update regarding the legal proceedings. Some work is being done with an engineering firm to obtain a better precise estimate for demolition and a better timeline of how long that process may be. Due to the holidays not much has happened, but anticipate hearing from the engineers and legal department in the coming months.

Councilwoman Hightower advised she missed part of Heritage House and asked if there was anything special. Mr. Clegg responded the matter is still in court and has provided a brief update for the Commissioners. Staff is working with an engineering firm to obtain a more precise number for the timeline for demolition. There have been no legal updates.

5d. Phillips Lombardy Redevelopment Area

Mr. Crane advised staff received a letter of interest for some property that has not received a lot of attention historically. It is located in the Phillips Lombardy Redevelopment Area. Mr. Crane depicted a screen shot of the map of the property. This site used to be an old quarry site, about 10 acres. The front portion of the property is on Phillips Avenue, the eastern portion is on Lombardy. There are environmental concerns and constraints regarding the stream that runs through part of the site and the topographical issues that come with attempting to develop on an old quarry site. Staff has a developer that is very interested in this site and have been talking for several months in attempting to gauge the interest and ensuring it would be a good project for them. Troy Collins, Ariondack Community Development introduced himself as the interested party. Mr. Crane stated Mr. Collins and staff have been working together. Ariondack is very interested in this property. Mr. Collins has spoken with the council people out there. This is in the preliminary stages but are hopeful this could be a potential project for this redevelopment area. The Commission may be hearing more about this project and from Mr. Collins in the future.

Mr. Collins stated he was present representing Ariondack Community Development. Ariondack is primarily a work force, affordable housing developer and looking at this site for either a 4% or a 9% tax credit application. This site could be either. It scored well on a 9% tax credit allocation. Currently there are some topographical issues and things that are being looked at. They are attempting to work out the execution. This site will require a rezoning to RM-12 or RM-26 to be allowed for multi-family use. This is in the early stages of working through but are excited and look forward to continuing the process. Currently that is all that is known. Mr. Crane stated the firm that Mr. Collins has worked for has done a lot of good projects and have been great to work with so far. Staff is hopeful there will be development on this property.

5e. Arlington Park Redevelopment Area

Mr. Crane advised there is a developer interested in doing single family development in Arlington Park, southwest of Ole Asheboro. Off of Martin Luther Kind, Jr. Drive and in the heart of south Greensboro. There is a newly revived Neighborhood Association that is very active and does good work in the community. Mr. Crane

provided a heads up about this will be coming and are expecting this developer to provide the Commission with some type of proposal and presentation at the next meeting in February and work towards a Sales Development Agreement.

This plan was adopted in 1988. The Redevelopment Plan has two objectives; to remove structurally substandard buildings and encourage extensive rehabilitation. The Redevelopment Commission owns only 4 properties in this redevelopment area. This developer is interested in two of these properties, 1402 and 1404 Plymouth Street. The developer is Trinity Consulting and Development, based in Greensboro and have an interest to build two single family dwellings. One on 1402 and the other on 1404. Mr. Crane depicted some of Trinity's past projects and homes built recently in 2019. Mr. Crane stated he felt these homes would fit in well in the area. Trinity predominantly builds single family homes but have built multi-family homes. Mr. Crane advised if the Commissioners were interested in looking at some of the homes that Trinity has built, there are four properties on Craig Street, 118, 119, 121, 123 and two on Broad Avenue, 1002 and 1004. Mr. Crane advised this developer met with the Arlington Park Neighborhood Association in December. Questions primarily revolved on how can community members take advantage of a home built there. The answer was not immediately provided but there is a follow-up community discussion via Zoom for more information and questions to be resolved. Staff feels Trinity is doing what needs to be done to work with the community. The community wants to make sure they can take advantage of these homes and receive preference in applying for those homes. Generally the neighborhood is in favor to the development interest. Mr. Crane provided additional aerial views of the two properties and referenced the shape of the parcel. Additional views were depicted from street level. Assuming the Commissioner will be okay with what this sounds like, staff will obtain an appraisal on the property. Staff will continue to work with the developer to eventually to develop a sales development agreement. Staff anticipates having more steps and information at the next meeting and have Trinity introduce themselves. There has been a lot of development interest at properties that have not gotten a lot of interest in the past. Staff is excited and busy with a lot of good things going on and trying to get the Commission properties developed in a responsible way and involve the community. This is a weird time for the world, but a good time for redevelopment activities.

6. Board & Commission Member Survey

Mr. Crane reminded the Commission of the Board & Commission Member Survey included in their packet. Mr. Crane will be resending the hyper-link to the survey and an updated Commissioner roster and staff roster.

7. Additional Business

There was no additional business. Mr. Crane stated he has big shoes to fill from Dyan Arkin but is excited for Chair Johnson, Vice Chair Adams, for the new Commission members and himself working and going forward. Chair Johnson thanked Mr. Crane for a good presentation. There was a lot to digest and question will probably come up over the next month or so. Chair Johnson also thanked Mr. Colón for his presentations. Mr. Colón thanks Bob Chapman, Dave Olverson and Breck Kean for their time and presentation. Chair Johnson also thanked everyone for working through the annual meeting and some of the procedural requirements at the outset. This meeting was longer than usual. Chair Johnson thanked Councilwoman Hightower for her presence at this meeting. Mr. Chapman thanked the outgoing members of the Commission, especially Dyan Arkin who was a real pleasure to work with. It appears the Commission will be wonderful to work with and this will be a good future.

8. Adjournment

Amy Murphy made a motion to adjourn the meeting; seconded by Chair Johnson. The Commission voted 5-0. (Chair Johnson, Ms. Adams, Ms. Murphy, Mr. Heberle and Ms. Turner). The meeting was adjourned at 6:25 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Susan Schwartz, Secretary

**REGULAR MEETING OF THE
REDEVELOPMENT COMMISSION**

February 3, 2021

The regular meeting of the Redevelopment Commission of Greensboro (RCG) was held on Wednesday, February 3, 2021, via Zoom satellite. The following members were present: Chair Patrick Johnson, Vice Chair Trisha Adams, Amy Murphy, Pamela Turner and Doug Heberle. Staff present was Hart Crane, José Colón, and Russ Clegg, Planning Department. Andrea Harrell, Counsel for the Commission, City Attorney.

Chair Johnson called the meeting to order at 5:00 pm and thanked everyone for attending the meeting. Mr. Crane identified those present for the meeting and presented the agenda.

1. APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES (Approved)

1a. Minutes of the December 2, 2020 Regular Meeting.

A motion was made by Ms. Adams to approve the December 2nd, 2020 minutes, subject to being amended, seconded by Ms. Murphy. The Commission voted 5-0. (Chair Johnson, Vice Chair Adams, Ms. Murphy, Ms. Turner, and Doug Heberle. Nays: 0).

2b. Minutes of the January 6, 2021 Special Meeting

The January minutes were delayed until the meeting in March for changes to be made.

2. Renewal of Use Agreement with Guilford Urban Farming Initiative for 1901 McConnell Road (APPROVED)

José Colón provided background information on the Willow Oaks Redevelopment area to provide context. Willow Oaks is mainly located along McConnell Road and east of South English Street. It is a traditional style community with a variety of architectural styles including Craftsman, Colonial Revival, and Victorian architecture. The most recent version of the Redevelopment Plan was adopted in 2017 and the architectural guidelines amended in 2019. A map depicting several vacant lots in the redevelopment area owned by Redevelopment was displayed for the Commissioners. Most of the inventory is owned by Greensboro Housing Development Partnership (GHDP). GHDP entered into a sales development agreement with the Redevelopment Commission develop approximately 90 remaining residential lots. Mr. Colón referred to a map depicting lots owned by the Redevelopment Commission. The plan objectives in the Redevelopment Plan and Neighborhood Plan for Willow Oaks were shown. Mr. Colón referred to a red circle indicating the property located on McConnell Road and Willow Oak Lane. An aerial photograph indicated where the property was located and a street view of the Redevelopment Commission owned property was shown. The Use Agreement covers the 5 lots of 1901 McConnell Road, 801, 803, 805, and 807 Willow Hope Place.

The Farmers Market started with the Greensboro Housing Coalition and the Cottage Grove Initiative. There was a farmers market in the Cottage Grove neighborhood who reached out to City staff expressing interest in moving the market to a more prevalent area along McConnell Road to generate more traffic and interest. Guilford Urban Farming Initiative (GUFU) approached the City when that market was closing with an interest to create a similar market with two objectives; 1) To provide healthy food and for the surrounding community, not only Willow Oaks but the surrounding areas around Willow Oaks; 2) Provide an economic opportunity for minority farmers in the area. The proposed market will be the same as the previous year and take place every Saturday until the end of the calendar year from 8:30 a.m to 2:00 p.m. Mr. Colón provided context in regard to the Redevelopment Plan and what was ultimately envisioned to be developed there. Site C2 is a proposal for a park and near the park would be a market building. Mr. Colón quoted “the building could be used for food trucks, markets, and craft foods” from the Redevelopment Plan. When the Greensboro Housing Coalition first suggested the idea of a market, they did not know this was the plan for this area. Staff felt it was a great fit to have an open market there and to make an incremental step to create that reality. The plans and design efforts for the proposed park will

begin in 2021. There should be no conflict between the proposed improvements that will take longer and the upcoming 2021 market.

Ms. Paula Sieber stated the first market was started in 2020 with 4 vendors and by the end of 2020, there were 38 registered vendors ranging from farmers, minority farmers, and even non-profits that joined. The organization strictly enforces a no contact policy, due to COVID concerns, and all books are donated. Children, parents, grandparents come out routinely to get books and vendors also come to the market. After discussion with Mr. Colón, it was determined it was essential to also support local businesses. A logo contest was held at Dudley High School for the market and people in the community voted on the logo. People have heard about the market and inquired if they could join them. Ms. Sieber stated one person had opened his storefront and two weeks later COVID hit. His wife called crying and advised they did not have an outlet to sell their goods. GUFU wants to continue being a facilitator in the community in bringing people together and to continue the partnership with the Redevelopment Commission and have this market in 2021.

Will Farr, a representative of GUFU, stated he was from Greensboro and cares a great deal about the city. Coming from a different part of the city and helping out with the market has given him a perspective on how strong the community is in East Greensboro and Willow Oaks. Mr. Farr was very grateful to be a part of the market and very excited going forward. Mr. Farr thanked the Redevelopment Commission for allowing it to happen last year and hope it will continue in 2021.

Ms. Sieber added if this is agreed upon, a job could be created to have a market manager and an assistant market manager that would provide relief during COVID. There is a worker who is 17 years old, a Dudley High School student with a tax ID number, her own business on Etsy, and has applied to be the Assistant Manager. It has been a great experience in providing jobs, healthy food, helping minority farmers to save their family farms, and providing an outlet for local and small businesses. The community very much supports the market and hopes this effort will be continued.

Chair Johnson thanked both Ms. Sieber and Mr. Farr for attending the meeting. Chair Johnson stated it was really interesting to see where this went in the last year particularly and the challenges dealing with the pandemic. It appeared that it turned into opportunities also. Chair Johnson inquired if any other Commissioners had any thoughts or comments before voting. Hearing none, Chair Johnson requested a motion to approve the Use Agreement for another year.

Ms. Murphy made a motion to approve the Use Agreement for another year; seconded by Ms. Turner. The Commission voted 5-0. (Chair Johnson, Vice Chair Adams, Ms. Murphy, Ms. Turner, and Doug Heberle. Nays: 0).

3. Eastside Park Development Proposal for 201 Gillespie and 206/208 York Street

José Colón provided context for the Eastside Park Development area and introduced Jeremy Simpson, with JRG Development. Mr. Simpson is interested in developing 3 lots in the Eastside Park community. A photograph of the Redevelopment area was shown indicating the properties the developer was interested in, circled in red. The Eastside Park Community is located along US 220 to the west and east Market Street to the north. The Eastside Park Community Revitalization Plan was adopted in 1983, with two amendments, one in 2004 and 2005. The Revitalization Plan includes activities such as housing rehab, property acquisition and demolition, new housing development, and public facility improvements. RCG owns 7 lots within the Eastside Park redevelopment area. There is a community center there. Three of the 7 lots are part of this request. The Revitalization Plan is close to being finished.

The Revitalization Plan specifically had a plan to build a parking lot, along with a multi-family development. Given the specifics of the plan, staff will propose a plan amendment that will go before the Commission prior to moving forward with this development. It will go hand in hand with the development proposal. The Revitalization plan is almost 30 years old currently. Properties south of 201 Gillespie Street were originally planned to be a part of the multi-family development but single-family development went there. The subject properties are 201 Gillespie Street, acquired in 1995, and 206 and 208 York Street. There was an apartment complex condemned on the lot. Lots 206 and 208 were acquired in 2004 and were considered blighted properties. Zoning for these lots is

RM-18, allowing for a variety of housing to include single-family, attached single-family, townhomes or apartments. In total it is approximately .57 acres. Mr. Colón advised the Commission that JRG Development presented their proposal and plans to the Eastside Park Neighborhood Association and received positive feedback from the community. Mr. Colón requested Mr. Jeremy Simpson to speak on behalf of his company.

Jeremy Simpson, stated they are looking to develop the Eastside Park Development with a vision to invigorate the neighborhood with high quality affordable housing, improved landscaping and an upgrade to the entrance of Eastside Park. JRG is a for profit entity based out of Greensboro. Their primary goal is to build equitable communities through development and management of affordable housing units for low income families, to include seniors, veterans, and differently-abled. The model will center around the creation of diverse neighborhoods in under invested areas where financial hurdles impede necessary development. The goal is to have 3 housing options for these properties and JRG is proposing the construction of the 3 buildings to remain in their original parcel configuration. The homes will provide safe, comfortable, and affordable housing for any qualified future Eastside Park resident with landscaping and railroad barriers along Peachtree St. in the form of Cyprus trees and shrubbery to shield the properties from noise and view of the railroad tracks. They will be 3-bedroom homes, 2 baths, single-family residences to be sold below market value at approximately 1200 square feet. The properties will have a spacious master bedroom with bathroom, washer and dryer hookups, another bathroom, screened front porch, a back porch, and a 300 square foot garage space.

Duplexes will be 3 bedroom, two baths with approximately 1100 square feet per unit and will have the same amenities as stated for single-family. A site plan for the development of the area was presented. Mr. Simpson indicated where the duplex units and single-family homes would be located. Renderings were shown depicting how the homes would look once completed. The proposed development would be entirely funded through a combination of JRG's private capital and financing from North Carolina lending institutions. JRG has determined that the cost of the land is critical to the fiscal success of the project and are requesting that the lots be transferred to them as a donation from the Redevelopment Commission. The only other portion of the project that will require public funding of any kind is the design and construction of the neighborhood signage. The signage will not be owned by the resident or JRG

ADA compliance is very important to JRG Development as it provides options for all types of individuals. Floor plans were depicted for the duplex homes and single-family housing. In working with staff and the City, JRG also met with the neighbors who were excited about the project. The final process will be to present the final plan to the Redevelopment Commission with the hopes of entering into a sales agreement for the land. Mr. Simpson stated JRG shares with the Commission the same vision to improve the quality and affordability of housing. JRG believes their model of cost-efficient mixed-income housing supports the goals of the City for filling the missing middle house gap to establishing a diverse community that reflects the city's best and unique population. JRG believes the addition of single-family homes will provide residents the opportunity to become leaders in their community through home ownership and the establishment of a long-term community presence. Mr. Simpson thanked everyone and stated JRG looks forward for further conversation regarding their goals and how to best align with the Eastside Park Community, Redevelopment Commission, and Greensboro's Neighborhood Development goals.

Chair Johnson asked Mr. Simpson if any concerns were mentioned by the neighborhood when they met. Mr. Simpson responded the feedback went well. The neighborhood and Councilwoman Hightower liked the mixed development part and the options of being able to provide home ownership as well and were motivated about the project. Chair Johnson asked if priority would be given to the residents of the neighborhoods in terms of buying options. Mr. Simpson responded the goal was from a rental's standpoint and a buyer's standpoint to keep it affordable. Discussion has centered on keeping it affordable. There is a gap that JRG is working toward to have the numbers be affordable for the people in the area. Chair Johnson inquired if any of Commissioners had questions or comments for Mr. Simpson or Mr. Colón. Ms. Turner asked what was the number of families or units based on. Mr. Simpson responded it would be 4 multi-family units and 1 single-family unit; a total of 5 families. Ms. Turner asked if the multi-family units were four buildings. Mr. Simpson displayed a photograph depicting the duplex model. Two homes in one building similar to townhomes. The single family would be a house by itself.

Due to audio issues, Ms. Turner used the chat feature to ask if it was one house and two duplexes. Mr. Simpson responded that was correct.

Chair Johnson inquired if there were any further questions from the Commissioners. Mr. Heberle asked if the proposal was asking for a donation of the land which would allow them to sell the homes at below market value. Mr. Simpson responded that was the request from JRG to have the land donated by the Redevelopment Commission. Their goal was to keep the homes in an affordability range and are working to bridge the gap. Mr. Heberle asked how would the Redevelopment Commission know if the people who were buying, were the ones most needing the benefit from the below market priced housing. Mr. Simpson responded one of the sources JRG was looking to work with is Sophia Crisp and the down payment assistance program. By law, JRG cannot discriminate on who may be purchasing and was reaching through the channels that would add value but still be on the open market. Mr. Heberle stated he wanted to reach the communities of people who need the access to this kind of under market homes. Mr. Simpson responded that was the first and foremost goal of JRG. Chair Johnson, in reference to Mr. Heberle's point of making homes available to those that could benefit the most, asked if historically if that was something where a condition could be placed in whatever agreement is reached with JRG. How did that work historically or was it something that could be done? Mr. Colón will work with staff to see if there are any previous agreements that have language to aim this development toward the desired buyer. Ms. Harrell stated it can be worked on. Chair Johnson inquired if there were any further questions from the Commissioners. Chair Johnson asked Mr. Colón if he would clarify the next steps for the Commissioners in the upcoming meetings. Mr. Colón responded he would. There was no action item for this item.

4. Staff Updates

4.a. Willow Oaks Redevelopment Area

Mr. Colón stated some of the current Commissioners were serving when True Homes, LLC, proposed 4 single family homes for sale on the properties located at 1548, 1600, 1602, and 1604 McConnell Road. The 1548 McConnell property was a City of Greensboro home and not a part of the RCG inventory, but packaged together with the others. The properties were closed on in November of 2020. True Homes is currently conducting site work on the properties. Staff has received the architectural plans for all four of the homes. A map was depicted indicating "house 1" and "house 2." that True Homes will start with. The plan review is moving forward and True Homes is eager to obtain permits and start having the homes constructed. Elevation drawings were depicted for "house 1" and house 2." True Homes built this program in partnership with North Carolina A&T, specifically their construction technology division. Students from A&T will help build these homes as part of their curriculum and the proceeds from the sale will become scholarship funds for those students in the program. Jeff Grenier, of True Homes has advised he is interested in more properties within Greensboro to continue the program and staff is very excited to be working with them. Mr. Colón asked if the Commissioners had any questions or concerns.

