

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

**January 4, 2023**

A regular meeting of the Redevelopment Commission of Greensboro (RCG) was held on Wednesday, January 4, 2023, beginning at 5:03 p.m. online via Zoom. The following members were present: Chair Doug Heberle, Vice Chair Trisha Adams, Thomas Sinclair (joined meeting in progress at 5:09 p.m.), Peter Isakoff (joined meeting in progress at 5:38 p.m.), and Pamela Turner. Staff present were Russ Clegg, Hart Crane, Cari Hopson, Kelly Larkins, and Andrew Nelson, Planning Department, and Andrea Harrell, Assistant City Attorney. City Councilmembers present included RCG liaison Nancy Hoffman, Sharon Hightower, and Dr. Goldie Wells.

**1. Approval of meeting minutes**

**a) Minutes of the November 2 Regular Meeting**

Chair Heberle asked for an update about the previous meeting minutes. Andrew Nelson stated that a review of the November meeting recording confirmed that Commissioner Sinclair had a technical issue that prevented him from recording votes in the first two items.

Vice Chair Adams made a motion to approve the November 2 meeting minutes as represented, seconded by Ms. Turner. The Commission voted 3-0, (Ayes: Turner, Vice Chair Adams, Chair Heberle; Nays: 0).

**b) Minutes of the December 7 Regular Meeting**

Ms. Turner made a motion to approve the December 7 meeting minutes as presented, seconded by Vice Chair Adams. The Commission voted 3-0, (Ayes: Turner, Vice Chair Adams, Chair Heberle; Nays: 0).

**2. Grant Funding for Brownfields Work**

Mr. Sinclair joined the meeting in progress at 5:09 p.m.

Russ Clegg presented this item, regarding Commission property at South Eugene and Bragg Street to the west of the South Elm redevelopment area. This environmental testing is a follow-up from past remediation work. Previous industrial uses on the subject properties created some contamination, and the testing will allow the Commission to enter a Brownfields Agreement with the State's Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ), which will include the guidelines for selling and developing the site. The Commission had a previous non-binding Letter of Intent with Generations Development Group and some of the work with DEQ uses this older site plan as a guide but it will be applicable to other users. This testing would use program income from the Environmental Protection Agency's revolving loan program that the City cannot use directly. These funds require the action of the Commission and the grant agreement follows previous agreements. \$29,000 will come from program funds and \$20,400 will be from general funds. Staff will send results of the testing to NC DEQ as the basis for a Brownfields Agreement.

Chair Heberle asked if the program funds are a grant or a loan. Mr. Clegg stated this would be a grant. Chair Heberle asked to confirm there would be no obligation to repay anything, and Mr. Clegg stated that was correct. Chair Heberle asked if the purchase price from a future interested party in the subject properties would account for the general funds expended. Mr. Clegg stated that would be a decision of the commission when agreeing to a sale.

Ms. Turner asked if there was a possibility that the Commission could recoup these funds when the Commission sells the property. Mr. Clegg stated that income from a sale would go back to the general fund of the City.

Mr. Sinclair asked what DEQ would do after the submission of results. Mr. Clegg stated that Brownfields Agreement with DEQ would state if the Commission would need to impose any development restrictions on the subject property. Mr. Sinclair asked if the brownfield study included the Elm Street property under consideration by Lidl. Mr. Clegg stated it did not, as that property is subject to a different brownfield agreement.

City Councilwoman Sharon Hightower asked about the request for the City to match funds. Mr. Clegg stated that the \$29,000 is the remainder of the revolving brownfield funds, and the Commission needs the request general funds from Planning's consulting budget allotment to make up the difference.

Chair Heberle asked if this brownfield agreement would provide sufficient assurance for a future developer to work with the subject property. Mr. Clegg stated that was correct, that it would protect both the Commission and a potential future purchaser.

Mr. Sinclair asked if there were any interested parties in the subject property. Mr. Clegg stated that Generations Development Group has indicated non-binding interest in it. Mr. Sinclair asked if this is the property presented previously in April or May 2022 facing Elm Street. Mr. Clegg stated that was correct.

Mr. Sinclair made a motion that the Redevelopment Commission enter into a grant agreement with the City of Greensboro as discussed for the property at 1201 and 1015 Eugene Street and 107 West Bragg Street, for the purposes of conducting an environmental assessment in order to gather data necessary to enter into a Brownfields Agreement with the North Carolina Department of Environmental Quality, seconded by Vice Chair Adams. The Commission voted 4-0, (Ayes: Sinclair, Turner, Vice Chair Adams, Chair Heberle; Nays: 0).

### **3. Request for Favorable Recommendation for Rezoning of RCG Property located at 1209 and 1211 Lombardy Street**

Kelly Larkins presented this item and stated that this request came from Nara Bakthisaran, who previously presented his proposal in November. The City purchased the subject property with bond funds in 1988 and there have since been multiple commercial and single-family residential developments in the area. He displayed maps of the Philips-Lombardy redevelopment area, and discussed the redevelopment plan that called for the removal of structurally substandard buildings, improving street circulation, and revising land use patterns. Mr. Larkins stated that this request was for both a Sales Development Agreement with the prospective developer and a favorable recommendation from the Commission for the contingent associated rezoning request. He displayed information from the SDA and stated that the pre-closing obligations require the developer to provide specifications and a plan for the development. The SDA's timeline requires submittal of pre-closing obligations within 180 days with an option to extend by 30 days, and closing shall occur within 60 days from the satisfaction of the obligations. Satisfaction of the obligations shall be complete within 16 months of the execution of the agreement.

Nara Bakthisaran, on behalf of Lombardy Twins LLC, stated that he has been working to renovate and manage single-family and small multi-family properties in North Carolina for over ten years. He is proposing to build two homes, as one twinhome development, on the lots located at 1209 and 1211 Lombardy Street. The current zoning does not permit this type of attached dwelling, and that is why he is requesting the favorable recommendation for the rezoning request. He displayed aerial and street-level photography and maps of the subject property, and a conceptual rendering of the twinhome style of building. Mr. Bakthisaran stated each unit would have a garage and likely both a front and back porch. He displayed a conceptual floorplan and stated this would be a two-story building with each unit being approximately 1100-1200 square feet, 3 bedrooms and 2 or 2 and a half bathrooms.

Mr. Larkins stated that there may be a meeting with the Concerned Citizens of Northeast Greensboro tomorrow, and if so, the applicant will attend and discuss his plans. At the next Commission meeting, they would present the SDA for approval, and the Planning and Zoning Commission would hear the request on February 20. If that request were successful, March 1 would be the start date of the SDA.

Hart Crane stated that the SDA is not yet complete, and tonight the Commission is only voting on recommending the rezoning.

Andrea Harrell confirmed that the SDA is nearing completion.

Mr. Sinclair asked about the difference between the R-5 and RM-5 districts. Mr. Bakthisaran stated it permitted an attached multi-family dwelling.

Mr. Isakoff joined the meeting in progress at 5:38 p.m.

Chair Heberle asked about zoning outreach with the surrounding neighborhood. Mr. Larkins stated that they are waiting to confirm a neighborhood meeting will be happening, but if it does not they will still conduct outreach.

Councilwoman Hightower stated that Councilwoman Dr. Goldie Wells informed her there is not a meeting of the neighborhood group tomorrow. Mr. Clegg stated that they will work with the neighborhood to conduct outreach, and that the Planning and Zoning Commission asks about neighborhood outreach measures taken.

Mr. Crane stated that the applicant has introduced himself to the neighborhood and he will continue to reach out and collaborate with key neighborhood leaders.

Chair Heberle asked why the applicant has requested the rezoning now. Mr. Clegg stated that rezoning requests have a financial impact on the prospective developer and there are deadlines for the Planning and Zoning Commission. Chair Heberle stated that he supported providing a positive recommendation as long as the neighborhood is supportive. Mr. Crane stated that because the Planning and Zoning Commission deadlines are tight and fees are due for rezoning, staff is trying to help the applicant.

Mr. Bakthisaran stated that he was requesting the favorable recommendation now because the rezoning requires the owner—currently the Commission—to authorize the rezoning request, and this approval would allow them to go forward with the request. Mr. Crane stated that the Commission's concern is about the land use and not the specific project. The Commission needs to be sure that an RM-5 district is a fair introduction of density to this area.

Chair Heberle stated that he would prefer to hear from the neighborhood about the change. He supports a motion allowing the process to go forward contingent on their support.

City Councilwoman Nany Hoffman asked if the developer needed to be on the February Planning and Zoning Commission meeting agenda. Mr. Bakthisaran stated that the timing was critical for the project.

Vice Chair Adams stated that the Commission was separating elements of this request, and stated that community outreach, education, and collaboration with the potential developer was important. She stated that she believed the rezoning request was a reasonable first step for working with the neighborhood.

Mr. Sinclair asked about the zoning of the adjacent parcels. Mr. Crane stated that the current zoning was generally R-5, single-family residential. Mr. Bakthisaran stated that there were some multi-family dwellings in the neighborhood. Mr. Sinclair stated he preferred having neighborhood input. Mr. Crane displayed a zoning map of the adjacent area, which indicated that the immediate area was zoned R-5 with some RM-12 moderate-density multi-family zoning districts in the area.

City Councilwoman Hightower stated that Councilwoman Wells wished to comment on the request.

City Councilwoman Dr. Goldie Wells, representative of this district, stated that the subject property has been vacant for many years and has challenging topography. After speaking with the developer, she believes the requested zoning district is appropriate for the neighborhood. She stated she is not speaking on behalf of the neighbors, but thinks this style of development would be an asset to this area.

Chair Heberle thanked Councilwoman Wells for her input.

Vice Chair Adams made a motion to approve a favorable recommendation from the Commission for rezoning their properties located at 1209 and 1211 Lombardy Street from R-5 to RM-5, contingent upon subsequent positive community conversations, seconded by Mr. Sinclair. Mr. Isakoff stated he joined the conversation on this item mid-way, and asked if he should abstain from voting. Mr. Crane stated that it would be reasonable. The Commission voted 4-0-1, (Ayes: Sinclair, Turner, Vice Chair Adams, Chair Heberle; Nays: 0; Abstention: Isakoff).

#### **4. Staff Updates**

There were no staff updates.

#### **5. Additional Business**

Hart Crane introduced Jeremy Simpson.

Jeremy Simpson, on behalf of JGR Development Group, stated he was potentially interested in 927 Pearson Street, and he would eventually need a favorable recommendation for rezoning as well. They are meeting with the neighborhood next week. He stated that they were interested in building a duplex with multiple development options based on the configuration of the subject property. Mr. Clegg stated that Mr. Simpson is building with the City in Willow Oaks. Mr. Simpson displayed some photographs of his company's work with a previous duplex and stated that they commonly build single-level dwellings to accommodate aging-in-place and disability accommodations.