Mr. Colón provided an additional update on the remaining side of the Willow Oaks Development. There are several vacant lots owned by the Greensboro Housing Development Partnership (GHDP). In 2019 GHDP released the Willow Oaks single family property that focused on development opportunities and zones B and E of Willow Oaks. The reason for the focus on these properties was because a lot of the other lots have been developed. The goal was to actually complete the buildout of the areas before moving on to the larger parcels in Willow Oaks. Maps were depicted indicating in green, the lots that are single family. There is a lot planned for townhome development. There are some lots designated for twin home development. Currently there are two builders, Habitat Greensboro who built homes in the Willow Oaks area at the corner of McConnell and English. Foundation Home Builders is the second builder. Staff is currently reviewing the architectural plans for their first homes. There is a third builder interested in this opportunity and staff is hopeful on receiving an application in the coming weeks.

4.b South Elm Redevelopment Area

Mr. Colón stated currently staff is working through the South Elm Street Sales Development Agreement. The plan was to have a special session meeting in January. Unfortunately, there were some moving parts in the agreement that needed negotiating and are still working through those parts. Staff hopes to have the Sales Development

Agreement at least in March, perhaps earlier. Mr. Colón stated staff is pushing against a development schedule currently and are hoping to wrap up the agreement in the coming weeks, if not the month.

4c. Ole Asheboro Redevelopment Area

Mr. Crane displayed a map of the redevelopment area. The Ole Asheboro Redevelopment area was shown indicating the boundaries. Properties highlighted in purple were those owned by Redevelopment. At the last meeting there was discussion about an agreement that the Commission entered into in 2019 that did not move forward. Staff updated the Commissioners to know that staff and the developer were looking to expand the agreement to include additional land and Greensboro Housing Development Partnership. Since the last RCG meeting, staff has met with the Greensboro Housing Development Partnership and received some favorable reviews in support of that direction. Staff has continued to work with the attorneys to flesh out the agreement and to include GHDP into the agreement, scope of 160 multi-family units located on MLK north priority lots. Staff is working on the agreement and are excited and hopeful to have it executed. The Commission should be seeing something from staff hopefully in March regarding the agreement, possibly April.

4d. Arlington Park Redevelopment Area

Mr. Crane depicted the Arlington Park map indicating where Arlington Park was located and the properties owned by the Commission. At the February meeting, a discussion ensued regarding a developer being interested in these two parcels on Plymouth Street, 1402 and 1404. Staff has continued working with the developer who intends to have a single-family home on each one of the lots. Staff has been working with the developer to have a sketch plan drafted which will allow the developer to go to a sketch plan meeting with the city and obtain comments from the various city departments. Staff expects the developer to bring a proposal to the Commission in March, similar to the one from Mr. Simpson and Mr. Colón. Staff will keep the Commissioners posted as it develops.

5. Additional Business

Mr. Crane invited the public to state their comments.

Councilwoman Hightower stated staff and herself have been attempting to get these lots developed. Mr. Crane advised nothing was coming through via the audio. Due to audio interference via Zoom, a portion of audio by Councilwoman Hightower could not be heard.

Councilwoman Hightower stated she has talked with Mr. Simpson and other developers and the Eastside Park Development proposal has taken a lot of effort. The lots have been held for a long time. The community has to change. Due to audio interference via Zoom, Councilwoman Hightower could not be heard. Councilwoman Hightower asked the Commissioners to do their due diligence. Due to audio interference via Zoom, a portion of audio by Councilwoman Hightower could not be heard. Councilwoman Hightower stated the lots have long been neglected and the housing needs improvement and be transformed for the neighborhood.

Deena Hayes, Chair of the School Board and on the Ole Asheboro Street Neighborhood Board speaking on behalf of the neighborhood, stated she has lived in the area for over 20 years with her spouse, John Green. Ms. Hayes and her husband were inspired to rebuild and revive their communities that at one time were thriving.

Approximately 5 or 6 homes were purchased by Ms. Hayes and Mr. Green in the Gorrell St. Redevelopment Area because family members wanted to move there. Ms. Hayes stated that her and Mr. Green self-financed the rebuilding of the block. People have asked if there are available properties in their neighborhood and there are plans to restrict the diversity of homes, incomes, professions, and backgrounds of people living there. If there is not a balance between gentrification and affordable housing, Gillespie Park Elementary School, Washington Street Montessori, Jones Elementary will remain Title 1 schools. People do not want to move into neighborhoods where their children would not be exposed to a school that has strong veteran teachers. Ole Asheboro had the highest transfer of low performing teachers in the schools this past year and it is because teachers were not effective or performing well. Ms. Hayes stated they will be back to speak before the Commission about a unique approach to rebuild their community from the inside out. Ole Asheboro cannot be overburdened and saturated with developers and plans for income restricted housing. At the Neighborhood Board meetings, they have seen

developers coming in with blueprints and images of what the houses will look like, but do not stay that way when the infrastructure and the properties around them are abandoned and neglected. People do not have the resources to keep the houses up. Ms. Hayes asked the Commission to think about that as the Commission approves, reviews plans, options, and offers. They live in the community and raised their children in the community. Ms. Hayes and Mr. Green believe in the community and would like to know the Commissioners thoughts, visions, and high expectations for what this community can be going forward.

Mr. Crane felt the Redevelopment Commission was lucky to have Ms. Hays who redeveloped the street that she lives on and who has expressed interest on some of the properties owned by the Commission. Staff and Ms. Hayes have been working together to find a good fit of a parcel that she could build on. Both Ms. Hayes and Mr. Greene have been positive forces in the community and staff is looking forward to see how the conversations develop. There was a precursor to proposals that may be coming from Ms. Hayes and Mr. Greene. Ms. Hayes stated they were not developers or realtors. There are young professionals and other African Americans are asking if there is more housing in the neighborhood. Ms. Hayes and Mr. Greene are not interested in big development but do want to begin building the collective base. They were not here to make a lot of money, but want to make the community and neighborhood available to people that want to move to Ole Asheboro. Mr. Crane inquired if there were any further comments or questions for any of the speakers. Chair Johnson thanked Ms. Hayes, Mr. Greene and Councilwoman Hightower for their comments and being present.

6. Adjournment

A motion was made to adjourn the meeting by Ms. Murphy; seconded by Doug Heberle. The Commission voted 5-0. (Chair Johnson, Vice Chair Adams, Ms. Murphy, Ms. Turner, and Doug Heberle. Nays: 0).

Respectfully Submitted,

Susan Schwartz, Director

SS/cs

DRAFT

**SPECIAL MEETING OF THE
REDEVELOPMENT COMMISSION
MARCH 10, 2021**

The Special Meeting of the Redevelopment Commission of Greensboro (RCG) was held on Wednesday, March 10, 2021, via Zoom satellite. The following members were present: Chair Patrick Johnson, Vice Chair Trisha Adams, Pamela Turner, Doug Heberle and Councilwoman Nancy Hoffmann, City Council Liaison. Staff present was Hart Crane, José Colón, and Russ Clegg, Planning Department. Andrea Harrell, Counsel for the Commission and Assistant City Attorney, Chuck Watts, City Attorney, and James Dickens, Deputy City Attorney.

Absent: Commissioner Amy Murphy

Chair Johnson called the meeting to order at 5:00 pm and thanked everyone for attending the meeting. Mr. Crane identified those present for the meeting and presented the agenda.

1. Approval Of Meeting Minutes (Approved)

1a. Minutes of the January 6, 2021, Regular Meeting Minutes. A motion was made by Mr. Heberle to approve the January 5, 2021 minutes, seconded by Ms. Turner. The Commission voted 4-0. (Chair Johnson, Vice Chair Adams, Ms. Turner, and Mr. Heberle. Nays: 0).

1b. Minutes of the February 3, 2021 Regular Meeting Minutes. A motion was made by Mr. Heberle to approve the February 3, 2021 minutes, seconded by Turner. The Commission voted 4-0. (Chair Johnson, Vice Chair Adams, Ms. Turner, and Mr. Heberle. Nays: 0).

2. Naming of New Redevelopment Commission Trustee

Chair Johnson stated at the January 6, 2021, meeting of the Commission, Chair Johnson was given the authority to appoint trustees as needed for the Commission. With respect to the South Elm Sales Development Agreement and the passing of Attorney Blackwood, Chair Johnson appointed Assistant City Attorney Andrea Harrell as the substitute trustee for the Commission. Ms. Harrell stated she appreciated the honor and will do a good job.

3. South Elm Sales Development Agreement w/Rea South Elm, LLC and SEDG

José Colón stated on behalf of staff, everyone was very excited to present this project. The Commission was being asked to consider the approval of the Sales Development Agreement and its terms and conditions, subject to approval by the Greensboro City Council for the properties located at 100 East Gate City Boulevard, 725 and 727 South Elm Street, and 508 and 518 Ballinger Street to the South Elm Development Group and Rea South Elm, to develop a mixed use project.

The staff presentation covered the history of the South Elm Street initiative, how the development program aligned with the South Elm Street Redevelopment plan, an overview of the Sales Development Agreement, the terms of sales and conditions, and the next steps for moving forward. Mr. Colón advised after his presentation, the development partners will present their information and provide more detail on the development program. Mr. Colón requested the Commissioners to wait until the end of the presentations to ask questions.

Mr. Colón depicted an overview of the South Elm Street Redevelopment area bound by Eugene Street, Gate City Boulevard, Arlington Street and south to Bragg Street which is now in the southern portion of the downtown

Greenway. This project is located on the east side , they also noted an existing cell tower on the site, highlighted in green.

Mr. Colón provided a brief history on how the South Elm Street redevelopment area came to be. The South Elm Street redevelopment area originated in the early 2000's primarily when assessment planning initiatives and early implementations took place. In 2010, the City released an RFP (Request for Proposals) for a master developer to assist in the implementation and development of the area. The South Elm Development Group was selected in 2011 and in the following years, groundwork was put in place by the completion of the Master Development Agreement, Master Plan, and Design Guidelines. By 2016, Union Square Campus was completed as the first anchor within the redevelopment area, leading to the present time where Rea Ventures was introduced to the Commission in 2019. Mr. Colón presented images of how the area looked like before the Union Square Campus was built, and another picture depicting the grand opening of the Union Square Campus opened in August 2016.

Mr. Colón provided a brief overview of the development program and advised the development partners will provide more detail in terms of what is being developed. The improvements are approximately 250 rental apartment units, with 20% of those units being rented to occupants at 80% area median income. There is a public plaza with 2000 square feet of commercial space and a parking structure with a minimum of 500 spaces. The sale price of the land was determined by the Master Development Agreement which sets the price at \$428,694 per acre. The price will increase by an annual inflation rate. The actual acreage has not been determined yet. A survey is needed as part of the SDA, but the total price is in the ball park of 1.2 million. The timeframe of the project is approximately 3 years from closing, with a one-year extension.

Mr. Colón advised this program aligns with the South Elm Redevelopment plan in various ways. The project fits with four principals of the redevelopment plan. It transforms the Gateway by making it visually attractive, safe, and a vibrant destination for a broad range of users. The project addresses existing environmental issues to create an area that is safe and ecologically responsible and viable. The project is a form of private investment that will restore the economic uses of the area. The project also would establish mixture of uses, creating a unique identity while supporting uses for a variety of ages and income levels. The project also supports the preferred development vision of the redevelopment plan. A development with a mix of uses serving a broad range of users, rather than having a single use. The mixture of uses will include residential, commercial, open space, and will be adjacent to Union Square Campus, an existing institutional use.

Mr. Colón stated a Sales Development Agreement allows the transfer of property from a seller to a purchaser and defines what will be built on the property. The Sales Development Agreement included in the packet presented to the Commissioners was organized by nine articles; Purpose; Engagement; Scope of Redevelopment activities or all conduct of the parties; Warranties, Duties; Responsibilities of the Master Developer, Component Developer, and the Commission respectively; Insurance requirements; Purchase price; Closing and conveyance of the property; Breach of Contract; and General conditions. Mr. Colón stated the packet provided to the Commissioners included an abbreviated version of the exhibits. In the agenda, a link was provided to view the full version of exhibits.

Mr. Colón stated the Terms of Sale for the agreement. First, the master developer will receive a credit toward the purchase for the release of his purchase of 1.036 acres of property within the South Elm Street Redevelopment area. Secondly, the remainder purchase price will be satisfied by delivery of a promissory note for a term of 10 years. A calculation was depicted on the screen. Mr. Colón stated the original purchase price was established by the Master Development Agreement that there would be a credit deducted from that price and the remaining purchase price would be satisfied by the promissory note.

Mr. Colón depicted a slide listing what would be required in terms of approval from RCG prior to closing on the property. Many of the documents related to the final design plans. Marketing, financial documentation, scheduling, and the final agreement regarding the potential development assistance of 2016 bond funds. Mr.

Colón advised the Commissioner will have the opportunity to review and approve various elements of the development at the final stage prior to closing.

Mr. Colón reviewed the development assistance and the terms of the land sale allowing RCG to take back a promissory note, forgivable over a period of 10 years. As stated in the previous slide, 2016 Community and Economic Development bond funds dedicated to the South Elm Street area are earmarked for the project. Mr. Colón advised the Commissioners this would require a separate contract that would require a recommendation from the Redevelopment Commission with final approval from City Council. Other assistance provided included the Streetscape and Infrastructure improvements along South Elm Street and East Gate City Boulevard, currently in the planning stages and support to make sure the cell tower will be removed in due time.

In terms of next steps, Mr. Colón stated if RCG approves the agreement, it will go before City Council. City Council will approve the sale of the properties at their next meeting on March 16, 2021. After that, RCG will approve the items required prior to closing at any time between 2021 and early 2022. Once approved by the Commissioners, closing can be completed in May 2022. Hopefully that will be concurrent with the removal of the cell tower, with a construction start date of June 2022 and construction completion in January 2023.

Mr. Colón thanked everyone involved in making this happen, such as the South Elm Development Group and Rea Ventures. There was a lot of time involved and a lot of interaction to get to where it is right now. Mr. Colón said a big thank you to Andrea Harrell for her assistance. Mr. Colón also thanked planning management, Russ Clegg and Sue Schwartz for their support, and Dyan Arkin for coming back from retirement to help move this forward. Mr. Colón continued on to state this will be a transformative project not only for downtown Greensboro but Greensboro overall. Mr. Colón advised Mr. Kean and Mr. Chapman will finish the presentation. Ms. Harrell interjected that it could not have been done without the assistance of Dyan Arkin and thanked her for all of her efforts.

Breck Kean stated they are very excited to be at this stage and echoed Mr. Colón's comments. There is a wonderful relationship and partnership with the City of Greensboro and greatly appreciated all the hard work Mr. Colón, Ms. Arkin, and Ms. Harrell did in getting to this stage. Rea Ventures is looking forward to putting their team to work and advancing the schematic design and financial closing. Mr. Kean was hopeful it would be before May of 2022, as the cell tower probably would not be moved before that time. Mr. Kean stated with the approval of the agreement at this meeting, Rea Ventures looks forward to going to work with the talented team that has been assembled.

The project scope has not altered from previous presentations. The land area is approximately 2.47 acres, with approximately 250 units with a mixture of studio and one and two bedrooms. Fifty of the units are at 20% and dedicated to residents making 80% of AMI or less. In the weeks ahead, they will be looking at taking 50% of those affordable units to the 60% of AMI level and will present the impact and effects of that to Mr. Colón and his team to determine a workable solution. Rea Ventures has a very long history of affordable housing development through the southeast and fully supports the mission of the City to bring more affordability into the inner city. Projected rents were depicted on the screen. Mr. Kean advised things are always in flux. In the City of Greensboro, rents are increasing and may not be the same rents two to three years in the future but are the rents being underwritten at this point in time. The residential units will be supported by a parking garage with approximately 500 spaces.

This project will be mixed use, to include a public plaza, retail, restaurant, and a coffee shop. Slides were depicted indicating a conceptual site plan and elevations. An outline of the subject site was depicted. A conceptual site plan depicting the siding of the residential buildings, parking deck, and public spaces was shown. Elevations were depicted indicating a five-story structure wrapping around an almost six story parking deck. On top of the parking deck, they will attempt to have an amenity deck there for the residents to enjoy overlooking the city. Based on preliminary estimates in working with the design team and potential contractor, it is believed this would be

approximately a 51-million-dollar overall project. Developer is anticipating City of Greensboro development assistance of approximately 4 million dollars. Private equity would also be brought to the transaction to balance the sources and uses.

The timeline presented by Mr. Colón is their best estimate at this time, but with approval from the Redevelopment Commission and City Council's approval, Rea Ventures will fully engage with the design team and start working toward the May 2022 timeframe with complete transparency and commitment to share the progress moving forward and seek Redevelopment approval once the schematic designs have been accomplished. Rea Ventures is seeking approval for the Sale of Development agreement and the terms of the sales. Mr. Kean deferred to Mr. Chapman to speak on the terms negotiated with the city.

Bob Chapman stated they established a strike price of approximately \$10.00 per square foot when they won the competition for the site of Union Square Campus. At that time, they thought it might be the beginning of an entire downtown university campus occupying the entire site. They ended up not charging for that property, nor charging any markup and in effect SEDG worked for free, but it was necessary in order to make their budget work, that there not be any land costs. The project had a lot of challenges. The Gray property was in the middle of the site and agreed to a swap with them. An attempt was made to have the cell tower move sooner, but have they not left. Title insurance was not attainable because there was an inclusion for any claim by the railroad. The railroad provided a quick claim deed after research at the National Archives. Everything has lined up. It was thought that last year the Arden Group was going to begin building townhomes on the other side which fell through. At the same time, SEDG was introduced to Rea Ventures, from Atlanta, and was impressed with their work in affordable housing across the south, market rate housing, and projects in Atlanta. Rea Ventures introduced to SEDG to Praxis3, an architectural firm that has impressive work that includes Liberty Walk. Mr. Chapman was thrilled to have them involved in this project. To make the numbers work, a proposal was made to have a forgivable note with the Redevelopment Commission along the same lines that Union Square Campus had but not combine the note with cash or cash equivalents and the note would be forgiven over a 10-year period. It would be a contribution from the Redevelopment Commission and the City to achieve the goals of a better and more desirable place at a lower rent. They have a very good team to achieve those goals and look forward to working with the neighborhood and will continue with presentations regarding the progress of the project. Mr. Chapman stated they will be an open book and the Commissioners could feel free to call him or Bob Isner or Breck Kean at any time.

Mr. Kean stated they respectively request approval from the Redevelopment Commission of the SDA under the terms that were presented. They look forward to working in earnest to bring before the Commission an attractive, high quality and transformative project at the Gateway of the City of Greensboro.

Chair Johnson thanked everyone involved in the presentation and working to get to this point. Chair Johnson stated with respect to the agreement, one item was regarding the cell tower and asked Mr. Colón if he could touch on what needs to happen with the cell tower for the benefit of the Commissioners who were new. If the Commission would have to address this issue prior to May of 2022 at this point or did it need to just expire. Mr. Colón responded at this point staff is working diligently and have started communications with the company to see if there was a possibility the cell tower could be removed earlier than May of 22. It looks unlikely. Staff is pushing for them to remove the equipment as soon as possible once the lease expires. A letter is being drafted to the company to provide a date of when it will be removed. Chair Johnson asked if there was something in the existing agreement that the equipment has to be removed within so many days. Mr. Colón responded there was no period of time included in the lease for when the items had to be removed.