Ms. Turner asked about the square footage of the unit displayed. Mr. Simpson stated the illustrative unit was 1216 square feet, and included laundry.

Mr. Sinclair asked about the size of the subject property, and Mr. Simpson stated it was 77 feet wide on the Pearson Street frontage. He displayed aerial photography of the subject property and drew illustrative polygons to indicate potential setbacks.

Mr. Sinclair asked Mr. Simpson if he believed the lot was suitable for this kind of development, and Mr. Simpson stated he thought it was.

Ms. Turner asked how many units the applicant thought the subject property could support, and Mr. Simpson stated two units in one duplex.

Mr. Sinclair stated the current zoning is R-5, and Mr. Simpson stated that they would require a rezoning request. Mr. Sinclair asked if the adjacent properties were single-family detached or duplex dwellings. Mr. Crane stated that one is a single-family home and one may be multiple units. He stated that this block is predominately the R-5 zoning district, and across the street is Traditional Neighborhood for the Ole Asheboro redevelopment area. Mr. Simpson displayed street-level photography of the area.

Chair Heberle asked about the applicant's timeline. Mr. Simpson stated that they are meeting with the neighborhood next week, and after that, they will likely be back in February to present the neighborhood feedback. Chair Heberle thanked Mr. Simpson for his presentation

**Adjournment**

Mr. Sinclair made a motion to adjourn the meeting, seconded by Vice Chair Adams. The Commission voted 5-0, (Ayes: Sinclair, Isakoff, Turner, Vice Chair Adams, Chair Heberle; Nays: 0).

There being no further business, the Commission adjourned at 6:06 pm.

DRAFT

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

**February 1, 2023**

A regular meeting of the Redevelopment Commission of Greensboro (RCG) was held on Wednesday, February 1, 2023, beginning at 5:02 p.m. online via Zoom. The following members were present: Vice Chair Trisha Adams, Thomas Sinclair, Peter Isakoff, and Pamela Turner. Staff present were Russ Clegg, Hart Crane, Cari Hopson, and Kelly Larkins, Planning Department, and Andrea Harrell, Assistant City Attorney. City Councilmembers present included RCG liaison Nancy Hoffman and Zack Matheny.

Absent: Chair Heberle

**1. Approval of meeting minutes**

**a. Minutes of the January 4 Regular Meeting**

Mr. Sinclair made a motion to approve the January 4 meeting minutes as represented, seconded by Mr. Isakoff. The Commission voted 4-0, (Ayes: Sinclair, Turner, Isakoff, Vice Chair Adams; Nays: 0).

**2. 1209 & 1211 Lombardy Twin-Home Sales Development Agreement**

Kelly Larkins presented this item. He displayed a map of the Phillips-Lombardy redevelopment area and indicated the location of the subject properties and conceptual architectural rendering of the twinhome design. The request before the Commission is to enter into a Sales Development Agreement for the development of the twinhome project contingent upon positive community feedback and the approved rezoning of the subject properties at the upcoming 20 February Planning & Zoning Commission meeting. He stated that the sale price was \$8,000 per parcel. The timeline for the SDA indicated 180 days for pre-closing obligations from the beginning of the agreement with an option to extend this time by 30 days, and closing shall occur within 60 days from satisfaction of contractual obligations. Mr. Larkins stated that this timeline would be have March 1 as the start date of the Sales Development Agreement if approved by the Commission.

Narayanan Bakthisaran, on behalf of Lombardy Twins LLC, stated that he had discussion with City Councilwoman Dr. Goldie Wells and reached out to members of the neighborhood on her advice. He used the notification list provided by the Planning department to send letters to neighbors on January 24 and has not received any responses yet, but he is in discussions with other community leaders. Mr. Bakthisaran stated he would attend the Concerned Citizens of Northeast Greensboro community meeting on February 2 to discuss his proposal.

Ms. Turner lost connection at approximately 5:11 p.m.

Mr. Sinclair moved that the Commission enter into a Sales Development Agreement between Lombardy Twins LLC and the Redevelopment Commission for the development of a twin home project located at 1209 and 1211 Lombardy St., contingent upon positive community feedback and the approved rezoning of the property from R-5 to CD-RM-5 at the February 20th Planning and Zoning Commission Hearing, seconded by Mr. Isakoff. Commissioner Turner rejoined the meeting in progress at 5:15 p.m. and stated she had heard the presentation of the item and saw the motion language. The Commission voted 4-0, (Ayes: Isakoff, Sinclair, Turner, Vice Chair Adams; Nays: 0).

### **3. Update on 1520 McConnell Rd. in Willow Oaks Area**

Cari Hopson presented this item, and stated that the prospective developer, RISA Construction, LLC, was a HUB certified M/WBE entity that owns adjacent parcels at 1514, 1516, 1518, 1522, 1524 McConnell Road.

Salvador Santana, on behalf of RISA Construction, LLC, stated that his business purchased the subject parcels to build an apartment development and was unaware of the incompatible zoning in this small lot. He stated that they would need the Commission's approval to rezone the subject property to move forward with the development process.

Ms. Hopson displayed aerial photography of the subject property, and noted that the lot was approximately 32 feet wide with RM-18 zoning. This property is in Willow Oaks Area 3 that has less stringent encouraged design guidelines, and the prospective developer has stated they can comply with the requirements. She displayed a map of the Willow Oaks redevelopment area, and noted there were no other Commission-owned parcels in proximity to the subject property. Ms. Hopson displayed street-level photography of the subject property and adjacent properties, and stated that the area is close to the intersection of McConnell Road and Dewitt Street. The proposal is for three multi-family residential buildings marketed to students with eight dwelling units each, 24 total dwelling unit density. She stated that the developer is financing the project privately with no public assistance, and has an 18-month building timeline. Displaying a rough illustrative site layout and a conceptual architectural rendering of the development .she stated this is not a request for a motion tonight, but an update for the Commission and an opportunity for input and questions to the prospective developer.

Vice Chair Adams asked if the upset bid procedure is similar to the tax foreclosure process. Ms. Harrell stated it was different, and requires an appraisal and reservation of additional funds.

Mr. Clegg stated that if they move forward, the Commission would receive an SDA and more information.

Mr. Crane confirmed this is not an action item and stated that staff wanted to judge the comfort the Commission had with this project. He stated the subject property is likely unbuildable in its current state.

Ms. Hopson stated that significant community outreach efforts would be a part of this request.

Mac Sims, East Greensboro Now, stated they would be glad to assist with connections in the neighborhood.

Mr. Crane stated that Mr. Santana would return in the March meeting for the presentation of the SDA.

### **4. Staff Updates**

#### **a) South Elm**

Mr. Clegg presented this item, and stated that the Cagan Group is working on the parking agreements with the Union Square Campus, are completing the Brownfields Agreement with the North Carolina Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ), and will soon have the updated architectural drawings and foundation plan to present to the Commission. He then displayed aerial photography and illustrative architectural elevations of the proposed Lidl building and stated that they are working to ensure the Elm Street frontage of the building would be attractive. Mr. Clegg displayed a new sketch plan of the site, and stated that Lidl has been working on the site plan to account for the subject property's topology. The new layout allows for more effective stormwater control, truck maneuvering, and access to the Downtown Greenway to the south. He stated that the plan now calls for the loading dock area to be closer to the parking lot, increasing visibility around the Greenway, and that the footprint will be unique to account for

the configuration of the subject property. Regional Lidl representatives have recently visited Greensboro and have become even more enthusiastic about this location.

**b) Heritage House**

Mr. Clegg presented this item, and displayed aerial photography of the redevelopment area. He gave recent history of the subject property, and noted that that the City condemned it July 2014 and designated it blighted September 2014. He gave overview information about the plan and presented three potential uses, displaying conceptual site plan layouts for the possibilities. Mr. Clegg stated that demolition is moving forward, and he displayed photographs of the demolition in progress. Demolition may not be complete until April, and redevelopment will leave the Meridian center intact. He stated that the connection to the Meridian center complicated the demolition, but they will be able to operate throughout the process.

Ms. Turner asked how much parking the Meridian event center uses on the subject property. Ms. Harrell stated that this will be part of the use of the site and the City is discussing it with the parties.

**5. Additional Business**

There was no additional business.

**Adjournment**

Mr. Isakoff made a motion to adjourn the meeting, seconded by Mr. Sinclair. The Commission voted 4-0, (Ayes: Sinclair, Isakoff, Turner, Vice Chair Adams; Nays: 0).

There being no further business, the Commission adjourned at 5:38 pm.



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

**April 5, 2023**

A regular meeting of the Redevelopment Commission of Greensboro (RCG) was held on Wednesday, April 5, 2023, beginning at 5:04 p.m. online via Zoom. The following members were present: Chair Heberle, Vice Chair Adams, Pamela Turner, Thomas Sinclair, and Peter Isakoff. Staff present were Russ Clegg, Hart Crane, Cari Hopson, Kelly Larkins, and Director Sue Schwartz, Planning Department, and Andrea Harrell, Assistant City Attorney. City Councilmembers present included Sharon Hightower and Zach Matheny.

Commissioner Isakoff and Sinclair joined the meeting at 5:03 p.m.

**1. Approval of meeting minutes**

**a) Minutes of the February 1 Regular Meeting**

Mr. Isakoff made a motion to approve the February 1 meeting minutes as presented, seconded by Mr. Sinclair. The Commission voted 4-0-1, (Ayes: Sinclair, Turner, Isakoff, Vice Chair Adams; Nays: 0; Abstention: Chair Heberle).

**2. Introduction of New Commissioner**

Commissioner Isakoff has recently had to move outside of City limits for family commitments, and expressed his appreciation for his time serving on the Commission. Chair Heberle thanked Mr. Isakoff for his service to the City and wished him well on his future endeavors.

Hart Crane introduced Dr. Stacey Greene, newly appointed to the Commission by Dr. Goldie Wells from District 2.

Dr. Greene introduced himself and stated that he has been practicing dentistry in Greensboro for more than 30 years and looks forward to serving the City and advancing his public service. Chair Heberle welcomed Dr. Greene to the Commission.

**3. Introduction of Interested Builder in Willow Oaks**

Cari Hopson, project manager for Willow Oaks, presented this item. She stated that Victor Johnson of Johnson Construction Management LLC looks to develop single-family homes in the Cottage Grove neighborhood in Willow Oaks. She displayed preliminary elevations of potential designs for homes and displayed photography of previous construction by Mr. Johnson.

Victor Johnson, 8194 Rylan Drive, Browns Summit, stated he is a licensed residential and commercial contractor and is interested in building in the South English Street area as it is close to where he grew up. He is excited to build more properties in the area and hopes to bring high quality smaller and affordable homes to his community.