Ms. Harrell stated this is a 40-year-old lease and originally entered into and then extended for two 10-year terms. The terms could have been a little better flushed out. There was no requirement that they have to be off the property by a certain time. Having some constructive conversations with them about getting it removed within the

time period mentioned would be reasonable. There was also language in the agreement about permanent improvements. The cell tower company is somewhat attached to the land and there is language that may help to push the issue a little bit. Ms. Harrell was hopeful that the cell tower will be off as quickly as possible. The language is not as strong as she would like. Mr. Heberle asked if there was some kind of tenancy created during a holdover status. Ms. Harrell responded no. Mr. Heberle asked what Ms. Harrell would assume that language to be, a tenant at will or month to month. Ms. Harrell responded there is no authority to even let them stay longer. For that reason, it is clear that once this lease ends, it is over. Any reasonable tenant knows the lease is over and they need to get their property off. If legal action is required, there is enough there to be able to force them off the property.

Ms. Arkin asked to clarify what has been done in the past, the cell tower has been notified that the Redevelopment Commission anticipates taking ownership of that property back the day that the lease terminates and there was no intention of extending that lease, period. They were notified about a year ago or longer. They have been notified that there will not be an extension under any conditions. The lease is silent on just about everything.

Chair Johnson stated if he was hearing this correctly it might be slightly better news than what it has been in the past that there is some open dialog currently. Ms. Harrell responded she thought the company was still fairly non-responsive. The City can show starting a year ago that they cannot stay and their property needed to be removed by a certain date and time. Ms. Harrell felt the company wanted to stay as long as they want. Ms. Harrell was hopeful the equipment had enough value that they will not want it hanging around so long that the City would take legal action. Ms. Harrell stated that she heard no response to any recent communications.

Chair Johnson asked Mr. Colón how many parking units were available and what was the number of units required or contemplated to be required for the Union Square Campus or downtown parking. Mr. Colón responded the minimum of parking spaces was 500 spaces. It was Mr. Colón's understanding there will be at least one parking space per unit reserved in the parking deck, 150 parking spaces are dedicated to Union Square. The remainder of the parking is up to the developer if they want to lease those. The City would not be involved in terms of leasing those particular spaces. Mr. Kean stated the 500-space parking deck will be jointly used by residents of the apartments and Union Square Campus. It will not be large enough to have public parking in addition to that. It may be determined at some point that the Union Square Campus is using their spaces only certain hours of the day and vacant for the rest of the evenings or weekends and could possibly be made for public use. Currently it is only the residents and Union Square patrons.

Chair Johnson stated he was happy to hear information regarding the affordability component and asked if the 20% at 80% of the AMI was correct. Mr. Colón responded that was correct. Chair Johnson asked if that was applicable in perpetuity or only applicable to the initial tenants. Mr. Colón responded currently the affordability for those 20% units would be the first tenant. That is the only requirement currently for that. There may be further requirements if deeper affordability is pursued, but for now that was the current standard. Chairwoman Hoffmann asked if there would be an option of adding additional floors and working through the particulars of that if the City felt additional public parking in that area was needed. Mr. Kean responded all it takes is money. At one point in time the parking deck was 700 spaces but the cost of that went up expeditiously. There was a plan for parking and a parking deck conceptually planned for the block across the street. Chair Johnson inquired if there were any additional questions. Mr. Heberle asked if the business plan or model for the developers to buy and hold was developed to potentially sell it off. If so, what were the conditions of the forgivability of the loan following a transfer. Mr. Kean responded Rea Ventures has always been a long-term holder and Mr. Chapman has been an even longer-term holder. Mr. Chapman stated that was their goal. Mr. Kean stated the key partners enter into this transaction with long term hold intentions.

Mr. Heberle asked if that did not pan out and is sold with the 10-year timeframe, was that forgivability of the loan transferable or become payable at the time of sale. Ms. Harrell advised that was correct which can be addressed

that in the subsequent documents that have yet to be drafted. Staff will make sure to address that issue. The communications all along that Ms. Harrell has seen in the past seven months was the property would not be sold during that period. Chair Johnson inquired if there were any further questions.

Chair Johnson requested Mr. Colón to state what was being requested for this item again. Mr. Colón stated the Commission is being asked to consider the approval of the Sales Development Agreement and its terms and conditions, subject to City Council approval of the properties located at 100 East Gate City Boulevard, 725 & 727 South Elm Street, 508 & 518 Ballinger Street, to the South Elm Development Group and Rea South Elm, to develop a mixed use project.

Chair Johnson requested a motion to approve the Sales Development Agreement. Mr. Heberle moved that the Commission approve the agreement. Seconded by Chair Johnson. The Commission voted 4-0. (Chair Johnson, Vice Chair Adams, Ms. Turner, and Mr. Heberle. Nays: 0).

Chair Johnson thanked everyone for their hard work in this journey. Mr. Chapman stated his appreciation. Mr. Kean thanked the Commission and stated he was looking forward to the City Council approval and working with everyone in bringing this project to fruition. Mr. Chapman stated they very much enjoyed working with the Commissioners and staff. For any questions, ideas, concerns, or suggestions to reach out and be in touch. Mr. Chapman thanked Mr. Colón and Ms. Arkin for all of their work on this project.

4. Builder Presentation for Commission Owned Lots at 919 and 927 Pearson Street

Mr. Crane depicted a map of Ole Asheboro Redevelopment Area where Deena Hayes and John Greene are interested in properties for development. The specific properties they are interested are 919 and 927 Pearson Street highlighted on the map. Mr. Crane indicated where the properties were located in the redevelopment area. Mr. Crane turned the meeting over to Ms. Hayes and Mr. Greene. Mr. Crane advised this was not an action requiring any approval from the Commission. Ms. Hayes and Mr. Greene will be showing some of the work that they have done and then present a specific proposal of what they plan to do with the intent of continuing to work with staff towards the Sales Development Agreement that can brought to the Commission in the future for the development of two single family homes.

Deena Hayes-Greene stated her and her husband, John Greene, are not developers, realtors, or builders, they have become the community revivalists. They purchased their home in Southeast Greensboro from Skip Alston back in 2000 with their own personal vision of rebuilding the African-American community, inspired by Warnersville, Collier Heights in Atlanta, GA., and other communities. At one time African Americans schools were strong, and businesses were supported. Over the past 20 years, they have brought property that was abandoned, neglected, or not maintained. Over the past 20 years they have been able to buy the properties themselves and renovate the property to sell because they want people to live in a stabilized community. Ms. Hayes-Greene claims Renters don't plant shrubs or d the beautification and curb appeal to enhance the community. John Greene, Ms. Hayes-Greene's husband, is a contractor but also the community handyman, pest control person, and goes up and down the block to address any concerns.

John Greene, owner of JCG & Associates that has been in business for the last 15 years. Mr. Green stated he is an licensed general contractor and a licensed plumber. Some of the projects he worked on was Union Square Campus with Rentenbach for the student recreation center at UNCG, and a new addition for Bennett College on their campus. Mr. Greene has partnered with Rentenbach to do a new Hayes-Taylor YMCA. Part of their effort is to partner with the city and find some great lots with redevelopment potential and to add their spin and flavor to this community vibe. They would like to partner with Redevelopment Commission for building and fixing the community.

Ms. Hayes-Greene presented information regarding the financial overview that will be submitted formally. They are not seeking any type of financial assistance and not seeking any assistance from the bank. They have self-

financed all of their projects, their home and family members homes. Ms. Hayes-Greene provided a brief history of what is happening in their community. An article was presented from May of 2019 about their neighborhood regarding a dividing line between two neighborhoods and only one was thriving. The south side of the neighborhood that are brick townhomes, yoga studios, hair salons, Dame's Chicken and Waffles, new sidewalks, landscaping, tulip shaped lights and other streetscapes. To the left of the intersection is the beginning of Ole Asheboro with homes boarded up, lots vacant and littered. Loiterers on the corners that the neighbors called "day walkers". This presentation will show this iteration of redevelopment plans that have been going on almost a century. They are getting ready to recycle and redesign the problems currently being dealt with.

Ms. Hayes-Greene stated it was important to know how they get here because what is shown in this presentation is there is an iteration of Redevelopment plans going on for almost a century. What Ms. Hayes-Greene has heard at this meeting is that if there is not a new broader vision. The neighborhood is in the process getting ready to recycle, and redesign the problems they are attempting to deal with currently. Here in Greensboro, 40% of residents struggle to meet their housing costs and this region has two major cities top a national list on concentrations of addiction. It is said these maps that led them to Ole Asheboro were predictors of where gentrification happens and are right in the midst of that. New investments and new residents have not come to Ole Asheboro. The federal government drew these maps up after the stock market crashed in 1929. The federal housing administration came in 1934 because if you wanted to buy a house prior to FHA getting involved and insuring mortgages, you had to put 50% down and have it paid off within 3 to 5 years. When FHA came, it opened opportunities up for housing that had not existed before. All kinds of things were going on. Racially restricted covenants seen all throughout Greensboro. Hamilton Lakes, Westerwood, Urban Park, Fisher Park, and College Hill to name a few had racially restricted covenants that if you were not white, you could not live there. Greensboro black residents were forced legally to live in the southeast quadrant of the city, one of the most problematic quadrants in the city. Ms. Hayes-Greene and her husband live in a house that is over 110 years old. It is the Windsor House that William Windsor had attempted to buy in 1913. They live on the dividing line from Bennett College and from their house toward downtown was white. When white residents found out that Mr. Windsor purchased that house, they went to the City of Greensboro. The City Attorney at the time was Waylon Cooke. They went to Winston-Salem and had an ordinance adopted within 24 hours that said if you're a member of one race, you cannot move into the neighborhood of another racial group. Mr. Windsor was forced to sell the home and lost money in the sale due to home improvements he had done to the home. Mr. Windsor became the Black Superintendent of the Greensboro's black schools into the '50s when he retired and moved to Ashe Street. Windsor Center is named after him. The Greene's live in Mr. Windsor's home that he could not live in.

Ms. Hayes-Greene referred to a Redevelopment Commission action regarding the Cumberland Project in 1959 that read "the Cumberland area has long been a blighting influence on the City of Greensboro. More than 70% of the 545 dwellings within this section are sub-standard." An examination of the map revealed that the street could not serve traffic efficiently as 72 of the streets were too narrow." Ms. Hayes-Greene referred to the social problems and read, "the Cumberland area creates many social problems for its residents. Studies by the Redevelopment Commission indicate that compared with standard housing areas, the incidence of one major robbery is 19 times greater, aggravated assault is 20 times greater, tuberculosis is 8 times greater and venereal disease is 29 times greater in this community. This community is also an economic liability. The Redevelopment Commission was acquiring all of the land within the 83 acres of the Cumberland project. Individuals and house holders were relocated into standard housing accommodations with the assistance of the Redevelopment Commission. Structures are being demolished as they are vacated." Ms. Hayes-Greene stated this could be distributed today. Change venereal disease to other sexually transmitted disease, change tuberculosis to maternal and child health or Covid 19. It has been 70 years of this. There have been so many plans to do something about this and here we are talking about it again.

Ms. Hayes-Greene stated the approaches from the Redevelopment Commission in 1959 state. "It has long been recognized that these blighted areas are a drain upon the economic and human resources of the City. Various

schemes have been devised to solve the problem.” One solution was public housing. The federally subsidized program involved the acquisition of blighted areas, their clearance, and replacement with apartment units for low income families. Greensboro has three such projects. Public Housing programs have been successful in eliminating some blight. Only a limited number of families have income low enough to qualify for this type of housing. The second thing was going to be housing enforcement. Ms. Hayes-Greene stated at every meeting held by the Neighborhood Association currently, there are discussions regarding housing codes, what is not being reinforced, trees down, no lighting, houses boarded up, people not maintaining their property, stores and what they are doing. It is 70 years later and there are the same problems. Under the third approach of the problem from the Redevelopment Commission, was a program that utilized clearing to eliminate the areas of bad environment and extreme structural deterioration, coupled with rehabilitation of structures worth saving. It stated “the cleared land is sold to private enterprise for redevelopment in accordance with the master plan from Greensboro. It then said “the sale of the land is subject to certain restrictive covenants to permit future reversion to a blighted area. This is the same condition. Ms. Hayes-Greene stated she lives in Census Tract 112. The poverty rate is 43%, more than double the rate of the City. Poverty rate for children that live in this neighborhood is 59% and for seniors is nearing 30%. This area has one of the lowest graduation rates in the city. Just slightly over 10% of the people that live in this area have Bachelor’s degrees and wondered how much of south side was counted in this area statistics. Ms. Hayes-Greene requested Monica Walker to speak on concentrated poverty.

Monica Walker, 608 Martin Street, stated she has been doing the work of addressing structure and instructional racism for 30 years. One of the things being done and talked about are the issues of race and racism, and the issue of concentrated poverty. One of the persons who has been studied and whose work has informed their research was Dr. Paul Jargowsky of Rutgers University and his work is supported financially by the Century Foundation. Dr. Jargowsky looks at concentrated poverty looking through the lens of looking at the nation and poor people in this country. The last estimate was approximately 37 million poor people in the country, 7.8 million of those are black and 14 million of those are white. Dr. Jargowsky stated that the federal definition for poverty is a family of four making less than \$25,000 a year. Dr. Jargowsky spoke to how they are situated. If 20% of families making less than \$25,000 are congregated together, that is high poverty. High poverty that is concentrated poverty and if 40% are congregated together, that’s very high poverty. What Ms. Hayes stated, is what the residents live in. The concentration of poverty is not accidental, it is a result of red lining, a result of public policies. It is a result of planned development where funding and support goes and where it does not go. When you live in concentrated poverty, it will be a community with poor quality schools, lack of good health care or poor health care options that are available. The community with the check cash advance stores as opposed to banks. It grows and grows. The concentration of affordable housing in one community is the new red lining. Red lining was that there was no investment in those communities. Now with the new red lining all affordable housing in a city is concentrated in one community. If only affordable housing is concentrated there will be more of the same conditions. The lack of access, opportunities, and lack of resources. This community is concerned about that. The other program that often occurs for communities like this is gentrification. People coming in and bringing back the value but displace everyone living there. This is a community of black people who have decided they are going to do everything they can to revitalize redevelopment and reconfigure communities. The community will be reeling back against every effort to concentrate affordable housing in one zip code in this community.

Ms. Hayes-Greene stated she was Chairman of the School Board and was on the Board for 20 years. At the school board hearing there was discussion about how people who want to buy homes go about it. The number one driver of deciding where to live is schools. The southeast Greensboro report indicates a disproportionate number of sex offender registries, the condition of their schools is rated as poor. Concentrated poverty when it reaches 20% begins to affect educational outcomes, public safety, and the duration of the poverty. Concentrated poverty perpetuates generational poverty. People are stuck in place and dealing with poor schools, environmental burdens, health issues, transportation, public safety, jobs and access to jobs with decent wages. When hemmed in by all of those things, mobility is impacted. It has been very difficult. The Greene’s are not developers and did not move to

Ole Asheboro to see their property values sky rocket or anything. They moved here because they wanted to create a neighborhood with a strong and stable community.

Mr. Crane asked if what was being proposed would combat the long-standing institutions, or at least start the positive effect in these areas by providing single family homes and stabilization, and is what is planned for these two properties. Ms. Hayes-Greene replied yes.

Ms. Hayes-Greene stated it was discovered that 919 has restrictions. They are not looking to buy land and hold that land. There are people who want to buy and stay close to their block. The issues in the neighborhood are too overwhelming for a family to be on a block by themselves. They are hoping to stabilize by having 2, 3 4 families on the block and continue to move inward and around the community. It was discovered 919 Pearson Street has income restrictions and square footage restrictions because it was purchased with HUD money going back to 1959. Ms. Hayes-Greene has talked to the Mayor regarding this broader issue. Mr. Crane has been working to see if there is anything that can be done to give the money back to HUD and release those restrictions. A Yes-Weekly article and pictures were depicted indicating before and after of the Ms. Hayes-Greene son's home and a home owner at the age of 30. Pictures of shrubbery were shown. More photographs were shown depicting the improvements and upgrades that were done. Ms. Hayes advised she was sitting in what was at one time a "crack house" when it was purchased. Ms. Hayes-Greene stated whatever the process is for securing 927 and 919 Pearson for people who want to commit to this neighborhood, they were very much interesting in proceeding.

Mr. Crane stated the lots and the houses shown are approximately 2 blocks north of the lots the Greene's are interested in building on. Examples of Ms. Hayes-Greene's work is within walking distance from where these homes would be. Mr. Crane thanked Ms. Hayes-Greene. Mr. Crane advised Ms. Walker's daughter and son-in-law may be the potential buyers. Mr. Crane stated this was an informational presentation and was not an action item or required voting. Mr. Crane encouraged the Commissioners to ask any questions they may have.

Chair Johnson thanked Mr. And Mrs. Greene for their presentation and hoped they would come back with more information. Chair Johnson asked if there was any interest in treating the lot acquisitions individually and trying to streamline the one that does not have entanglements while working through discussions on the other lot. Mr. Crane responded there are federal restrictions based on how the properties were acquired in the past that are determined by HUD and are hard and fast that are cannot be maneuvered around but staff will make sure Ms. Hayes-Greene's is aware of those restrictions as they move forward. Staff will have the Greene's go through the normal process where they go to a TRC meeting and have the chance to go in front of the City Departments and receive comments from them regarding their particular project. That will provide information about the direction and perhaps things not know about the lots. Things that come up from that will make their way into the Sales Development Agreement. Staff will be working as quickly as possible to move this forward and will be clear about federal requirements with Mr. and Mrs. Greene.

Chair Johnson asked if it was fair to say to the extent that the Greene's are interested in moving forward individually with each lot and collectively both. Staff and the Commission could make that happen while working through the entanglements on the other lot. Chair Johnson was not attempting to put words in anyone's mouth but the Commission does want to move everything along as fast as possible. Mr. Crane asked if Chair Johnson was asking if it would be one agreement or two. Chair Johnson responded essentially yes and asked if it was a possibility. Mr. Crane stated that has not yet been determined, but if there is a benefit for the developer or the City to structure it in that way that staff would look into it. Chair Johnson inquired if there were questions from the other Commissioners.

5. Staff Updates

5a. Willow Oaks Redevelopment Area

Mr. Colón stated there were no updates different from the January updates. Currently they are waiting on design plans for the first homes. Two builders have been procured, Habitat Greensboro and Foundation Home Builders which is a private builder. They have reserved a total of 11 lots collectively in Willow Oaks and are trying to get the design review process. One lot has been closed on by Habitat. There is progress and should see construction late spring or early summer.

5b. Old Asheboro Redevelopment Area

Mr. Crane stated at the last meeting an update was provided regarding the Prestwick deal for the lots in the Ole Asheboro Redevelopment area, specifically for lot A-3 and A-4. Staff is still working towards that. The contract will be split into two. Initially it was to be a one-party agreement between GHDP, Redevelopment, and the City. That will be split with one for GHDP, one with the Redevelopment Commission, and the one with the City that was originally done in 2019. Staff will be at GHDP on March 23, 2021 which will determine the rest of it based on their approval. It will be for the multi-family project as detailed in the plan for the Ole Asheboro Redevelopment Plan

5c. Heritage House Redevelopment Area (Closed Session)

Mr. Johnson stated pursuant to N.C.G.S 143-318.11(a) (3), moved that the Commission go into closed session in order to preserve its attorney-client privilege in consultation 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; 19CVS 5882 and 19 CVS 5883; CVS 20-6035; and to give instructions in the handling or settlement of the claims made against the Commission therein. Seconded by Mr. Heberle. The Commission voted 4-0. (Chair Johnson. Nays: 0).

Closed session began at 6:23 p.m.