Chair Heberle thanked Mr. Johnson for his presentation and stated he looks forward to working with him in the future.

Ms. Hopson displayed a map of the parcels in the neighborhood, and stated that the subject properties for the proposed development are at the north end of Willow Oaks. Staff will be following up with the Commission next month.

**4. South Elm Inspection Period**

Russ Clegg presented this item, and provided background information on the project. He displayed aerial photography of the subject property and stated that Lidl has requested to extend the timeline for the

Inspection Period by 90 days. The current period expired March 20, and they ask for no other changes regarding other parts of the process or obligations by the Commission. Lidl is seeking to conduct borings and surveys as necessary to advance the development process. As part of this site investigation, Lidl could recoup its earnest money of \$30,000 if the project is determined to be unfeasible. He stated that the closing will still occur by November 20, 2023 if the extension is granted. Lidl has reiterated its commitment to the site in discussions with the City. Mr. Clegg displayed a conceptual sketch plan of the site and stated that Lidl is working with the North Carolina Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ) to determine the engineering steps necessary for a grocery use on the site, and this requires additional testing. As well, stormwater retention requirements necessitate new stormwater and water table investigation. There is also work in progress on traffic access including finalizing details on a right-in/right-out turning movement on South Elm Street. He stated that Lidl and the North Carolina and Greensboro Departments of Transportation (NCDOT and GDOT) are determining the necessary improvements. The current site plan removes the lower access point on South Elm Street due to issues with retaining walls and traffic circulation inside the site. Mr. Clegg stated that the new design makes the southern side of the site more visually pleasant and better for the Greenway, but it requires significantly more work in the north end of the site to ensure its functionality. The square footage of the shopping area has stayed the same but the building size is smaller in the back-end due to advancements in inventory management techniques. He stated that prior to closing Lidl must provide drawings and specifications for external architecture and layout and indicate parking arrangement agreements. The Closing will be no later than November 20

Chair Heberle asked if this extension only moves the inspection period and not any other dates. Mr. Clegg stated that was correct. Chair Heberle asked if trucks would need to back in to the site, and Mr. Clegg stated that they would not, most trucks would enter through the east, and back into a loading bay at the south of the building. The new configuration of the loading dock will also make it more pleasant for the Greenway. Chair Heberle asked if 90 days was sufficient to finish this process. Mr. Clegg stated it was a tight timeline but Lidl expressed this schedule was possible.

Planning Director Sue Schwartz stated that changes by DEQ on Brownfields agreements mean that these new environmental considerations are now necessary to permit any future development on the site.

Chair Heberle asked about what remediation measures the site might need. Mr. Clegg stated that soil removal might be necessary due to DEQ regulation changes. Director Schwartz stated that developers are investigating alternative effective remediation techniques to meet DEQ standards, and this is part of the need for the extension.

Chair Heberle confirmed that the closing timeline is not changing.

Mr. Sinclair moved that the Redevelopment Commission of Greensboro approve the extension of the Inspection Period in the Purchase and Sale Agreement, as amended in December of 2022, to the first business day after 90 days which is June 20, 2023 to complete the necessary inspections per section 3, seconded by Mr. Isakoff. The Commission voted 4-1, (Ayes: Sinclair, Isakoff, Turner, Chair Heberle; Nays: Vice Chair Adams).

## **5. Staff Updates**

### **a) Phillips Lombardy**

Kelly Larkins presented this item, and stated that Narayanan Bakthisaran has rezoned the property and the process is moving along swiftly. The applicant is in the process of acquiring a loan to begin construction. Mr. Bakthisaran and staff will return to the Commission for a future vote after meeting pre-closing obligations.

**b) Willow Oaks**

Mr. Clegg presented this item, and displayed a map of the Willow Oaks redevelopment area with Commission properties indicated. The intent of the redevelopment area was for development to work together. Zooming in to a map of the primary Willow Oaks neighborhood with zones indicated, he stated that there is a lot of activity in Zone C, and increasing in Zone D. Mr. Clegg displayed a map of properties on McConnell Road, and stated that properties are in Area 2 of the neighborhood plan. The proposed use indicates slightly relaxed design guidelines from Zone 1 with a maintenance of the traditional neighborhood building pattern. He displayed aerial photography of the properties on Everitt Street and stated that the Commission must decide how to move forward selling the properties. The Willow Oaks project started in the late 1990s with construction starting in the early 2000s, and the Commission has taken a greater role in managing development agreements. The question now is if the Commission adds its properties to the Homeowners Association (HOA) of Willow Oaks with its associated Covenants, Conditions and Restrictions (CC&Rs) while development is still at a level to make the decision easier to implement. He stated that it would be easy to add the Commission's properties to the HOA right now, but this will not be the case after a little more development happens.

Chair Heberle asked if the CC&Rs are just building restrictions and guidelines, or if it entails architectural review and common maintenance. Mr. Clegg stated that they are extensive, and contain guidance on the management of the properties. They do impose architectural review and lay out the steps for changing the guidelines. Chair Heberle asked if the HOA conducts maintenance and if there are dues. Mr. Clegg stated there are annual dues and they do maintenance but not to the individual homes. The HOA maintains common areas and has deeded control over alleyways. Chair Heberle asked if there was any community input on annexing the properties into the HOA. Mr. Clegg stated that outreach is ongoing, and they will be a part of the consideration. Chair Heberle asked if the declarant was cooperative in this process. Mr. Clegg stated that they have been. He stated that the Commission could market the properties similarly to the Greensboro Housing Development Partnership (GHDP), but no marketing materials are prepared yet. There is some advantage to mirroring the elements of Willow Oaks as it maintains continuity. Chair Heberle asked if there was any way to get the declarant assigned. Mr. Clegg stated GHDP is working on the declarant issues.