Mr. Heberle moved that the Commission go into closed session in order to preserve its attorney-client privilege in consultation with its attorneys concerning the pending litigation in Guilford County Superior Court involving West Town Bank and Meridian Conventions, LLC, identified as case numbers 17CVC 4458; 19 CVX 7862; 19CBS 5882 and 19 CVS 5883; and to give instructions in the handling or settlement of the claims made against the Commission therein. Seconded by Ms. Turner. The Commission voted 4-0). (Chair Johnson, Adams, Turner, and Heberle. Nays: 0)

The regular session resumed at 6:41 p.m.

6. Adjournment

Chair Johnson thanked the Commissioners and Councilwoman Hightower and Councilwoman Hoffmann for attending the meeting. A motion was made to adjourn the meeting by Ms. Adams; seconded by Mr. Heberle. The Commission voted 4-0. (Chair Johnson, Ms. Adams, Ms. Turner, and Mr. Heberle. Nays: 0). The meeting adjourned at 6:42 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Sue Schwartz, Director

SS/cs

**REGULAR MEETING OF THE
REDEVELOPMENT COMMISSION**

April 7, 2021

The Regular Meeting of the Redevelopment Commission of Greensboro (RCG) was held on Wednesday, April 7, 2021, via Zoom satellite. The following members were present: Chair Patrick Johnson, Vice Chair Trisha Adams, Pamela Turner, Amy Murphy, and Doug Heberle. Staff present was Hart Crane, José Colón, and Russ Clegg, Planning Department. Sue Schwartz, Planning Department Director. Andrea Harrell, Assistant City Attorney, Counsel for the Commission.

Chair Johnson called the meeting to order at 5:00 pm and thanked everyone for attending the meeting. Mr. Crane identified those present for the meeting and presented the agenda.

1. Approval of Meeting Minutes (Approved)

1a. A motion was made by Mr. Heberle to table the March 10 Special Meeting minutes to the May meeting to allow for revisions to be completed; seconded by Ms. Turner. The Commission voted 5-0. (Chair Johnson, Vice Chair Adams, Ms. Turner, Ms. Murphy, and Mr. Heberle. Nays: 0).

2. Ole Asheboro Sales Development Agreement between PDC Land Acquisition, L.L.C., the City, and RCG for MLK North TND Priority Sites.

Mr. Crane advised this agreement has been worked on with the developer for some time. A very similar agreement was executed in 2019 with the Commission. The funding mechanism the developer was seeking in 2019 was not awarded. Prestwick has returned and is reapplying for the tax credit financing from the North Carolina Housing Financing. The low-income tax credits are the primary funding mechanism for the project. This is one deal with two agreements. Mr. Crane presented slides depicting a 2004 Plan with 5 goals primarily aimed at stability and investment. In 2011 an addendum to the plan was adopted called the MLK North Traditional Neighborhood Plan. Three things were laid out; specific design principles, zone and site standards, and priority development properties within the redevelopment area boundaries. Mr. Crane stated he would refer to A2, A3, and A4 which are the priority properties identified in the MLK North Plan. These specific sites are for multi-family. This is notable because most of the other sites owned by the Commission or the City are identified for single-family uses. Aerial views were shown to indicate the ownership and the layout of the property. The A2 parcel is owned by the Greensboro Housing Development Partnership and is 3.88 acres. The A3 is owned by the City and is 1.68 acres. A4 was 3 parcels combined into one and owned by the Redevelopment Commission and is approximately 1.12 acres. Street views were depicted indicating what they look like today. There are some hills and a sharp topographical slope in the middle of A3. A2 has a number of topographical issues that the Developer believes they can overcome. The way this deal is structured, it is through two development agreements. The A2 parcel is owned by the Greensboro Housing Development Partnership, A3 by the City and A4 by the Commission.

Tonight the Commission is considering a three-party agreement between PDC Land Acquisitions (Prestwick), the City of Greensboro, and the Redevelopment Commission for 920 Pearson (A3), 526 Douglas (A4) and 326 and 328 East Gate City. This agreement is in addition to A2 parcel which is outlined in a separate agreement between GHDP and PDC Land Acquisitions. Mr. Crane highlighted the agreement as structured. The agreements outline Prestwick Development having 20 months to fulfill the items listed on the screen. Mr. Crane explained each of items for the Commissioners.

Vice Chair Trisha Adams joined the meeting in progress.

Mr. Crane advised Prestwick will provide the Commission with the final site plan and elevations that conform with the Redevelopment Plan and the MLK North Plan. Final site plans will need to be approved by the NC State Historic Preservation office as this redevelopment area is in a National Register Historic District. A final development program or phasing schedule will need to be provided. A proposed development budget with sources and uses, a marketing plan for rental of units, drawings and specifications, any other matters pertaining to the proposed construction will be provided. Documentation will be provided as to the projected costs of the improvements. Proof of the low-income housing tax credit financing is one of the most important checkpoints. Prestwick will also need execution of one or more agreements with the City regarding funding and construction of site preparations, tree scape work, and infrastructure. Staff anticipates the Developer will request bond funds from the City at some point if the agreements are approved. Staff is looking at what those numbers would be and what the need is. A site plan was depicted on the screen to indicate what is envisioned such as the orientation of buildings on the parcels. An entrance was shown off of MLK for the A2 parcel, an entrance off Bragg Street for A3 and a shared parking and driveway was depicted with the existing adjacent use for the A4 parcel.

Mr. Crane advised staff is very excited and has been working through this for a number of months. Mr. Crane requested Mr. Harris to reintroduce himself to the Commission as not everyone has met him. Mr. Harris will talk about his project and what the vision is.

Mr. Edrick Harris stated they are extremely excited and motivated to continue pushing forward to make this development a reality. A lot of the details have been provided by Mr. Crane as to what Prestwick is looking to do. This was attempted a couple of years ago and pursued the 9% tax credits from NCHFA. One of the changes now is the development has been made a little larger by adding in the A2 parcel, doubled the number of units to be developed, and will be suitable for a tax-exempt bond transaction. More units will make it more financially feasible moving forward and will work for the bond program. Prestwick is hopeful the path becomes less bumpy going the 4% route versus 9%.

Mr. Crane advised what Mr. Harris was referring to was the last time Prestwick was before the Commission, it was for an agreement for just these two parcels. The first section was going to be built out, go back to the Greensboro Housing Development Partnership and do the second phase. Mr. Harris was referring to the application to the North Carolina Housing and Financing Agency would become stronger when they are able to do all the parcels at once through one development.

Mr. Harris stated the goal was the cycle is different now. Going to a 4% tax exempt bond allowed for a more open cycle versus one dead lot and a 9% cycle. The bond cycle will open up May 1 and goes through October. The goal of Prestwick is to be in somewhere before July. Mr. Harris stated most of the Commissioners are familiar with all the different challenges that everyone is facing every day with Covid, the Pandemic, lumber and construction prices. Prestwick is working through all of that. Mr. Crane alluded to other bonds Prestwick is seeking. Some bonds are being sought with the City, others will be outside of the City. Prestwick is pursuing bonds such as the Federal Home Loan Bank Group to make the development financially feasible. There are a few other things and some hoops that Prestwick needs to jump through to bring this project to reality. Prestwick is pushing forward. Prestwick's target is 160 units and are looking at income averaging which is another tool recently introduced. Prestwick has several financial investors and is hopeful to partner up with Truest Partnership and Enterprise on the tax credit side. Mr. Harris stated currently Prestwick is attempting to line everything together to move it forward.

Chair Johnson asked Mr. Crane if that was the end of the presentation. Mr. Crane responded it was. Mr. Crane had wanted to highlight what the next steps would be if the agreement was approved at this meeting. The City is the other party in the agreement. The agreement will be presented to City Council on April 20, 2021 for final approval. From that point on, the clock will be ticking for Mr. Harris to provide the conditions at closing. Staff will be working hard to have everything resolved for Prestwick. This is a project that speaks directly to what Prestwick's plans state, and Mr. Harris has an open line of communication with the community. The community

is in favor of the project. Chair Johnson asked Mr. Crane if the purchase price was based on an appraisal. Mr. Crane responded that was correct. The typical process for disposing of land would be to obtain an appraisal, see what the fair market value is on the land, and set a price based on that. In order to make this deal work, GHDP actually accepted less than the appraised value for their land, based on what the Developer has in their budget for land costs. For this particular deal between the City, Prestwick and the Commission, Prestwick is paying full price for all of the land that is involved in this particular deal. Chair Johnson welcomed Mr. Harris back and advised everyone was glad Mr. Harris was back and working through this process. Chair Johnson asked if there were any further questions. Mr. Heberle asked what would happen if at the end of the 20-month period the pre-conditions failed. Mr. Crane stated staff would not allow Prestwick to commence improvements on the land and the deal would likely dissolve and staff would look at what the next steps would be. Ms. Harrell advised it would be considered a breach and immediate termination of the full agreement. Mr. Heberle asked what kind of investment would the City have, if any by that time, other than the land itself. Mr. Crane responded while no funds would have been dispersed, funds would likely be committed by that time. There would be a type of commitment letter that would have a set amount of City dollars set aside but would not have been dispersed or expanded any of them at that point. Mr. Heberle advised he was attempting to understand if there were any risks on the part of the City regarding a failure of the 20-month period.

Chair Johnson asked if the tax credits fall through, what would happen in that event. If there would be a quicker termination if the tax credits did not go through. Mr. Crane asked if the question was in terms of if the Developer would apply again. Chair Johnson stated the bond program was being pursued which had a less stringent deadline. Chair Johnson stated by the end of the period mention through, and no award following that period, asked would the deal fall through at that point or is there an ability to reapply on next year's tax credit timeline. Mr. Crane stated the opportunity for Prestwick to reapply would be provided. At that point, it would have to be determined if that was realistic as it would be the third time at that point. The Communities' input would be needed if they were and if they wanted to still move forward with this partner. Redevelopment would be sympathetic to that. If tax credits cannot be obtained on this second try, Redevelopment Commission would need to be realistic about reapplying. The way the agreement is structured, it does allow Prestwick to go again in the next tax-credit cycle without Redevelopment renewing the contract or amending it. Chair Johnson inquired if there were any other questions from the Commissioners. Hearing none, Chair Johnson requested Mr. Crane to phrase again what the request is in terms of a motion. Mr. Crane stated what the motion should say and was approved by Ms. Harrell, City Attorney.

Mr. Heberle moved to approve the Revised Sales and Development Agreement between PDC Land Acquisition, L.L.C., the City, and affiliated parties, and RCG in the Old Asheboro Redevelopment area as presented to the Commission on April 7, 2021. Seconded by Ms. Turner. The Commission voted 5-0. (Chair Johnson, Mr. Heberle, Vice Chair Adams, Ms. Murphy, Ms. Turner. Nays: 0). Mr. Crane reiterated the agreement will be before City Council on April 20, 2021 and will keep everyone in the loop regarding the progress.

3. Staff Update

3a. Redevelopment Commission Information and Overview

Mr. Crane presented a power point for the Commissioners reviewing what the Commission is, the powers of the Commission, and where the powers come from. A listing of the primary activities was shown indicating what the Commission will carry out: acquisition of real estate, clearance or demolition, disposition of any real property, and provision of relocation payment in the case of eminent domain that the Commission has the power to do in certain cases and would be in compliance with the North Carolina Urban Redevelopment Law. The Redevelopment Commission was incorporated in 1951 primarily to conduct studies, formulate plans and implement projects for blighted areas within the City. The Redevelopment Commission was established under and regulated by the NC General Statutes and the Greensboro Development Ordinance.

Mr. Crane reviewed the State Statute Urban Redevelopment Law 160A that provides the Redevelopment Commission with the power to determine what blight is, power in preparation and adoption of Redevelopment plans. Mr. Crane stated a blighted area is the ignition point for how a Redevelopment area comes in. Proving blight or seeing blight in an area is what allows staff to bring a case for a redevelopment to the Commission. A blighted area is usually predominantly residential with a combination of factors of dilapidation, termination, obsolescence, inadequate provision of light, ventilation, air sanitation, open space, overcrowding, unsanitary or unsafe conditions generally. Those things would substantially impair the sound growth of the community and would be conducive to transmission of disease, ill health, infant mortality, and detrimental to the public health.

A flow chart was depicted indicating the steps for turning a blighted area into a redevelopment area. Staff would investigate and bring the issue before the Commission for their consideration. If the Commission agreed it met the threshold public hearings would be held and would go to the Zoning Commission for more public hearings before going before City Council. Once approved by City Council, Redevelopment would be able to implement the plan. Mr. Crane advised the powers the Redevelopment Commission has such as the voluntary repair program, rehab, plan for enforcement of laws and codes of regulations for the rehabs and removal of buildings and improvements. The Commission can develop a report for methods and techniques and carry out demonstrations of other activities for the prevention and elimination of slums and urban blight. Expenditures can be made to carry out those purposes. Historically, Redevelopment carried out more rehab work. Currently the Commission is more in the disposition business. The plans of the Redevelopment Commission define the boundaries of the area, the land use plan, the standard population densities, preliminary site plans, proposed changes and street layouts.

Mr. Crane depicted Redevelopment plans that are active and inactive, along with goals and plans that were achieved. Staff keeps tabs with the community members that are in an inactive area, but are ultimately less involved. A map depicting active and inactive plans was displayed. Mr. Crane stated typically properties are sold by the Redevelopment Commission through an upset bid process, although there are other options that can be used by the Redevelopment Commission. But typically, the properties are appraised and go through the upset bid process. Mr. Crane stated the power point, flow chart, and the actual NC Statute, will be sent to the Commissioners to have for reference.

Chair Johnson asked following the April or the May meeting, could Mr. Crane circulate an updated list of inventory listing of properties. Chair Johnson suggested in free time perhaps the Commissioners could drive by some of the properties as it may be helpful for them to look at them and perhaps have fresh ideas. Mr. Crane stated staff is looking into different ways of to market or look at the parcels individually. Mr. Crane agreed fresh eyes and thinking innovatively was a very good idea. In the past before Covid, there were occasionally field type trips to different redevelopment neighborhoods to get a sense as a group about what the redevelopment areas look like on the ground and where certain parcels has nuances that need to be seen in person as opposed to pictures. Mr. Crane encouraged everyone to do that. Mr. Crane will send a list along with the items previously mentioned to the Commissioners.

Mr. Clegg stated there are a lot of redevelopment areas across town. Some of them may not be looked at as redevelopment areas. College Hill or downtown used to be redevelopment area. The Redevelopment Commission has a long history within the different neighborhoods.

3b. Willow Oaks Redevelopment Area

Mr. Clegg advised the parcels that the Redevelopment Commission owned on McConnell Road, West side of US 29 sold to True Homes. True Homes has started working on those. There are two houses that should be starting soon. Plans have been submitted by True Homes for the next two homes. There will be a total of four houses, three of which came from the Redevelopment Commission. True Homes worked with NCA&T home building which was slightly delayed due to Covid. There are GHDP partnership property zoned on the other side of Willow Oaks that will also begin construction soon.

3c. South Elm Redevelopment Area

Mr. Clegg advised on April 6, 2021, City Council approved the sale of the Development Agreement with SEDGE and Rea for the South Elm project. There is a lot of work to be done between now and when the cell tower is moved.

4. Additional Business

Chair Johnson advised he did not have additional business. Ms. Turner thanked everyone for the opportunity to speak. Ms. Turner advised she has been speaking with Mr. Crane regarding a non-profit organization called Back 2 Back Empowerment for survivors of domestic violence. Ms. Turner inquired if there were small parcels to create a mural or art work that would exemplify and celebrate a survival of domestic violence. Back2Back not only speaks to prevention but celebrates survivals. Ms. Turner stated what better way, especially in the neighborhoods, to be better able to embrace survivors of domestic violence or survivors in general. Back2Back focuses on survival of domestic violence. Back2Back is looking for small parcels to place art. The City of Greensboro is an art city and a Redevelopment Commission parcel may be a good fit for a piece of art. Ms. Turner thought if some of the initiatives of Greensboro were combined together for the betterment of empowering survivors of domestic violence, not only women but men as well, it would be the epitome of embracement of the City to the survivors. Ms. Turner advised her plight is finding small parcels of land that art work could be placed to celebrate each or selective survivors. NOVANT had a center initiative of hearts. Mayor Vaughn also has an initiative regarding violence. Ms. Turner felt even if the lot is very small, to place a piece of art there with a bench and a name or a face of a survivor, would be awesome to do. It would be great to have it on all four sides of the City to create a circular embracement. Ms. Turner advised as a survivor herself, being able to hear and see someone embrace or celebrate her for her confidence in coming out of a domestic violence marriage, would empower her even more to continue on and assist others in pulling through. Ms. Turner would like to have some brainstorming or finding smaller parcels to beautify the community with something positive as opposed to being overgrown with foliage or trash.

Chair Johnson thanked Ms. Turner for sharing the idea but also the personal sharing. Chair Johnson stated he was sorry to hear that there was a personal nature to this and glad she is a survivor, and appreciated Ms. Turner sharing the comments. Chair Johnson thought it was creative and a good idea. Chair Johnson asked Ms. Turner her thoughts on obtaining the inventory list and everyone would have an opportunity over the next month or to brainstorm and bring those back to the virtual table at the next meeting. Ms. Turner responded she said it is a very good idea and a fair idea. Ms. Turner thanked Chair Johnson for embracing or considering the idea and it spoke volumes. Ms. Turner personally thought it is a necessity to empower the community in some way, shape, or form. A neighborhood might say there is a park that is celebrating X, Y, Z would speak volumes in the community. Whatever or however, Ms. Turner was open and was looking forward to empowering some people.

Chair Johnson stated there was mention of a bench idea coupled with art and things, and asked Ms. Turner if she had any relationships with artists or ideas on how the art would be portrayed because there are a lot of Redevelopment sites that are vacant. Ms. Turner did not obtain names, but did go to downtown Greensboro and went to some art galleries recently. She met artists. One of the artists that she spoke to said on Lees Chapel there could be half an acre of artwork. Names of the artists are on their artwork. Ms. Turner did say it was for a non-profit and was told on Lees Chapel they do the work for free. Ms. Turner has not had an opportunity to explore Lees Chapel, but will gather names and information from the artists located there. Ms. Turner will be reaching out to companies for possible donations. Ms. Turner would like to have lights on a mural. Whatever the art may be, Ms. Turner felt it would bring an empowering movement to the community and to the city. Greensboro is noted for art.

Mr. Clegg stated he had not heard of an initiative that the Mayor had and asked Ms. Turner if she knew the name of the initiative. Ms. Turner she saw an interview with Mayor Vaughn, Marikay Abuzuaiter, and Sharon Hightower and the Mayor stated she had a walk in the park initiative which Ms. Turner did not know of, but

believed it was called A walk in the park. Mr. Crane stated from the Commission's standpoint what this would actually look like is probably a Temporary Use Agreement. There are pieces of Commission land currently being used for urban gardens and this would probably look like those agreements, that essentially state 'you can use this piece of art on this land until we sell and then it would have to be moved.' The Commission would need to have more details about the artists before moving forward. The artists then would probably present that idea in front of the Commission. If favorable, the Commission would then start to work towards what that Use Agreement would look like.

Chair Johnson stated Mr. Crane spoke about some of the other creative uses with gardens and things and asked Mr. Crane if he could over the month or so, just ask around or collaborate with Russ Clegg, Dyan Arkin and José Colón to see if anything similar to the has been done that the Commission could piggyback on the work.