Andrea Harrell stated that she would review any material the Commission is curious about before making a decision.

Chair Heberle stated that it would be preferable if there were a way to assign the HOA declarant rights to a City agency instead of the previous developer. Councilwoman Sharon Hightower, representative of District 1, stated that due to the development of a sufficient number of lots, the HOA would soon operate without the declarant.

Chair Heberle stated that there was more information to establish based on the feelings of the neighborhood and if the CC&Rs have worked as designed. Councilwoman Hightower stated that the immediate neighborhood would likely support it, but the outlying parcels would likely not want to be participants. They do not necessarily want to extend the HOA too far out into the community. She stated that she did not want the HOA process to be a barrier to a developer, and stated there were interested parties in these properties. Mr. Clegg stated that a potential developer has been in contact with staff recently. Chair Heberle stated he would appreciate City Attorney staff investigating the CC&Rs and ensuring they are incentivizing quality developers working in the area. Councilwoman Hightower stated that these Commission properties have sat vacant for years and she hopes to maintain the current positive momentum of development.

## **6. Additional Business**

Ms. Hopson introduced Jeremy Simpson with JGR Development, the developer interested in the Everitt Street properties. He is an approved builder in Willow Oaks with GHDP, is working on his first duplex in the area, and has a twinhome development in plan review currently.

Jeremy Simpson stated that his company is interested in all three properties and has support from his lenders. They are proposing to build a 6-unit, 3-building development for sale fee-simple. He displayed conceptual renderings of their design and stated that their intention is to make this development affordable. Mr. Simpson displayed a potential design for the site, indicating the buildings would have frontage on Everitt Street.

Chair Heberle about the proposed subdivision of the lot, and Mr. Simpson stated it could be either individual parcels or party walls. Chair Heberle stated it could be either a condominium-style ownership or 1/6<sup>th</sup> of the lot, and Mr. Simpson stated that was correct. Chair Heberle thanked Mr. Simpson for his presentation.

Vice Chair Adams stated that in her job as a real estate agent and instructor. She stated that Commission members should ask as many questions as they need to understand fully the situations presented in the motions they must vote on. Chair Heberle concurred, and stated that Commission members must be fully comfortable asking questions and expressing their views about the items under their review. Mr. Clegg stated that staff works hard to furnish information for the Commission and is available at any time to provide additional help if requested. Vice Chair Adams stated that she appreciated the good effort of staff, and that she feels her background in real estate that others might not have has led her to be cautious in the South Elm redevelopment situation. She stated that Commission members should ask as many clarifying questions as needed to make informed decisions to represent the citizens of Greensboro. Chair Heberle stated that the Commission will work together to make sure to address all concerns. Delays in development discourage him as well, but he believes it is ultimately a very positive project for the City and supports it.

Mr. Crane thanked Commissioner Isakoff again for his work on the Commission and wished him and his family well.

## **7. Adjournment**

Mr. Isakoff made a motion to adjourn the meeting, seconded by Vice Chair Adams. The Commission voted 5-0, (Ayes: Sinclair, Isakoff, Turner, Vice Chair Adams, Chair Heberle; Nays: None).

There being no further business, the Commission adjourned at 6:12 p.m.

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

**May 3, 2023**

A regular meeting of the Redevelopment Commission of Greensboro (RCG) was held on Wednesday, May 3, 2023, beginning at approximately 5:00 p.m. online via Zoom. The following members were present: Chair Heberle, Vice Chair Adams, Thomas Sinclair, and Dr. Stacey Greene. Staff present were Russ Clegg, Hart Crane, Cari Hopson, and Kelly Larkins, Planning Department, and Andrea Harrell, Assistant City Attorney. City Councilmembers present included Councilwomen Sharon Hightower and Nancy Hoffman.

**1. Approval of meeting minutes**

**a) Minutes of the April 5 Regular Meeting**

Mr. Sinclair made a motion to approve the April 5 meeting minutes as presented, seconded by Dr. Greene. The Commission voted 4-0, (Ayes: Greene, Sinclair, Vice Chair Adams, Chair Heberle).

**2. Future Sales Development Agreement for English Street Lots**

Cari Hopson presented this item, and stated that there is an offer from Johnson Management Corporation to purchase 222, 224, and 226 South English Street and displayed an illustrative photograph of a development similar to that proposed by JMC principal Victor Johnson, 3 single family houses approximately 1200 to 1300 square feet. The subject properties are in the Willow Oaks redevelopment area 5 in the Cottage Grove neighborhood. Displaying a parcel map of the vicinity, Ms. Hopson noted that the subject properties are distant from the core Willow Oaks areas. Mr. Johnson has met with the Cottage Grove community and they are supportive of his proposal, which would likely make the houses available for between \$210,000 and \$218,000. She stated that JMC is proposing to invest significantly in overhead costs to develop these parcels and that JMC is offering \$8,000 per lot. The Sales and Development Agreement (SDA) is not final, but Ms. Hopson stated that staff would provide more information to the Commission as it develops.

Hart Crane stated that JMC has remaining work to do to move forward with the proposal, but staff's work is mostly complete, and staff is suggesting an electronic vote to allow JMC to move forward as soon as their work is complete.