Chair Johnson stated it is such a creative idea that he would be surprised if there was anything directly on point for this, but if this is something that could assist in the streamlining process, if it something the Commission wants to do. Mr. Crane responded he felt something could be found analogous. Mr. Clegg stated in terms of the Use Agreement, the Urban Farming Initiative at Willow Oaks would be a very good template and could relative be easily modified. The other idea would be to reach out to the neighborhoods and talk with them to ensure buying it from them early on and having that within the agreement. Benches have at times created situations in neighborhoods and it would be good to have conversations with the neighborhood about their preferences for the art installtion. It would be good to get ahead of that curve.

Mr. Crane advised most of the sites are scattered predominately in residential areas. Ms. Turner and Mr. Crane spoke about and the adjacent neighbors to this will have to be on board as well as the community as a whole. The point made by Mr. Clegg was correct. Benches at times can be a hot button item.

Ms. Turner stated the reason she mentioned a bench was because of the incentive. There are times when walking in a park, someone wants to sit. The initial idea was just the art, not the bench. If the bench was a button push, it can be omitted. It is about the art and the message.

Chair Johnson asked Ms. Harrell if anything came to mind in terms of the Commission's discretion to make use of the property's portfolio and on the list for that type of purpose. Anything the Commission could look at over the next month or two. Ms. Harrell stated it should definitely be looked at it. Ms. Harrell did not know if it was foreclosed. The Commission has a good bit of discretion around redevelopment property and the best way to use it and making recommendations to City Council.

Chair Johnson inquired if there were any Commissioners who had questions or thoughts. Mr. Heberle recognized that the Commission's purview is limited to the redevelopment areas that have been identified previously. The issue being discussed is far more pervasive community wide and is not limited to any particular area. Mr. Heberle liked the idea and did not want to quell the idea for Redevelopment's use, but he would very much like to see it expanded into other areas of Greensboro, not limited to what the Commission has the ability to approve or not approve. Ms. Turner agreed. Initially in speaking with Mr. Crane, it was more so properties in Greensboro whether to purchase or be loaned. Ms. Turner would like the Commission to understand there is a need everywhere. Domestic violence goes to all neighborhoods and people from all walks of life. If her non-profit could raise money to put it in a different neighborhood other than what the City owns, that would be a great idea. If there are dual purposes for the land, it is not only empowering and celebrating but also beautifying the community. Mr. Crane stated maybe this could be a pilot for a series of art done on that people could point to on Commission land and say they would want to do that. This could be the model. Mr. Crane stated generally it makes a lot of sense and is a great idea.

Chair Johnson inquired if there were any more thoughts before closing the meeting. Chair Johnson thanked Ms. Turner for her idea and personal shared story. Chair Johnson thanked the Commissioners for attending the meeting and working to get the agenda items taken care of. A motion was made to adjourn the meeting by Mr.

Heberle; seconded by Ms. Adams. The Commission voted 5-0. (Chair Johnson, Vice Chair Adams, Ms. Turner, Ms. Murphy, and Mr. Heberle, Nays: 0). The meeting adjourned at 6:11 p.m.

In the previous minutes the motions of Chair Johnson and Mr. Heberle were incorrectly transcribed by Christine Swanson, minute taker. Below is the corrected transcript from the meeting of March 10, 2021.

Chair Johnson inquired if it was okay for him to make a motion. Mr. Watson responded as Chair, under Roberts Rules of Orders normally, Chair Johnson would ask for a motion to be made and someone could say so moved.

Respectfully Submitted,

Sue Schwartz, Director

SS/cs

DRAFT

**REGULAR MEETING OF THE
REDEVELOPMENT COMMISSION**

May 5, 2021

The Regular Meeting of the Redevelopment Commission of Greensboro (RCG) was held on Wednesday, May 5, 2021, via Zoom satellite. The following members were present: Chair Patrick Johnson, Vice Chair Trisha Adams, Pamela Turner, Amy Murphy, and Doug Heberle, Councilwoman Hightower, and Councilwoman Hoffmann. Staff present was Hart Crane, José Colón, and Russ Clegg, Planning Department. Andrea Harrell, Assistant City Attorney, Counsel for the Commission.

Vice Chair Adams called the meeting to order at 5:00 pm and thanked everyone for attending the meeting. Mr. Crane identified those present for the meeting and presented the agenda.

1. Approval of Meeting Minutes (Approved)

1a. Mr. Heberle made a motion to approve the Special meeting minutes of March 10, 2021; seconded by Ms. Turner. The Commission voted 4-0. (Vice Chair Adams, Ms. Turner, Ms. Murphy, and Mr. Heberle. Nays: 0).

2. Amendment to Use Agreement with Guilford Urban Farming Initiative (GUFI) for Farmers Market in Willow Oaks – COVID 19 Vaccinations.

José Colón stated this was an amendment to the Use Agreement from January 2021 that would allow Guilford Urban Farming Initiative (GUFI) to add provision of Covid vaccinations to their scope of services within the agreement they have with the Commission. Ms. Seiber consulted with the Commission to work with United Health Care and Alignment Health Care to provide vaccinations on site and to the community, in an effort to improve neighborhood access to vaccinations. Mr. Colón consulted with the legal department who advised that adding this to GUFI's scope of services requires an amendment to the agreement to 1) update the additional services, and 2) the liability insurance language. Depicted on the screen was the new agreement replacing the existing Use and Agreement. The record of liability insurance has been requested from United Health Care and Alignment Health Care before signing the agreement.

Ms. Seiber advised that Triad Adult Pediatric Medical Center, (TapMed) are very interested in this endeavor and have several locations in Greensboro and Guilford County. She stated it would work better as TapMed wants to posture themselves for the promotion of vaccinations for everyone 16 and over. TapMed will be ready for participants be able to receive their two vaccinations and the waiting period would be done before school starts back. The scope will be to provide education and vaccinations at the existing neighborhood Farmers Market. Ms. Seiber felt this group would be better suited for their needs.

Ms. Harrell asked if this request was in lieu of United Health Care. Ms. Seiber responded Sharon Pouncy of United Health Care was her contact and coordinates with several different groups for the community outreach. United Health Care is the coordinator and this will be in lieu of Dr. Bulk (ph) from Raleigh. Ms. Harrell asked if that was Alignment Health Care. Ms. Seiber responded it was. Ms. Seiber stated her contact with United Health Care believed the Triad Adult Pediatric Medical Group would be much conducive and able to provide additional services.

(Chair Johnson joined the meeting in progress.)

Ms. Harrell asked what were the additional services. Ms. Harrell advised the additional services need to be covered in the agreement and did not know if that could be approved at this meeting. Ms. Seiber stated there is a big push

to vaccinate teenagers and young adults, whereas Alignment Health only had access to Moderna. TapMed has access to both Moderna and Pfizer. Pfizer has added benefit because it is already approved for 16 and older. Ms. Seiber stated the goal is to increase the percentage of people being vaccinated by July 4, and also to help educate young adults and teenagers on the subject.

Ms. Harrell asked if there was a written proposal or any type of document received from the new entity outlining the services they listed. Ms. Seiber advised she could obtain that. Ms. Harrell felt that would be needed to ensure that the amendment to the current agreement is as expansive as possible for all potential uses of the property. Ms. Seiber asked if it was possible for them to be the first agenda item at the meeting in June to allow the vaccinations to start in June and July. Mr. Colón advised it should be possible. Ms. Seiber apologized for the change but felt it may be a better service for the community. Mr. Colón stated there will be an updated Use Agreement in June.

Mr. Crane inquired if Commissioners had any questions for Mr. Colón regarding the agreement. Mr. Heberle asked if once the changes are made there could be a vote via email to start the process sooner for vaccinations. Ms. Harrell responded since it would not be at one of the regular scheduled meetings, a special meeting could be scheduled to vote on that. Ms. Harrell did not recommend voting on that via email as it was an agenda item and could appear the Commission may be hiding what was being done. She advised the Commission either call a special meeting or wait until the June meeting.

3. First Amendment to Sales Development Agreement between RCG and GHDP – Willow Oaks Redevelopment Area – Zones B & E.

Mr. Colón referred the Commissioners to the memo outlining the history on the updated agreement with the Greensboro Housing Development Partnership, (GHDP), which tasked GHDP to dispose and develop single-family properties that the Commission transferred to GHDP in the past. On June 22, 2020, the agreement was updated and some terms changed, mainly the price of the land, and incorporation of some incentives to home buyers.

This amendment will be addressing some language regarding the release of the liens in the agreement. Currently, in order for the Redevelopment Commission to release the properties off the lien and deed of trust, the home would have to be fully constructed and sold to the home buyer. It could be problematic when working directly with builder's that are buying the property, as builders cannot purchase properties with liens on them. The proposed amendment would update the process and allow the removal of some of the properties off of these liens. The proposed new structure is that GHDP will hold the proceeds and when the home is constructed the funds would be released to the builder who will also receive incentives depending on what was built. The Redevelopment Commission receiving the remaining funds and GHDP will receive a development fee per lot. The amendment will be updating the process allowing builders to purchase the land without a lien.

Ms. Turner asked if the liens were being taken off to go forward with building. Mr. Colón stated that was correct. Redevelopment staff is working with both non-profit and private builders. Their legal team does not advise them to buy properties with liens on them, so we are proposing the process to be amended. Mr. Colon stated there is precedent to do it this way, which Ms. Harrell will speak to. This has been done in the past and made the translation much easier. In the future when working with private builders, it will help them tremendously because liens on properties will affect how financing is acquired and make the process easier moving forward with future builders in this specific section of Willow Oaks.

Ms. Harrell stated the financing side of things got messy and were difficult with the lien being there. The money is segregated and placed in a safe account. The City and the Commission are protected where the money is concerned. The builder can obtain the preferred financing they need to move forward and build on the lots. It is a win/win and has been done in the past. A change like this is not new, and the agreement does need to be updated.

Ms. Turner stated her concern was why didn't this happen earlier, why is it happening now, will it be an ongoing occurrence, and how can it be prevented moving forward. Ms. Harrell stated the lien is not being lifted. The money

is being paid and the money is kept in a secure account where they know where it is. These are standard terms and there could have been incentives, or a type of financing, or this bank wants something a little bit different. Ms. Harrell stated what she has learned with the Commission is that Redevelopment agreements are somewhat messy, and have to be changed along the way because the financing can fluctuate. There are times when these amendments will be needed. It cannot always be foreseen on the front end of an agreement of every potential financing issue or incentive issue that may arise. Redevelopment needs to be as flexible as possible while protecting the properties and the monies. Mr. Clegg added to some extent this is a result of attempting to streamline and simplifying the previous process which was complex with a lot of parts.

Chair Johnson asked from a risk assessment standpoint, with the monies in escrow, was it more a timing issue to be able to place a bank lien if needed. The money is still safe in the escrow account and ultimately given to Redevelopment Commission. Chair Harrell responded that was correct. Chair Johnson asked if there has been a shift in the type of developers. Mr. Colón responded they are currently working with Habitat of Greensboro which is a non-profit and their legal staff had concerns with the liens. Private builders may have an even higher concern. Moving forward, this will simplify the process, not only for the Commission and GHDP but the builders as well.

Vice Chair Adams made a motion to approve the first amendment to Sales-Development agreement between RCG and GHDP-Willow Oaks Redevelopment Area – Zones B&E; seconded by Mr. Heberle. The Commission voted 5-0. (Chair Johnson, Vice Chair Adams, Ms. Turner, Ms. Murphy, and Mr. Heberle. Nays: 0).

4. Staff Updates

a. Mr. Clegg stated the web site is live for the newly adopted Comprehensive Plan, GSO2040. Mr. Clegg presented a power point depicting the web site. The Comprehensive Plan was adopted in June of 2020 and serves as the guide to growth and development for the City. The Community stated their overall vision for where they want Greensboro to be in 20 years and created a roadmap in getting there. The website is accessible and easy to use. Paper copies are available if requested. Mr. Clegg shared the City Planning page, and the external website, , he also highlighted some interactive maps and explained tools on the site. The focus of the site is implementation of the plan. There is a resource library that has previous plans and reports. The Vision Statement describes what we want the City to be like in 2040. Areas and land use were depicted with maps of future growth. The goals and strategies were depicted that addressed infill development, creating great places, becoming car optional, building community connections, quality of life, and diversity of cultures. It talks about a wide variety of topics, like what makes Greensboro unique or memorable, or highlighting all the different college campuses and history, or describing how we continue to grow and become more economically competitive. As more departments are involved, there will be more added. Implementation sections was recently added that show implementation efforts spanning across multiple City departments.

Chair Johnson asked in terms of the function of the Commission and what each Commissioners does with proposals and projects that come in front of Redevelopment, was there a guide smaller in scale. Mr. Clegg stated it is a short comprehensive plan compared to the standard which is usually about 500 pages. Mr. Clegg suggested viewing the Big Ideas which describes somewhat the direction Greensboro wants to go and are pertinent to work of the Redevelopment Commission regarding equity, sustainability, spread of economic resources and infill development. The information will be sent out to the Commissioners.

b. Ole Asheboro Redevelopment Area Update

Mr. Crane advised at the last meeting the Commissioners approved the Sales Development Agreement between the City, Redevelopment Commission, and Prestwick Development. It went before City Council and was approved for final approval. The developers from Prestwick now have the ability to move forward with their LIHTC application that will be submitted over the summer. The Commissioners will be kept up to date on the progress.

5. Additional Business

Ms. Murphy stated she would like to see if a special meeting could be held to vote on the vaccinations and amending that. Mr. Colón advised he will work with Mr. Crane, Ms. Seiber and Legal to have the update to the agreement back before the Commission as soon as possible.

Mr. Crane stated the receptionist calls the Commissioners monthly for attendance to the meeting. The calls are helpful to ensure there will be a quorum and be able to make actionable decisions. The receptionist has expressed she is not always able to get ahold of some people. If there are better numbers or ways to contact, or better ways the Commissioners would like to confirm attendance at a meeting, please send via email to Mr. Crane.

Ms. Turner advised she has been in contact with some artists and inquired if staff had any information or any parcels for what was discussed at the last meeting in relation to celebrating domestic violence survivors. Mr. Crane advised the inventory lot list was sent to the Commissioners to think if any of them made sense and Ms. Turner advised she would do reconnaissance on artists. Mr. Crane stated from staff level, he has not found any additional lots. If the Commissioners have found some that are peaking interest, he would be happy to look into it. Ms. Turner advised she did receive that email. Ms. Turner reiterated it is only small parcels that would not do anyone justice other than beautifying the community. Ms. Turner stated she did not have a problem with purchasing the property. They want to be able to exemplify love to those surviving domestic violence. Mr. Crane advised he would take another scan of Redevelopment properties.

Chair Johnson asked if the next step was to identify a possible property, if there is one, and then start with samples and go through the artists. Mr. Crane responded it would be needed to be determined where it should be and who would do it. Once those two are identified, will attempt to work towards a Use Agreement. The two most important questions are where and who. Ms. Turner is trying to determine who and the Commission can work as a group to determine where. Ms. Turner asked about using the parcel on Parkwood for a sample or a model. Ms. Turner could then reach out to an artist. Mr. Crane responded that will probably be between some residences and would need to be sympathetic to that. There would probably not be very much exposure in a residential area. Ms. Turner asked if there was a template of letter that could be created or would she have to create to reach out to neighbors. Mr. Crane responded staff will take care of that once it is to that point, and will work with Ms. Turner on the language.

6. Adjournment

Chair Johnson thanked the Commissioners and Councilwoman Hightower and Councilwoman Hoffmann for attending the meeting. A motion was made to adjourn the meeting by Ms. Murphy; seconded by Ms. Turner. The Commission voted 5-0. (Chair Johnson, Vice Chair Adams, Ms. Turner, Ms. Murphy, and Mr. Heberle. Nays: 0).

The meeting adjourned at 5:54 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Sue Schwartz, Director

SS/cs

**REGULAR MEETING OF THE
REDEVELOPMENT COMMISSION**

July 7, 2021

The Regular Meeting of the Redevelopment Commission of Greensboro (RCG) was held on Wednesday, July 7, 2021, via Zoom satellite. The following members were present: Chair Patrick Johnson, Vice Chair Trisha Adams, Pamela Turner, Amy Murphy, and Doug Heberle. Staff present was Hart Crane, José Colón, and Russ Clegg, Planning Department. Andrea Harrell, Assistant City Attorney, Counsel for the Commission.

Chair Johnson called the meeting to order at 5:00 pm and thanked everyone for attending the meeting. Mr. Crane identified those attending the meeting and presented the agenda.

1. Approval of Meeting Minutes (Approved)

a) April 7, 2021 Regular Meeting

Mr. Heberle made a motion to approve the regular meeting minutes of April 7, 2021; seconded by Ms. Turner. The Commission voted 5-0. (Chair Johnson, Vice Chair Adams, Ms. Turner, Ms. Murphy, and Mr. Heberle. Nays: 0).

b) May 5, 2021 Regular Meeting

Ms. Murphy made a motion to approve the regular meeting minutes of May 5, 2021; seconded by Vice Chair Adams. The Commission voted 5-0. (Chair Johnson, Vice Chair Adams, Ms. Turner, Ms. Murphy, and Mr. Heberle. Nays: 0).

2. Second Amendment to Willow Oaks Single Family Home/Sales Development Agreement.

Mr. Colón depicted a slide with a brief description of items for the pre-development area of Willow Oaks. Mr. Colón refreshed the Commissioners memory regarding the Sales Development Agreement revised in 2020 and executed on June 22, 2020 for 32 lots located in Zones B and E of Willow Oaks as part of the single-family home property initiative for builders. A builders incentive was instituted for builders who have certain elements constructed for the homes to be able to obtain a rebate off the lot. The first amendment of updating the lien release procedure was instituted within that agreement for Habitat Greensboro, unanimously approved the Commission on May 5, 2021. The second amendment included 21 additional lots with Zone C, along McConnell Road. The same terms and conditions will be applied in Zone C that were done for Zones B and E. The second amendment was done to include the first amendment that updated the lien release procedure. A second amendment was developed to the Sales Development Agreement between the Redevelopment Commission and Greensboro Housing Authority.

Chair Johnson inquired if the Commissioners had questions for Mr. Colón. Hearing none, Chair Johnson requested a motion to approve the second amendment to the Sales Development Agreement between the Redevelopment Commission and the Greensboro Housing Development Partnership in the Willow Oaks Redevelopment area.

Vice Chair Adams made a motion to approve the second amendment to the Sales Development Agreement between RCG and GHDP. Seconded by Ms. Turner. The Commission voted 5-0. (Chair Johnson, Vice Chair Adams, Ms. Turner, Ms. Murphy, and Mr. Heberle. Nays: 0). Mr. Colón noted the Agreement will go to GHDP later in the month for their approval.

3. First Supplement to Declaration of Covenants, Conditions, and Restrictions for Union Square in the South Elm Redevelopment Area.

Mr. Colón reminded the Commission of the Union Square, covenants, conditions, and restrictions (CCRs). The only properties currently tied to those CCRs are the properties where the Union Square campus is located and the RCG

lot directly west of that property, where the parking lot is located. The supplement would include the remaining Redevelopment properties within the South Elm Street Redevelopment area. A map was displayed indicating the properties highlighted in blue. The request is for the Redevelopment Commission to approve the execution by the Chair of the first supplement to declarations of the CCR for Union Square in the South Elm Redevelopment Area. The supplement would be tied to the Master Redevelopment Agreement and is a necessary step in moving forward with development on both of the blocks. Mr. Colón inquired if the Commissioners had questions or concerns with this item. Mr. Heberle requested to know what the CCRs contain. Mr. Crane inquired if Ms. Arkin would provide a brief history summary.

Ms. Dyan Arkin stated under the South Elm Street Redevelopment Area Redevelopment Plan, a master developer was selected, (the South Elm Development Group), and the Redevelopment Commission executed a Sales Development Agreement with South Elm. One of the contingents for action moving forward with disposition and development of the land was to create the CCRs for the full area and were approved by the Redevelopment Commission. When Union Square Campus purchased the property on the corner of Arlington and East Gate City Boulevard, with an option on the property located on South Elm and East Gate City Boulevard, the CCRs were tied to that property. Some of what is in the CCRs are the creation of what was called the Assembly, very much like an Homeowners Association giving the rights and responsibilities of the Assembly to include how the voting rights are parsed to the different owners as the land is developed. A mechanism for assessing additional fees for each of the owners moving forward if there was a need, and described the ownership and maintenance of the common area and parking areas. The responsibility of the developer to be the declarant agent of the CCRs during the first development period was also included. South Elm Development Group currently is the declarant and the Redevelopment Commission is the contingent declarant.

Mr. Heberle stated he was familiar with the concept of the CCRs but regarding these particular CCRs, if there was anything in particular that was unusual that the Commission needed to be aware; such as supplementing and adding the property. Ms. Arkin responded the only thing unusual would probably be the Union Square Assembly. It was a term that Ms. Arkin was unfamiliar with and pushed to have a description of the rights and responsibilities be very clear and what percentage voting rights did the homeowners would have. The homeowners all became the assembly as each parcel was sold and developed. There may be some additional minor amendments to the supplement. Due to the market it is unlikely there will be a significant amount of retail and commercial and having a Merchants Association for this area would not be likely.

Ms. Harrell asked if it would be beneficial for the Commissioners to read the CCRs in order to vote on the item. Mr. Heberle felt that was not necessary. They were standard CCRs that outline the relationship to the parties in this redevelopment area in merging with the other two parcels. Ms. Arkin stated it was always intended to govern the full Redevelopment area.

Mr. Crane inquired if there were further questions. Hearing None, Chair Johnson inquired if there was a motion. Mr. Heberle moved to approve the execution by the Chair of the first supplement to the Declarations of the CCRs for Union Square in the South Elm Redevelopment area. Seconded by Ms. Murphy. The Commission voted 5-0. (Chair Johnson, Vice Chair Adams, Ms. Turner, Ms. Murphy, and Mr. Heberle. Nays: 0).

4. Staff Updates

Ole Asheboro Redevelopment Area Update

Mr. Crane depicted a screen shot indicating property on Bragg street and MLK, JR Drive intersection entering into the Redevelopment and an historical Vet building that was in severe disrepair. Historically the building was privately owned. In the past the City has attempted to acquire this property. In recent months, a private developer, Mr. Hinson, purchased the property and has revitalized the corner property that was headed towards being demolished. Mr. Hinson bought this property through a private sale and has built it up. Mr. Hinson is working toward a proposal for some type of housing to go on the parcels indicated on the drawing by Mr. Crane at 400 E Bragg, which owned by RCG. Mr. Crane introduced Mr. Ishmael Hinson to speak on the plans for this area.

Mr. Ishmael Hinson stated he is from Greensboro and introduced his partners, Odell Cleveland and Jessica Prowess (ph). Mr. Hinton stated he wanted to acquire the building and bring something back to the community that would be beneficial to everyone. Currently there are 6 to 8 parking spaces. The small parcel of land would provide access to the Greenway and parking along the Greenway. Once the plans for this area are together for the back lot and the final plans for the current building, Mr. Hinson will share with the Commission to receive comments or feedback.

Mr. Hinson stated all the development work is being documented. The building itself had two major areas inside where the flooring had completely collapsed. The building was gutted out and cleaned to have it become workable and walkable. The initial plans for the structure currently are to make it a business incubator on one side of the building, with approximately four different type offices inside. On the other side of the building will be a small coffee shop. The idea is to build a large wrap around deck providing ingress and egress to the Greenway.

Mr. Crane advised Mr. Hinson has drafted a letter to the Ole Asheboro Neighborhood Association and will meet with them on July 12, 2021 for further discussion of the project and provide input. The community has taken notice Mr. Hinson has used local people to work on this project. Mr. Crane stated this building itself has historical significance and the City was unsure if it could be saved. The fact that Mr. Hinson decided not to destroy the building adds great value to the community. It was an African American owned veterinary building for a long time before it fell into disrepair. The community is very pleased that the building will stay standing and the Neighborhood Association is very supportive.

Mr. Crane inquired if there were questions for Mr. Hinson. Ms. Murphy stated her appreciation of Mr. Hinson's enthusiasm for this project. Ms. Turner asked for the initial lot currently being looked at, were the plans for that part of land a continuance of the business incubator or another vision of something different. Mr. Hinson responded it would be something totally different. His thoughts were for some type of housing such as a two-story home. Mr. Hinson felt there was a big push for single-family home ownerships, also some form of apartment or townhome type of structure. The architects (C2 Hicaps) will have the plans ready for the back site by the next meeting. Mr. Hinson stated he has many ideas and would appreciate comments, suggestions, ideas from the Commissioners.

Mr. Crane advised specifically the property of 400 East Bragg, west of the building purchased by Mr. Hinton, was acquired by federal funds in the past, meaning the initial occupancy will have to be within a certain area medium income to qualify as buyer, should housing be developed there. Mr. Hinson stated he may commit to doing more. There are some exceptions that can be worked through.

Mr. Hinson thanked Mr. Crane for the invitation to attend the meeting and for his assistance in helping him to navigate this process. Chair Johnson expressed to Mr. Hinson his appreciation for attending the meeting and looked forward to hearing more.

Prestwick Development Update

Mr. Crane advised the project appeared to somewhat up in the air based on how the development world is looking currently and pricing for materials, especially lumber, that may push the project back a year to 2022.

Conversations are still ongoing but lumber is 400% more of what it was. The North Carolina Housing Finance Agency is the main funding mechanism that was going to be used by Prestwick to acquire the low-income housing tax credits, but the North Carolina Housing Finance Agency has not committed to any new projects for this funding cycle. Across the country housing finance agencies have not been awarded new credits to new projects. The credits that were meant for this year are for projects that were awarded last year. Staff is expecting North Carolina to also do that. Meaning even if applied for, the state agency would not be providing funds. The developer is still engaged and committed to the area.

Phillip Lombardy

Mr. Crane shared a map and aerial views indicating the Phillip Lombardy Redevelopment area to display where the Commission owned land was located. There is an interested developer looking at the site as a 2022 low-income housing tax credit deal for approximately 180 multi-family units. If the Commissioners want to put multi-family housing on that site, it will require rezoning. The developer has not met with the community but is aware of the proposal. Mr. Crane stated the developer has implied if the Redevelopment Commission could initiate the rezoning and the community was okay with the rezoning, it would benefit the developer that the City initiate the rezoning. Historically, the Redevelopment Commission asks the developer to facilitate that. If there is a good reason and the Commission can understand why and makes the deal work, Redevelopment will listen. Mr. Crane wanted the Commissioners to be aware there may be a request that if the Commissioners see the project as a multi-family Redevelopment area, and the community is good with it, where that rezoning will be initiated from. Those are conversations being developed. Mr. Crane will be attending the community meeting in August and will obtain more detail.

In terms of the developer and quality of work, it is very impressive. Their information has been sent to the community folks who were impressed. In general, the community is supportive of development, understands the need for it, and always knew that Redevelopment Commission would try to develop there. There is an operating urban farm on the property who has asked Redevelopment to find them another location. The lease currently goes through to January 2022 and are hopeful to be located somewhere else. Mr. Crane advised he was in the process of attempting to find a suitable location for them. Troy Collins, Director of Acquisitions, Adirondack Company Development and Director of Business Development, Mayfair Management Group, advised of the plan and approach for a development to be presented to the community that everyone will be proud of which has support from Councilwoman Wells for the development.

5. Additional Business

Mr. Crane stated as a result of conversations with Ms. Turner, both agreed due to Covid and not being able to meet as a group, it would be nice to connect in a more informal way. Mr. Crane stated he thought he would hold a Zoom meeting 12:00 to 1:00 pm Commissioner lunch so Commissioners could informally chat with each other and get to know each other on a more informal basis. Ms. Turner felt it was imperative the Commissioners get to know each other as this is a very diverse Commission and could possibly enhance each other's skills and discover what the commonality is. Holistically the Commissioners should be on one accord when addressing endeavors from other people.

Chair Johnson supported something that would work for everyone's schedule. Chair Johnson inquired of Ms. Harrell if the Commissioners would be able to meet informally as a group or would it be considered a meeting if the entire Commission meets; was there flexibility to have non-agenda items and social interaction outside of the meeting. Ms. Harrell responded it would depend. If the Commissioner could meet with 100% certainty there would be not a single thing discussed having to do with Redevelopment and the City of Greensboro, they could get together and not tell anybody. When City Council members gather as a group, they announce it as a meeting to give notice to the public that information may come up. Ms. Harrell advised her advice would be to notice it as a meeting, even though redevelopment may not be discussed.

Chair Johnson asked if Ms. Harrell would be able to walk them through the process of formalities. Ms. Harrell advised she would assist. Ms. Turner asked if that meeting would be in lieu of the actual meeting. And did the Commissioners have a certain amount of time to meet per month without eliminating the monthly meeting. Ms. Harrell responded there is nothing in the statute or ordinance that says you can only meet 12 times a year or whatever the case may be. Mr. Crane stated it would not be in lieu of the regular meeting, it would be informal. Ms. Harrell stated if there was no business on the agenda, the regular meeting could be cancelled and do something else. It would be best to have a regular meeting to discuss business and do an informal meet and greet to bond.

Ms. Arkin advised she was the staff to this Commission for many years. pre-Covid, there would be at least one retreat each year to actually discuss the concepts behind the work the Commission does, more than the projects worked on. Ms. Harrell could help figure out what legal pieces need to be done. The meetings would be noted and advising people it was a work session. There is precedent for doing that. Ms. Arkin admired the energy this Commission has put in in this very weird year and stated the Commissioners needed to know staff appreciated all of them very much.

Chair Johnson stated there has been talk recently in looking at what the City Council is doing, what other City Commissioners are doing in terms of virtual Zoom meetings versus in person meetings. Chair Johnson felt it would be timely over the next month or so to have the Commissioners feelings or thoughts on if the Zoom meetings continue or meet in person. Chair Johnson felt it would be timely at some point to have that discussion amongst the Commissioners, especially since there is a discussion about getting together because there are no in-person meetings. It becomes at what point there needs to be a discussion regarding getting back to in-person meetings. It did not to be a discussion at this meeting, but to be thinking about that.

Mr. Crane stated from a staff standpoint, they will do whatever is the discretion of the Commissioners for a hybrid scenario or stay virtual, staff is happy to accommodate. Mr. Crane advised he was comfortable doing virtual meetings or whatever the Commission would like. This item did not need to be voted at this meeting.

Mr. Heberle stated he was comfortable doing it either way. The efficiencies here for the normal business meetings might still be beneficial to the Commission. Travel time can make things more difficult for work. Regarding the proposition of getting to know each other better on a more personal level, Mr. Heberle appreciated the offer and was a great first step. Mr. Heberle would like where you can shake a hand and look everyone in the eye and be more natural in trying to get to know each other. If the decision was made to stay virtual for the regular business meetings, he was not opposed. Ms. Murphy agreed with Mr. Heberle. In Zoom, Ms. Murphy felt she was always interrupting someone and did not know when to talk. As far as getting to know each other, Ms. Murphy would like in person meetings. The regular meetings are fine on Zoom.

Chair Johnson stated he felt the Commission has been very efficient with the Zoom meetings and thanked Mr. Crane, Mr. Clegg, Mr. Colón, Ms. Harrell, Ms. Arkin and the whole team. There is efficiency in this particular kind of meeting that does not over complicate the general Zoom meetings. Chair Johnson asked if there was anything that could be tied to an outdoor type setting such as the tiny houses trip or tied to an opportunity to interact. Mr. Crane stated he will be thinking of options to be able to show some scenarios that would lend itself to that.

Ms. Turner stated Zoom has become the new normal and was good with whatever was decided. Ms. Turner asked about Tiny Homes. Mr. Crane advised it was tour by the Commissioners for a site visit pre-Covid to looking at the tiny homes development. Ms. Turner asked if that could be re-visited. Ms. Turner felt it was imperative to re-visit that for the betterment of what Commissioners do. Mr. Crane stated that may be a potential for an informal get together and will work on some ideas to pose and provide the Commissioners with options that are not Zoom oriented.

6. Adjournment

Chair Johnson thanked everyone for attending the meeting. A motion was made to adjourn the meeting by Ms. Murphy; seconded by Ms. Turner. The Commission voted 5-0. (Chair Johnson, Vice Chair Adams, Ms. Turner, Ms. Murphy, and Mr. Heberle. Nays: 0).

The meeting adjourned at 6:02 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Sue Schwartz, Director

SS/cs

**REGULAR MEETING OF THE
REDEVELOPMENT COMMISSION
AUGUST 4, 2021**

The Regular Meeting of the Redevelopment Commission of Greensboro (RCG) was held on Wednesday, August 4, 2021, via Zoom satellite. The following members were present: Chair Patrick Johnson, Vice Chair Adams, Ms. Murphy, and Mr. Heberle. Staff present was Hart Crane, José Colón, and Russ Clegg, Planning Department. Chuck Watts, City Attorney, and Andrea Harrell, Assistant City Attorney, Counsel for the Commission. Absent Commission Members: Pamela Turner.

Chair Johnson called the meeting to order at 5:03 pm and thanked everyone for attending the meeting. Mr. Crane identified those attending the meeting and presented the agenda. Mr. Crane advised that the City Attorney had requested a vote to move #7 to up after the minutes, due to scheduling constraints. Mr. Crane advised anyone who was not a part of the Commission or the City Attorney's office would be excluded from the closed session portion of the meeting.

Approval of Meeting Minutes (Approved)

a) April 7, 2021 Regular Meeting

Mr. Heberle made a motion to approve the regular meeting minutes of July 7, 2021, as presented. Seconded by Vice Chair Adams. The Commission voted 3-0. (Chair Johnson, Vice Chair Adams, and Mr. Heberle. Nays: 0). Mr. Crane advised the City Attorney had requested a vote to move #7 to up after the minutes, due to scheduling constraints. Mr. Crane advised anyone who was not a part of the Commission or the City Attorney's office would not be a part of that portion of the meeting.

Mr. Heberle made a motion to move Item 7, Closed Session, to Item #2 on this meeting's agenda. Seconded by Vice Chair Adams. The Commission voted 3-0. (Chair Johnson, Vice Chair Adams, and Mr. Heberle. Nays: 0).

2. Closed Session (at 5:03 p.m.)

Mr. Heberle moved that the Commission go into closed session pursuant to N.C.G.S 143-318.11(a) (4), to discuss matters relating to the location or expansion of business in the area served by this body and pursuant to N.C.G.S 143-318.110(a) (3) in order to preserve its attorney/client privilege in consultation 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 5882, 19 CVS 5883 and 20 CVS 6035; and to give instructions in the handling or settlement of the claims made against the Commission therein. Seconded by Vice Chair Adams. The Commission voted 3-0. (Chair Johnson, Vice Chair Adams, and Mr. Heberle. Nays: 0).

Regular session resumed at 5:32 p.m.

3. Temporary Use Agreement for 734 S. Elm Street.

Mr. Crane advised the temporary use agreement is for a local vendor to host an event on August 14 and will be in two parts. Mr. Crane advised from a staff perspective this was an opportunity to activate some Redevelopment space in the interim until it is developed, an effort to be a good community partner, and be flexible with the land. Mr. Crane advised this was an action item. If the agreement is approved, it would need to be signed. Mr. McLean has signed a waiver of liability for the event. Mr. Crane introduced Kevin McLean to provide details regarding the event.

Kevin McLean, stated his company, Hot Dog Central of Greensboro has been in business for approximately 2 months and was in planning for 3 years. Mr. McLean had been a Store Manager for the Walmart Corporation at

both locations in High Point for 18 years, retired from Walmart in 2020 to concentrate on his dreams, his aspirations, and provide care for his elderly parents. A drive was planned to obtain sponsorship to build up school supplies. Mr. McLean partnered with K&F Car Detailing who helps minority small businesses. While waiting on car repairs, a discussion ensued that resulted in the owner's decision to participate in the drive. Mr. McLean reached out to his connections at Walmart who also volunteered assistance. There have been car clubs and social clubs who expressed interest to use their name and social media influence to help out in the community. The New Zion Missionary Baptist Church was also onboard to assist. The goal was to have at least 100 book bags filled with school supplies. A give away will be done to connect with children in the community. When there are large families, it is hard to provide school supplies for all of them and there are single parents struggling to provide supplies for their children. Mr. McLean had reached out to Mr. Crane to inquire on the use of this lot for the back to school drive. This site will be large enough to hold it and have some type of visibility.

Mr. Crane provided the itinerary and agreement of the event. The agreement allows Hot Dog Center of Greensboro to set it up on the day for one set time of 10:00 a.m. to 11:00 p.m. on the contract. Language may be added regarding Covid protection before being signed and in place. Mr. Crane inquired if there were questions or concerns about the agreement itself.

Mr. Heberle asked if the waiving of liability was on the part of the Commission and if all the COIs were covered and things like that. Mr. Crane responded they were. Mr. Heberle stated it sounded like a great event, loved the combination and all the things being pulled into it that sounded very exciting. Chair Johnson agreed with Mr. Heberle. Chair Johnson stated the Covid concern should be focused on complying with anything the City has in place. Chair Johnson asked Mr. McLean if the bookbags were intended to be donated during the 3- or 4-hour period to where they were intended to go, or would they would be dropped off. Mr. McLean responded they will go ahead and start putting out on social media that bookbags will be available with supplies. From 2:00 p.m. to 5:00 p.m., some of the smaller vendors would be there, some free give aways will be done, and pickup of the bookbags and supplies will occur during that time period.

Mr. Crane noted that Commissioner Murphy had joined the meeting in progress during the presentation.

Chair Johnson requested a motion. Mr. Heberle moved that the Commission approve the temporary use agreement as presented, subject to further negotiation by City staff. Seconded by Vice Chair Adams. The Commission voted 4-0. (Chair Johnson, Vice Chair Adams, Ms. Murphy, and Mr. Heberle. Nays: 0).

4. Development Proposal for 400 E. Bragg Street and 500 MLK Jr. Drive

Mr. Crane reintroduced, Ishmael Hinson of Hinson Realty. Mr. Hinson has purchased one parcel through a private sale that is adjacent to a Redevelopment Commission owned lot that he is also interested in purchasing. A picture was displayed indicating the property the Commission owns. Another parcel was shown indicating the Community Garden and 500 MLK Jr. Drive was the small right of way. Mr. Hinson will be presenting a proposal for development of the lots and the general concept of the corner once it is built out. The Ole Asheboro Redevelopment area was depicted. The shaded area was the full Redevelopment area. Mr. Crane advised Mr. Hinson and Sharon Graeber will be speaking. Mr. Crane advised this was not an action item. The Commission will have an opportunity to provide input on the concept and vision. The presentation will be informational and an opportunity for major questions or concerns.

Mr. Hinson introduced Sharon Graeber who will be presenting the concept.