Councilwoman Sharon Hightower stated that she was in communication with Mr. Johnson and requested to add him to the meeting to be available for any questions the Commission might have.

Tiarra Brown, on behalf of the Greensboro Housing Coalition's Collaborative Cottage Grove Initiative, stated that the community supports single-family home development such as this proposal, and requested for the Commission and staff to keep the neighborhood apprised of the development process.

Vice Chair Adams stated that she has had opportunities to meet Mr. Johnson, and that she believes his professional capabilities and community focus are admirable and she supports the proposal.

Chair Heberle stated that he supports the Commission approving an electronic vote in lieu of a special meeting before the June meeting pending community feedback. Vice Chair Adams stated she was comfortable voting in that manner. Dr. Greene stated he would be comfortable voting once he completes a thorough review of the proposal materials.

Mr. Sinclair asked if the subject properties were directly adjacent, and Chair Heberle stated that was correct. Mr. Sinclair asked if there was any new information about the proposal, as he had not received a packet for this meeting. Mr. Crane stated that there is new correspondence and documentation regarding the proposal and that staff will ensure all Commission members receive appropriate materials for meetings.

Chair Heberle stated that the Commission would review the community's statement of position and vote electronically.

Councilwoman Hightower stated that she supports the proposal due to her assessment of Mr. Johnson's capabilities and intentions and because of the subject properties' long-term vacant status. The English Street corridor has not had much development, and this would be a positive development for this community.

### **3. Phillips Lombardy Twinhome Sales Development Agreement Approvals**

Mr. Crane stated that there is no longer a need for amendments to move forward on this item.

Kelly Larkins presented this item and stated that there is a lot of excitement about the potential for new development in the Phillips Lombardy redevelopment area. He introduced the developer, Narayanan Bakthisaran.

Mr. Bakthisaran stated that his company has ten years of experience managing and developing real estate in the Triad area. For this development, he sent letters to neighbors and presented the proposal to the Concerned Citizens of Northeast Greensboro to get support for the necessary rezoning request, and with that successfully completed, he is working toward completing all pre-closing obligations. He displayed a site plan of the properties and stated that each twinhome unit would be approximately 1200 square feet. If the loans close in the third week of May, construction can begin in June. Mr. Bakthisaran stated that they are phasing the development and expect a build time of 9 months, well before the maximum time outlined in the SDA. Expected cost of the twinhome units is \$176,000. He stated that their preferred option is selling the units to individual homeowners, but would convert them to rental units if market conditions make it necessary. Mr. Bakthisaran displayed illustrative architectural elevations of the twinhome and a budget cost breakdown of the development.

Chair Heberle asked staff to confirm that the application is in order, and Mr. Larkins confirmed that was correct. He stated that Mr. Bakthisaran worked with staff to review his submitted materials. Chair Heberle asked if approving this item means that the Commission will immediately move into closing with the developer. Mr. Crane stated that was correct.

Mr. Sinclair asked if the developer has all necessary approvals from the City to move forward other than the SDA, and Russ Clegg stated that was correct.

Vice Chair Adams moved to approve the Pre-Closing Obligations as outlined in Section 3.14 of the Sales and Development between the Redevelopment Commission of Greensboro and Lombardy Twins, LLC, seconded by Mr. Sinclair. The Commission voted 3-0-1, (Ayes: Sinclair, Vice Chair Adams, Chair Heberle; Nays: 0; Abstention: Greene).

### **4. Staff Updates**

#### **a) Ole Asheboro**

Mr. Crane presented this item, and stated that the developer working with the Commission property at 400 East Bragg Street has informed staff that they cannot continue development at this time. As there has been no development activity on the Commission property, there are no obligations for either party. The developer remains active in this community and there is some interest in the property from other entities.

Chair Heberle asked if the difficulties that led to this decision by Mr. Hinson would arise again with a potential future developer on the subject property. Mr. Crane stated that the situation seems to be a unique and unfortunate situation for the developer, not an issue with the property.

Mr. Crane stated that staff is working with the community and a consultant to connect Douglas Park with the Downtown Greenway in this area. This will be the first Greenway Spur in the City, and they will be conducting the community engagement process during the summer.

## **5. Additional Business**

Andrea Harrell stated that demolition at the Heritage House site is nearly complete and she is hopeful that the litigation will be resolved in 2023. She stated that the other tenant on the site, the Meridian Event Center, has recently finished very significant improvements and has a high level of activity.

Chair Heberle stated that both the Commission and Meridian would mutually benefit from resolving the situation and completing demolition. Ms. Harrell stated that Meridian is working with the City to finish the demolition process.

Mr. Sinclair asked about the potential uses for the Heritage House site. Ms. Harrell stated that the pending completion of the litigation process involving the sale of the event center property on the site would aid the Commission's ability to conduct a Request for Proposal (RFP) process to investigate potential uses.

Chair Heberle asked if the event center is landlocked within the Commission's property. Ms. Harrell stated that this is an item of the controversy, but she is hopeful for a positive outcome.

Councilwoman Nancy Hoffman asked about the current condition of the event center. Ms. Harrell stated that it was very nice and had excellent facilities and furnishings, and the operators of the facility are willing to provide tours.

Councilwoman Hightower asked if visiting the facility was advisable given the pending litigation. Ms. Harrell stated that the City Attorney's Office would assist with any concerns. Councilwoman Hightower stated she hopes the facility can be part of a positive trend of development in the area, and encouraged the Commission to ensure that the future RFP process makes best use of the property. She thanked staff for their work on the matter.