Sharon Graeber, architect, and contractor with C2 Contractors, LLC. Ms. Graeber advised Mr. Hinson has purchased the property located at 504 MLK Drive which fronts along Bragg Street and provides access to the Greenway through a private sale. On 400 E Bragg, the property the Commission owns, Mr. Hinson is proposing a twinhome project with 2 units of housing space. Drawings were shown to the Commissioners depicting a two-story twin home with the character of Ole Asheboro craftsman architectural style. One driveway would be directly accessible to Bragg Street. The second unit would be accessible to Bellevue Street. Elevations of the building were shown. A wrap around deck will be added to proposed coffee shop at 504 MLK Jr. Dr. and front on Bragg Street

with outdoor seating, bike racks, and a connector to the sidewalk that crosses the street. Twinhomes were depicted on the corner of Bragg and Bellevue. Mr. Hinson stated any feedback would be appreciated.

Chair Johnson thanked both Mr. Hinson and Ms. Graeber for the presentation. Chair Johnson asked if there have been preliminary discussions with neighbors in the surrounding areas. Mr. Crane responded the closest neighborhood is across the street. Mr. Hinson submitted a letter to the Ole Asheboro Street Neighborhood Association introducing himself and provided the concept of the homes. The Association was very amenable and excited about the redevelopment of this particular property which will add an entryway into the corridor. Mr. Hinson has engaged with other stakeholders and partners in the area outside of the Neighborhood Association. It is a Covid world and hard to have meetings, but staff is looking for more opportunities to connect Mr. Hinson with. Mr. Hinson advised Mac Sims of East Greensboro Now has been very helpful in connecting the dots and ensuring people in the community can contribute thoughts and ideas on projects. Everything thus far has been positive.

Mac Sims, thanked everyone for their support. The Greenway will be going through Ole Asheboro and will better connect the neighborhood. Mr. Sims advised he has spoken with the Greenway Committee who are very excited about the connection. The connection will enhance the Greenway and bring more people to the community. In looking for development in East Greensboro, this is a key component of that. Mr. Sims commended Mr. Hinson for having an amazing team and making this project work. The architect and general contractor understand and appreciate the quality that is being placed in the MLK area and the Greenway. If redevelopment property could be used, they will work with Redevelopment. Mr. Sims asked the Commissioners to provide their full support.

Councilwoman Sharon Hightower, stated the residential area was nice and asked if adding the coffee shop would require any rezoning or would it be a fit. Ms. Graeber responded eating establishments without drive-throughs, are permitted use in the CM (Commercial-Medium) district. According to the City's own zoning requirements, both uses proposed for 504 MLK are permitted. Mr. Crane added both of the sites are zoned Commercial-Medium currently and both uses shown were within that zoning. Mr. Crane inquired if there were additional questions for Mr. Hinson or Ms. Graeber. Ms. Graeber stated her appreciation in being allowed to present their project and looked forward to working with the City of Greensboro to make this a reality.

Chair Johnson thanked everyone for being present. Chair Johnson inquired if any of the Commissioners had questions or comments. Mr. Crane stated the concept presented is what staff will work toward having an agreement at one of the upcoming meetings. Staff and the developers will be working toward a Sales Development Agreement outlining all of the things the developer would be responsible for before the property is conveyed to them. If there are questions that occur in the meantime, Mr. Hinson or Ms. Graeber will be happy to answer those. Mr. Crane advised this was not an action item.

5. FY 20-21 Redevelopment Commission Annual Report.

Mr. Crane stated the report lists out what activities were done, property inventory maintained, and expectations for the next fiscal year. The report can be amended but has to be specifically approved by the Commission. This year in addition to the report, there is a property portfolio. Mr. Crane requested to have feedback on whether the portfolio was a helpful tool in going forward. Mr. Crane inquired if there was discussion or comments on the annual report.

Chair Johnson stated he appreciated the extra effort put into the portfolio and felt the portfolio was extremely helpful and valuable. Chair Johnson asked if the idea would be the portfolio would be incorporated into next year's annual report or would it always be somewhat of ancillary document to assist the annual report and day to day, month to month. Mr. Crane responded in terms of the annual report, it would not within the report itself but something to be updated and kept up to date at the time the annual report is presented. It would be an appendix to it. Mr. Crane and Mr. Colón field many phone calls regarding these properties and typically answer a lot of the same questions. There is not something that can be produced quickly visibly or electronically that puts everything holistically and answers a lot of those questions. Mr. Crane felt the Commission and staff could use these "one-sheets" as marketing tools. There are also online tools that the City has access to that could be utilized better. Discussions are ongoing regarding doing MLS listings for the Commission's properties. This portfolio may help with the information that would be

within that document. The idea is to be more outward facing and make Redevelopment's property inventory more visible to the public and be able to eventually dispose more land. Mr. Crane advised the portfolio is not within the actual annual report and would be a satellite to it. Mr. Crane asked if there were any other thoughts or comments from the Commissioners. Hearing none, Mr. Crane advised a motion for approval was requested.

Mr. Heberle moved to approve the FY 20-21 Redevelopment Commission Annual Report. Seconded by Ms. Murphy. The Commission voted 4-0. (Chair Johnson, Vice Chair Adams, Ms. Murphy, and Mr. Heberle). Chair Johnson inquired if the spreadsheet would be continued. Chair Johnson felt was more beneficial. Mr. Crane responded the spreadsheet will be continued but are trying to find ways for it to be more aesthetically pleasing and user friendly.

6. Redevelopment Commission Team Lunch & Site visits.

Mr. Crane stated the format that would probably work best would be to have a meeting location so staff can have lunch for the Commissioners and go as a group to some of the sites. In the packet there was a memorandum laying out times based on Ms. Murphy's comments at the last meeting that Friday's lunch would be her only potential time. It was decided Mr. Crane will send a "doodle poll" to the Commissioners to determine dates in the August, September, and early October that would work for everyone to meet for a luncheon.

7. Staff Updates

a.) Willow Oaks

Mr. Colón stated three Redevelopment Commission lots were sold to True Homes and a lot sold by the City of Greensboro managed by the City's Engineering Department as a package sale. Currently four single family homes are under construction. Closing on the properties occurred in November 2020 and the homes should be completed by this year. House 1 was depicted on the screen that is almost complete and the foundations are being worked on for Houses 3 and 4.

Chair Johnson asked if True Homes was in partnership with the NC A&T construction program. Mr. Colón responded that was correct. True Homes has a partnership with the Construction Management Department at A&T. They work with their students to acquire onsite experience for residential construction. A lot of students were focusing on other areas of construction that was not residential. This was a way to have them experience onsite practice that is near to the college. The program was elevated by having a down payment assistance program for local heroes. Local Heroes are described as front-line workers. Nurses and teachers will be occupying these homes.

A map of the Willow Oaks Redevelopment Area was shown, depicting four homes previously mentioned on the western side of US 29. Mr. Colón referred to zones that will be discussed in the future. Willow Oaks is Zone A, the center core of Willow Oaks that is almost completely built out. Zones B and E are approximately 60% built out. There are several vacant parcels owned mostly by Greensboro Housing Development Partnership. Blue dots depicted on a slide indicated Redevelopment Commission owned lots. Larger lots are prime for attached housing or potential multi-family development. Staff is focusing on development with GHDP approved builders on those areas first. Zone C is the face of Willow Oaks and starting to open up for development. Zone E along US 29 and Gillespie Street, and is saved for later development. Staff is concentrating on developing Zones B and E as much as possible before moving west. GHDP works on behalf of the Commission to dispose and develop residential lots within many redevelopment areas. Most of their inventory is in the Willow Oaks Redevelopment area. True Homes was approved as a builder within this area of Willow Oaks. Mr. Colón felt the project along McConnell Road helped to build True Homes' case and will hopefully raise appraisal values for the area. Staff is very excited to True Homes being on board and is working with True Homes for lot reservations. True Homes goal is to build 10 homes a year. Habitat Greensboro was the first approved builder. Six lots were closed with Habitat Greensboro. Currently there are five homes under construction, and one purchased. Foundation Home Builders purchased their first lot on 206 Spencer Street and have four other lots reserved. Staff is working with Pinnacle Financial Partners who are interested in purchasing and developing 10 single-family lots in Zone C. There are four approved builders.

Chair Johnson asked if there had been any discussion continuing the lot program for the A&T construction program. Mr. Colón stated that was why builders are being brought to Willow Oaks. The lots on McConnell were a start of that program. It was always intended for a long-term relationship with the City. As they came back, they were interested in Redevelopment Commission owned lots for single-family construction and it was only natural to recommend Greensboro Housing Development Partnership properties. Inventory was provided for RCG and GHDP properties. The Willow Oaks lots were specifically selected because of the proximity to A&T. Chair Johnson asked if it was fair to say it would be a continuous program. Mr. Colón responded that was correct. Chair Johnson inquired if there were any further questions.

Mr. Colón showed pictures of the development and how far in the process building was. There are 9 residential lots being constructed currently. Mr. Colón showed the initiatives and community engagement that staff was working on in Willow Oaks. Staff is partnering with the Willow Oaks Neighborhood Association to create “Second Saturday” events. The events would be outdoors and are meant to compliment the Grove Market which is the Redevelopment approved farmers market with the Guilford Urban Farming Initiative. The events will be near the market and is an opportunity to obtain input from the community residents for the park/open market and have them engage. There will be food, music, and games. Because of Covid, there will be social distancing, masks and gloves will be available.

Mr. Heberle asked if Farming Initiative had dropped their request to modify their contract for vaccinations. Mr. Colón responded Ms. Seiber did not return with the request and Mr. Colón did not have any updates on that. Mr. Colón will keep the Commissioners updated and everyone will receive the flyer and hoped everyone would come to the event. Mr. Crane advised it was on the same date as the Hot Dog event.

8. Additional Business

Councilwoman Hightower stated Mr. Colón provided great updates on items moving forward and the Willow Oaks area. Councilwoman Hightower stated the redevelopment process is slow. Councilwoman Hightower has brought other developers to the table to build in these areas, who are minority builders interested in helping to revitalize. It appears they have to jump through a lot of hoops. Councilwoman Hightower stated there are lots that Redevelopment has had for some time and did not understand why they have been held for so long. It can be very discouraging to a neighborhood to have properties that are just sitting undeveloped for years. Councilwoman Hightower was hopeful there will be innovative ways to help move the process along. With Redevelopment’s progressive thinking, there should be a transition in these communities to become thriving neighborhoods.

Chair Johnson thanked Councilwoman Hightower for her comments and requested any ideas she may have to share them with the Commission. Mr. Crane echoed Chair Johnson comments. The Commission is always looking at ways to improve processes and make it better for developers to get through as quickly as possible. Staff is actively looking at ways to move the process quicker.

Chair Johnson referred to the previous meeting in July regarding thoughts on continuing Zoom meetings, and proposed the Commission continue Zoom meetings, and to readdress the meeting format on a quarterly basis. Ms. Murphy stated the Zoom meetings were fine. Mr. Crane stated it will be an item for the next meeting.

Ms. Turner joined the meeting in progress and apologized for her lateness.

6. Adjournment

Chair Johnson thanked everyone for attending the meeting. A motion was made to adjourn the meeting by Ms. Murphy; seconded by Ms. Heberle. The Commission voted 5-0. (Chair Johnson, Vice Chair Adams, Ms. Turner, Ms. Murphy, and Mr. Heberle. Nays: 0).

The meeting adjourned at 6:32 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Sue Schwartz, Director
SS/cs

**REGULAR MEETING OF THE
REDEVELOPMENT COMMISSION**

September 1, 2021

The Regular Meeting of the Redevelopment Commission of Greensboro (RCG) was held on Wednesday, September 1, 2021, via Zoom satellite. The following members were present: Chair Patrick Johnson, Vice Chair Adams, Ms. Murphy, Ms. Turner, and Mr. Heberle. Councilwoman Nancy Hoffmann and Councilwoman Sharon Hightower were also present. Staff present was Hart Crane, and Russ Clegg, Planning Department. Sue Schwarz, Planning Director, and Andrea Harrell, Assistant City Attorney, Counsel for the Commission.

Chair Johnson called the meeting to order at 5:03 pm and thanked everyone for attending the meeting. Mr. Crane identified those attending the meeting and presented the agenda.

Approval of Meeting Minutes (Approved)

a) August 4, 2021 Regular Meeting

Ms. Turner made a motion to approve the regular meeting minutes of August 4, 2021, as presented. Seconded by Vice Chair Adams. The Commission voted 5-0. (Chair Johnson, Vice Chair Adams, Ms. Turner, Ms. Murphy, and Mr. Heberle. Nays: 0).

2. South Elm Sales Development Agreement – Assignment Request

Mr. Clegg provided background on the assignment request. Jeff and Bryan Cagan will speak regarding their projects and Bob Chapman was also present to answer any questions.

A map of the South Elm Redevelopment area was shown depicting Gate City Boulevard north, east was Arlington Street, and south was Bragg Street. This site wraps around Union Square Campus. The Redevelopment Commission is being asked by the parties involved to approve the assignment of the current Sales Development Agreement. The current parties are; Redevelopment Commission, South Elm Development Group, as the master developer, Rea South Elm as a component developer, composed of SEDG and Rea Ventures. The new component developer is NC Triad Associates, comprised of SEDG and Cagan Management. Mr. Clegg advised the Sales Development Agreement was signed in May of 2021, under the auspices of the Master Development Agreement RCG had with the South Elm Development Group. The sales agreement includes the terms of what needs to be done prior to the sale of the property and how that sale would take place. In addition, basic information about the building program is included. All of the elements with the Sales Development Agreement will be the same. The assignment of the agreement is outlined in Section 9.1, and states the parties can assign to another party with the approval of the Redevelopment Commission. Due to construction costs, Rea reevaluated all of their projects and made a decision to not continue in this project. Rea Ventures enjoyed working with everyone associated with the agreement, but this project did not make sense for them to move forward. At the same time, Cagan Management was interested in moving into North Carolina and talked with SEDG. Cagan Management became part of the agreement and stepped in where Rea Ventures had been working. There are other governing documents associated with this request that will still be in place; MWBE Plan, with a commitment of 20%, 85% being MBE participation. The Design Guidelines, the Green Development and all other pieces will stay in place. Mr. Clegg stated this still moves the Commission toward fulfilling the Redevelopment Plan that was passed and staff continues to work towards. A slide was depicted indicating the City Council presentation stating the Commission remains committed and SEDG remains committed under the Master Development Plan. More is staying the same then is changing with this assignment. Mr. Clegg introduced Jeff and Bryan Cagan of Cagan Management.

Bryan Cagan, stated Cagan Management is interested in this project. Mr. Chapman and Jeff Cagan have had a relation for nearly 30 years. Slides of projects were shown depicting the type of apartment homes Cagan Management develops with wide range of rents and a mix of housing types. Highlights were shown depicting more recent projects geared toward the project proposed on South Elm. High density urban infill developments were shown with HUD components and affordable components. Suburban mid-rise properties were depicted indicating recent designs. Garden style community housing was shown depicting the work of Cagan Management. Cagan Management is a family business born out of a managed property management business that has expertise and experience in developing projects focused on the middle market providing apartment homes. Cagan Management are not merchant developers, but are long term home builders. Cagan is not a traditional developer, but are real estate investors in it for the long run. Cagan Management manages nearly 12,000 properties in the southeast and Midwest. Cagan Management is self-funded and has the ability to invest in projects and see those projects come to fruition.

Mr. Jeff Cagan, stated Cagan Management still owns and manages added every project before his son joined, with some of the projects being 20 plus years. Cagan Management develops and invests in their project and is in it for the long term.

Chair Johnson stated appreciation for the presentation. Chair Johnson asked if they could touch on any preliminary thoughts on this project. Jeff Cagan responded it is Cagan's desire to rethink the plans. Cagan felt in today's market with Covid, the world has changed and felt some units and bedrooms in the current plans were small and felt they should be larger units with larger bedrooms. In today's climate, people are spending more time at home and need more space. Cagan Management plans to go ahead and meet with the architects soon to revise the plans and which may result in a lower total unit count. The facade of the development should not change much, as Cagane felt they looked great, but that there need to be more spacious units.

Sue Schwartz, Planning Director, clarified that this is not starting from scratch. It will be the same idea of multi-family and how they are put together. The idea of the mixed size and fitting it together needs to be a fresh look. There will not be a whole different development plan. It is about shifts and adjustments into the units and possibly some formatting of the units, parking, and orientation to update and refresh in this ever-changing market.

Chair Johnson thanked both the Cagans and Ms. Schwartz for their input and clarification to the Commissioners. Chair Johnson inquired if there was a possibility of a HUD component or a tax credit. Brian Cagan responded specific to "true" tax credits, such as Section 42 or something along those lines, Cagan Management does not have experience in that development space. There are developers who are, but it is not something Cagan Management would be looking at for this type of project. Cagan Management is exploring HUD financing which people associate with a type of credit or subsidiary, but would still be market rate development and financing. Cagan Management, at this point in time, are looking for what they consider the true federal tax credits for this project.

Chair Johnson inquired if Mr. Clegg and Mr. Crane could refresh his memory regarding an affordable component built into the agreement. Mr. Clegg responded there was a percentage that was to be affordable at 80% of the area medium income. Chair Johnson asked if that would still stay within the parameters going forward or was it unknown at this time. Mr. Clegg responded it was currently part of the agreement. If there were any major changes to the agreement, it would go back to the Commission. It is Cagan Management's goal to keep the same requirements. Cagane went on to explain talking about the unit mix changing, no one would have a different rent because they're within the 80% or in a worse unit. The component will still be there Mr. Bryan Cagan stated Covid has definitely created new living situations. What has been discussed with the City, Cagan Management does not develop for trends because they are a long term. Cagan Management always attempts to step away from shorter term trends. In looking at this project, Cagan is looking at market, costs, and building techniques today. There has been a big focus on design, layouts and function. Ultimately Cagan Management's goal is to be aligned with the City and this project to be successful for many years.

Chair Johnson inquired if other Commissioners had questions for Cagan Management. Ms. Turner, stated any increase in living area would be a plus. Space is important, not only due to Covid, but also brings quality. Ms. Turner thanked the Cagans for thinking outside of the box. Mr. Heberle felt this contract was approved in the past and felt confident in assigning this entity coming in and abiding by the original terms of the agreement.

Councilwoman Sharon Hightower stated the project initially, as presented to Council, was one way and asked if this project would go back to Council. Designs are being changed, unit totals may change, size may be increased and stated the affordable piece still needs to be incorporated in this project. Councilwoman Hightower asked where was the community engagement. There was a large issue around community input and exceptions of the project along these lines. This sounded like there will be significant changes and asked how will they be addressed.

Mr. Clegg responded the assignment of the component developer, the South Elm Development Group, is still in this as the master developer. The component developer is changing and does not need to go to City Council because City Council was not a part of that agreement. If there are changes to the building program such as design changes or changes to other elements included in that, it would have to go back to City Council, depending on the level of change. Mr. Clegg stated staff is committed to community engagement as this project moves forward and conversations about what the project will really will look like.

Councilwoman Hightower stated Mr. Clegg answered the question on the surface, but was looking for substance. Councilwoman Hightower felt everyone as council members would have concerns about a component developer that is changing. It was predicated upon SEDG having a component developer with designs. Councilwoman Hightower stated out of the 250 units, 20% was slated for affordable to have the mix type of use discussed and promoting for a better integrated community. Councilwoman Hightower felt everyone needs to be educated upon what changes are actually happening and how it would impact. Councilwoman Hightower felt City Council should hear this. Whether Council votes on approving a developer, the designs and models are changing. City Council is not aware of that and would not be adequately equipped to respond to the public to answer questions, this would need to go back to know how this project would be developed. Whether it ends up in fewer units or more units or bigger units. All of that appears to be indefinite at this point. The developers need the time necessary to slightly redesign the project. Councilwoman Hoffmann was interested in how much time that may require.

Sue Schwartz inquired if the Cagans heard the question on what kind of time did they feel they would need in reassessing and determining numbers in terms of additional time to this project. Jeff Cagan responded he was not able to provide an exact answer as it could take months. This is still a world of Covid, meeting and dealing with people and certain things could take some time. Cagan Management is very particular. Mr. Cagan understood the issues brought up by the Commissioners. Mr. Cagan stated they are not new to this type of project. Their properties have always done a good job of treating everyone fairly. Their certifications speak for Cagan Management. The goal is not to change a project at all. It may go from 250 units to 240 units, but will still be kept at the 20% affordable component. In today's world, it would not be prudent for Cagan Management to not look at the whole project and revisit it and perhaps make changes or no changes. Cagan Management felt they needed to make some changes in relation to sizes of bedrooms and kitchens. People today want to have more room in their unit. Cagan Management does not want to lose any units in this process as it would cause Cagan Management to lose money, but there are still parking considerations. The goal is for the units to be similar in size. The plan is not being criticized but Cagan wants to tweak inside the units based on what they feel has changed in the market in the past few years, and make it a better project long term.

Chair Johnson asked if this would be operating the existing agreement with the Cagans and SEDG in place of the old Rea entity. Ms. Harrell, City Attorney, responded it is only an assignment of the agreement that is already in place. There has to be approval by the Commission to do that. Any further modifications of development agreements or anything that would require an RFP, would go through the normal channels. This only allows Cagan Management to step in the component developer slot moving forward. Chair Johnson thought there was

some discretion in terms of the plans so it would enable the Redevelopment Commission to have additional discussions as needed once the developer had the opportunity to figure things out and asked if that was a fair thought process. Ms. Harrell responded it was.

Ms. Schwartz stated in assigning this to Cagan Management, the project continues to move. Any significant changes, anything after Cagan comes back, requires those conversations. This is keeping the progress going but not signing off on them changing anything and would need to come to the Redevelopment Commission. If it is significant enough, it would have to be modified before Council. There does need to be a summary piece of information together after this meeting to make Council aware of what is happening, what the touch points are, and perhaps public input along the way. There is an agreement with SEDG, this is a component of that agreement with SEDG. The reason for the assignment being put in the agreement was because these types of things happen in development. Sometimes there has to be a switch to keep it moving because something happened. Anything beyond that regarding significant changes or numbers changing requires conversations. This will not be the last time Redevelopment Commission will see the Cagans involved. They will be checking in periodically as they work through their assessment and talk about their ideas. The component of ensuring the community and City Council are informed does not stop.

Chair Johnson inquired if there were additional questions or discussion from anyone. Councilwoman Hoffmann stated she was glad Cagan was able to come in and pick the ball up. Chair Johnson asked if the Commissioners did not approve this request, the momentum stops on this project and back to the drawing board. Mr. Clegg responded REA, for reasons of their own, not associated with Greensboro or their working relationship with the Redevelopment Commission or SEDG, decided to not participate at this point in time. Given the state of the agreement, it makes sense to move forward.

Chair Johnson thanked Jeff and Bryan Cagan for being present and providing a background to help the Commission become comfortable with the reassignment being voted on at this meeting. Chair Johnson inquired if any other Commissioners had comments. Having no further comments, Chair Johnson requested a motion be made. Mr. Heberle made a motion to vote the Redevelopment Commission approve the assignment of the component developer agreement from Rea, South Elm to NC Triad Associates. Seconded by Ms. Turner. The Commission voted 5-0. (Chair Johnson, Vice Chair Adams, Ms. Turner, Ms. Murphy, and Mr. Heberle. Nays: 0).

3. Request for a Letter of Support for the Rezoning of Phillips Lombardy Properties

Mr. Crane advised a developer, Troy Collins of Adirondack, has been engaged with the Redevelopment Commission for a few months and interested in the Phillips Lombardy Redevelopment properties for some time. Mr. Crane advised this property is off of Phillips Avenue in northeast Greensboro and intersects at Lombardy Street and slightly at Barto Place. The current zoning for these lots is primarily residential for single-family use. The property has been vacant for a number of years. This was one of the first real development interests' staff has felt good about in a long period of time. The developer has had conversations both with the Neighborhood Leaders and the Council person for that district, Dr. Goldie Wells. The developer will be attending the Neighborhood meeting of this community to have a broader conversation on September 2, 2021, to gain additional support. The developer has always envisioned this project to be a 2022 timeline for low income housing tax credit deals. This is one of the major steps that the developer will have to achieve to get the site ready to develop during that timeline. Troy Collins was present, representing Adirondack, and will speak to the Commission regarding who they are and what they do, some conversations Mr. Collins has had, and what conversations are anticipated to be at the meeting for the next day and going forward.

Troy Collins introduced himself and advised Mr. Collins initially spoke with Dyan Arkin and Mr. Crane to learn more about the Redevelopment Commission and the opportunities that were available. Mr. Collins has been based out of Louisiana for the past 6 six years and provided his background development information that resulted in joining Adirondack Development more than a year ago and becoming an independent contractor working in-house as Director of Acquisitions and Director of Business Development for their affiliated management company. Mr. Collins advised Adirondack specializes in management development and construction of tax credit,

affordable housing projects that are 60% AMI primarily, and market rate housing occasionally. Adirondack Development feels it is their fiduciary duty to provide the need specific to a community determined by a market study and conversations. Mr. Collin stated Adirondack principles and real estate cycles go back 30 years and developed in Louisiana and North Carolina. The three essential principals teamed up in 2017 and acquired UAH Management, now HR Management Group in Dallas, Texas. Adirondack was formed in 2019, headquartered in New York City, NY. Mr. Collins works remotely in Louisiana and works throughout the gulf coast. Mr. Collins stated the Cagans own apartments in Lafayette, Louisiana and are good operators.

Mr. Crane advised the rezoning request will be from R-5 single-family residential zoning to multi-family zoning. Mr. Collins stated the initial community engagement with Councilwoman Goldie Wells who emphasized the need for high quality housing; 4% tax credit development is the focus of Adirondack. In some cases, it is 9%. This request would be a first deal for Adirondack in this calendar year in North Carolina. Adirondack spoke with the Greensboro Housing Authority to obtain their input and advice regarding housing and possible hurdles developers face. There was additional community engagement with Dr. Bob Davis of the Concerned Citizens Group of East Greensboro and they are very supportive of the project due to the demand for housing and in particular, affordable housing. Dr. Davis requested Adirondack to work with staff to ensure there would be enough time to relocate their garden.

Mr. Crane stated the conversations he has had with the community echo what Mr. Collins stated. There will be a broader conversation. The community has known the land that Redevelopment owns and maintains would be developed. In the interim, there was an operating lease agreement for the land to operate an urban farm currently existing on the property. Mr. Crane is committed to assist in looking for additional parcels that it could be moved to. In the short term, the lease for the land expires in January. Mr. Collins does not anticipate needing to get into the land until the better part of 2022. Staff expects to extend the lease for the first half of 2022 and will attempt to find another location. The Urban Farm is significant and is an amenity to the community. The Redevelopment Commission needs to be sensitive to that and be good partners. The community is generally supportive of housing but have concerns regarding their farm and how it will develop long term.

Chair Johnson asked who was anticipated to be present at the meeting on September 2nd. Mr. Crane responded the Concerned Citizens Group of East Greensboro is essentially the Neighborhood Association representing this area who meet on the first Thursday of every month. Mr. Collins and Mr. Crane will be attending the meeting to address concerns the broader community may have. Mr. Heberle asked if Redevelopment was being asked at this meeting to provide provisional support for the rezoning. Mr. Crane responded that was correct. Mr. Collins stated both Mr. Crane and himself are very transparent and have an open dialogue. With this site not being zoned and having the entitlement work done, in other cases Adirondack have asked for an administrative rezoning. The Commission or the City grant the zoning request or expand an existing zoning district to allow building under that use. Adirondack is very aware that Redevelopment needs to see more plans and information. Some of the biggest challenges are the pre-development expenses that Adirondack would have to bear throughout the tax credit process, apart from any entitlement work. Adirondack always requests to see if that would be an option as it would save Adirondack out of pocket expenses. The idea for administrative zoning takes time sharing information and building a relationship. It has not been a popular conversation topic, but some team members of Adirondack come from a corporate legal background and is apparently popular in some areas. Mr. Collins stated he has to sell projects to his senior leadership and receiving general support of the use and affordable housing would go a long way.

Chair Johnson stated from his perspective it would need to be conditioned on the meeting scheduled for the next day, in large part. Chair Johnson asked Mr. Collins if there was a timing consideration for the Commission to provide or approve a letter, even it is conditioned, at this meeting to expedite this project regarding Adirondack. Mr. Collins responded he did not feel there was a hurry. Adirondack only has a hurry and wait situation when there is a notice of funding availability with the state housing agency or a gap financing need.

Ms. Harrell, City Attorney, advised the Commission could make a condition on the meeting on 9/2/2021 and will help the Zoning Commission knowing that the Redevelopment Commission is concerned about the legal status. There are not specific parameters in what conditions could be placed on a letter of support. Mr. Heberle asked if a letter of support was like a letter of intent. Not legally binding but a demonstration of belief in the concept. Ms. Harrell responded that was exactly correct and would be presented to the Commission for consideration along with other specific conditions for that particular zoning classification submitted. It is ultimately up to the Zoning Commission on whether to rezone property.

Mr. Heberle stated if there no time pressure to have this done, waiting for the results of the meeting and hear more about the plan would be prudent to then be able to place specific language into the letter of support. Chair Johnson asked if it was possible to have the letter drafted for the next month's meeting to have it signed. Mr. Collins stated it is usually the funding availability that drives the process. Chair Johnson appreciated Mr. Collins bearing with the Commission in this process. Mr. Collins thanked everyone for their time and hopefully an affordable housing project to Greensboro.

4. Staff Updates

a.) Ole Asheboro

Mr. Crane advised Mr. Hinson is continuing to move along. The environmental review process for Section 108 has begun. The property was purchased with federal funds and additional approvals from the State Historic Preservation Office and conversations have begun. A brief productive meeting to determine what is needed for the approvals was done.

5. Additional Business

Chair Johnson advised the Commissioners and staff due to personal circumstances; this meeting was to be his last meeting as Commissioner and Chair of the Redevelopment Commission. Chair Johnson has to resign due to his family moving outside of the City of Greensboro. Working with Mr. Crane, Mr. Clegg, and Ms. Arkin, Mr. Colón, Ms. Schwartz, all of city staff and the team has been wonderful over the past few years and one of the highlights of his community involvements. It has been very rewarding in a lot of ways and hopefully he made some impact, although city staff makes so much more of an impact on a daily basis. Chair Johnson thanks Ms. Harrell for her assistance and support. Ms. Harrell thanked Chair Johnson for all of his work for the Commission and enjoyed working with him. Chair Johnson advised the Commissioners he was sorry to be leaving but for family reasons, this was the right choice, all things considered. Chair Johnson thanks Councilman Justin Outling for appointing him on the Redevelopment Commission. This has been a great opportunity and advised if he could be of assistance or answer questions or anything to please be in touch with him. Chair Johnson wished everyone Best Wishes going forward.

Mr. Crane stated he has thoroughly enjoyed working with Chair Johnson and felt he benefited from having him being patient and as his first Chair. Mr. Crane felt Chair Johnson thinks through items very well and asked good questions. The Commission will miss him greatly as the input provided by him was invaluable. Mr. Crane thanked Chair Johnson for his work with the Commission. Chair Johnson thanked all of the Commissioners and felt everyone was doing a fantastic job. Mr. Heberle echoed Mr. Crane's comments and felt Chair Johnson was a good guide in showing the Commissioners what to do. Mr. Heberle thanked Chair Johnson for his service and he would be missed. Chair Johnson responded that if he could ever answer any questions, he would be available. Being the most tenured member on the Commission at less than 3 years. Timing was tough but this was a great Commission and is in good hands with staff and other Commission members.

Mr. Crane stated in terms of what this means for the Commission moving forward, staff has been engaged with the City Clerk who is engaged with Council representatives. One that is present at this meeting. After the last meeting, there was an email from Commissioner Murphy who also resigned due to personal reasons. There are now two vacancies on the Commission. Mr. Crane was hopeful there will be replacements for their positions in October. If not, November. Staff will be leaning on the remaining, now senior, Commissioners. Mr. Crane stated

he was excited about this next chapter. Mr. Crane advised he had not forgotten about a site visit lunch as it will probably benefit the newer members to have that experience and to meet the Commissioners. The site lunch will be on hold for another month or so. Some of the dates previously indicated may still be viable for scheduling. Chair Johnson stated he hoped to actually meet all of the Commissioners even if retroactively. Chair Johnson valued working with all of the Commissioners and the virtual environment has been strange in so many ways and appreciated everyone's involvement during this process and staying committed to it. It has been a challenge with Covid and things. Chair Johnson sincerely hoped to have the opportunity to meet everyone at some point whether in an official capacity or not. This has been rewarding working with everyone. Commissioner Turner stated working with Chair Johnson was a pleasure who had a very unique and knowledgeable spirit, and looked forward to the day that everyone can meet. The spirit, knowledge, and professionalism has been greatly appreciated. Chair Johnson stated he hopes to live up to all the kind words. Chair Johnson stated if nothing else, perhaps after Covid is over at some point, to be able to have some face to face visitation. Chair Johnson thanked everyone for attending the meeting.

6. Adjournment

Chair Johnson thanked everyone, including Councilwomen Hoffmann and Hightower for attending the meeting. Mr. Crane appreciated everyone's comments and a productive meeting. A motion was made to adjourn the meeting by Mr. Heberle; seconded by Vice Chair Adams. The Commission voted 5-0. (Chair Johnson, Vice Chair Adams, Ms. Turner, Ms. Murphy, and Mr. Heberle. Nays: 0). rt

The meeting adjourned at 6:20 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Sue Schwartz, Director

SS/cs

**REGULAR MEETING OF THE
REDEVELOPMENT COMMISSION
OCTOBER 6, 2021**

The Regular Meeting of the Redevelopment Commission of Greensboro (RCG) was held on Wednesday, October 6, 2021, via Zoom satellite. The following members were present: Vice Chair Adams, Mr. Heberle, Ms. Turner. Councilwoman Sharon Hightower was also present. Staff present was Hart Crane, and Russ Clegg, Planning Department. Andrea Harrell, Assistant City Attorney, Counsel for the Commission.

Vicechair Adams called the meeting to order at 5:03 pm and thanked everyone for attending the meeting. Mr. Crane identified those attending the meeting and presented the agenda.

1. Approval of Meeting Minutes (Approved)

a) August 4, 2021 Regular Meeting

Ms. Turner made a motion to approve the regular meeting minutes of September 1, 2021, as presented. Seconded by Vice Chair Adams. The Commission voted 3-0. (Ayes: Vice Chair Adams, Ms. Turner, and Mr. Heberle. Nays: 0).

2. Certificate of Completion for 609 Gorrell Street.

Mr. Crane advised he had received a call from Bennett College asking for a Certificate of Completion for the property at 609 Gorrell Street. Mr. Crane was not familiar with the property and did research into it. In 1977, the Redevelopment Commission sold 5 acres to Bennett College comprised of 520 through 550 Medley Street which no longer exists. The street has been closed. In 2007 Bennett College came back requesting an amendment to the original agreement and added the 609 Gorrell Street land. Bennett College wanted to do an Intergenerational Center for Children, a childrens house to include middle colleges. Part of it stipulated that when completion of the development occurred, the Commission was to issue a Certificate of Completion and would have required Bennett College to come back and ask for it. In reviewing the minutes, Bennett College never asked for it. It is being asked now because Bennett College is looking to lease the land to another entity and upon the deed research from the other entity they did not feel comfortable leasing it from Bennett unless there was a Certificate of Completion. Staff looked at the property. A photograph was displayed showing the Intergenerational Children's Center/Middle College. It is operation and has been operational since that time. Staff is satisfied the improvements have been completed. Staff was asking the Commission to approve the issuance of a Certificate of Completion to allow Bennett College can be done with the deal and allow them to lease the property to another entity. Mr. Crane felt it was a procedural step that was skipped in some of the past Commissions. Mr. Heberle asked if it was a title company that raised the issue. Mr. Crane responded he thought Bennett College was leasing it to ramp the space up. Mr. Crane thought it was to be another daycare center or something similar. Ms. Harrell stated she thought it was odd but does understand Bennett College being extra cautious in making sure the person leasing the property has the legal ability to do so. It should have been done in 2007. Ms. Turner asked who was the we that approved improvements of the property. Mr. Clegg and Mr. Crane assessed the improvements and were satisfied based on the original development agreement language. Ms. Turner asked if that was based on the 2007 need. Mr. Crane responded it was. Mr. Crane requested a motion to approve staff and legal to issue the Certificate of Completion to Bennett College.

Ms. Turner motion to approve a Certificate of Completion for 609 Gorrell Street. Seconded by Vice Chair Adams. The Commission voted 3-0. (Ayes: Vice Chair Adams, Ms. Turner, and Mr. Heberle. Nays: 0).

4. Staff Updates

a.) Ole Asheboro

Mr. Crane provided an update for 400 East Bragg Street regarding the Hismire Henson development group to do the Twin Home project in the Ole Asheboro Redevelopment area. Appraisals have been received for the property zoned commercial that came in significantly higher than anticipated by the developer. There will not be a Sales Development Agreement entered into for the next couple of months as anticipated. Staff will assist the developer go forward with a rezoning of the property to residential as this is what the developer wanted to do originally. It will bring the appraised value of the property down significantly and allow the developer to have the homes be for sale. If the developer paid the current appraisal price, it would be a rental scenario. Having the purchase price lower will allow it be more flexible and allow the developer to move forward with a for sale product. The development time line will have more time, but will reduce his price significantly. Mr. Henson was willing to take that trade off. Mr. Henson will probably need support from the Commission going forward with the rezoning. Mr. Henson has been working verly closely with the community and will have the neighborhood support. Staff will advise of any updates moving forward. It may not be until the first of next year that the Commission will see the Sales Development Agreement for 400 East Bragg.

b.) Phillips Lombardy

Mr. Crane stated at the last meeting the Commission was requested to write a letter of support. The neighborhood has not met since the Commission last met due to Labor Day holiday. The neighborhood will meet on October 7 and from what Mr. Crane understood, the developer will be attending, Mr. Crane will be attending the meeting and will keep the Commission updated on the progress of conversations with the community. Mr. Crane inquired if there were questions regarding the updates.

5. Additional Business (Closed Session began at 5:09 p.m.)

Mr. Herberle moved to go into closed session pursuant to North Carolina General Statutes 143-318.11A4, to discuss matters relating to the location and expansion of business in the area served by this body. Seconded by Ms. Turner. The Commission voted 3-0. (Ayes: Vice Chair Adams, Ms. Turner, and Mr. Heberle. Nays: 0).

Regular meeting resumed at 5:25 p.m.)

Mr. Crane

The meeting adjourned at 5:26 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Sue Schwartz, Director

SS/cs

SS/cs