Mr. Crane thanked the community members for their attendance at the meeting and encouraged future involvement and collaboration.

## **6. Adjournment**

Dr. Greene made a motion to adjourn the meeting, seconded by Mr. Sinclair. The Commission voted 4-0, (Ayes: Greene, Sinclair, Vice Chair Adams, Chair Heberle).

There being no further business, the Commission adjourned at approximately 5:48 p.m.

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

**June 7, 2023**

A regular meeting of the Redevelopment Commission of Greensboro (RCG) was held on Wednesday, June 7, 2023, beginning at approximately 5:00 p.m. online via Zoom. The following members were present: Dr. Stacey Greene (joined in progress), Thomas Sinclair, Vice Chair Tricia Adams, and Chair Doug Heberle. Staff present were Russ Clegg, Hart Crane, Cari Hopson, Kelly Larkins, and Andrew Nelson, Planning Department, and Andrea Harrell, Assistant City Attorney. City Councilmembers present included Sharon Hightower and Nancy Hoffman.

**1. Approval of Meeting Minutes**

**a) Minutes of the May 3 Regular Meeting**

Mr. Sinclair made a motion to approve the May 3 meeting minutes as presented, seconded by Vice Chair Adams. The Commission voted 3-0, (Ayes: Sinclair, Vice Chair Adams, Chair Heberle; Nays: 0).

**2. Redevelopment Commission Properties in Willow Oaks**

Russ Clegg presented this item, and stated that the Greensboro Housing Development Partnership (GHDP) has requested the inclusion of Commission properties into the Willow Oaks Homeowners' Association (HOA). Willow Oaks began in the late 70s as a partnership between the Commission and GHDP. Development responsibility shifted to the Commission in 2010 following the redevelopment of the former Morningside Homes site, the original Development Agreement ended in 2013, and GHDP is effectively acting as the Master Developer in the neighborhood. He displayed a map of the Willow Oaks area that indicated GHDP owns most of the remaining undeveloped land. Displaying another map indicating the subject properties, he stated that the City acquired these Commission properties in foreclosure in 2016. The subject properties are in Area 2, proposed as a transitional area between Area 1 and the neighboring communities with new attached single-family housing with less stringent architectural controls than in Area 1. Mr. Clegg stated that GHDP request for the Commission to add the subject properties to the HOA when transferred to a developer, bringing the subject properties under the association's Covenants, Conditions, and Restrictions (CC&Rs) and provision of services.

Chair Heberle asked if admission into the HOA would not happen until the Commission divested the property. Mr. Clegg stated that was the recommendation from GHDP, as it did not make sense for the Commission to join the HOA as it is. Chair Heberle asked how this relates to the request to transfer the properties to GHDP for their management. Mr. Clegg stated that the Commission could take a number of different options following the potential of a transaction guided by a State law mandated upset bid process. Chair Heberle stated that it makes sense to include the subject properties with GHDP's unified marketing and development efforts.

Councilwoman Hightower stated that it would make GHDP's work smoother and there is already interest in the subject properties. Chair Heberle stated it makes sense to him as well.

Mr. Sinclair asked if three properties would be bundled in a single sale and transfer, and that transfer would stipulate their inclusion in the HOA. Chair Heberle stated that the Commission could separate those two facets. Mr. Sinclair asked if the Commission could specifically request the properties to have membership with the HOA. Chair Heberle stated the Commission could if it desires. Mr. Clegg stated that was correct, and while ultimately it is up to the HOA to accept the properties, the Commission can still dispose of the properties at any time should time be critical. Chair Heberle asked to confirm that this is a sale to GHDP. Mr. Clegg stated that was correct, but he did not have sale price information other than the use of the upset bid process. Mr. Sinclair stated that he wished for the neighborhood to be consistent and have reliable upkeep. Chair Heberle stated that GHDP retains the ability to make this request at a later



date as well. Councilwoman Hightower stated that GHDP agrees with adding the subject properties to the HOA, and that it would likely improve the market incentives for them.

Dr. Greene asked if GHDP would be consistent with the design in the neighborhood or if they would permit modern homes. Mr. Clegg stated that the design guidelines are in the adopted plan and are part of the CC&Rs associated with the HOA.

Mr. Sinclair made a motion to direct staff to develop an agreement to transfer 2115, 2116, and 2128 Everitt Street to the Greensboro Housing Development Partnership specifying terms that are consistent with current Willow Oaks disposition and building practices, seconded by Dr. Greene. The Commission voted 3-0, (Ayes: Sinclair, Greene, Vice Chair Adams, Chair Heberle; Nays: 0).

Chair Heberle asked if it was better for the Commission or GHDP to make the request to join the HOA. Mr. Clegg stated that it would work either way. As the HOA would not meet until November, there is no rush to decide. Councilwoman Hightower stated that it would probably be easier if GHDP made the request given the pre-existing working relationship. Chair Heberle asked about the potential for timing of a Purchase and Sales and Agreement aligning with GHDP activity, and if the Commission should table that element of the request for a later date. Mr. Clegg stated that made sense to him, and Councilwoman Hightower agreed.

### **3. English Street Sales Development Agreement**

Cari Hopson presented this item and displayed a map of the area, stating that that the subject properties 222, 224, and 226 South English Street are in the Cottage Grove neighborhood within the Willow Oaks redevelopment Area 5. The prospective developer is proposing to build one single-family detached house per property as supported by the neighborhood, approximately 1200-300 square feet per. Displaying an illustrative sketch plan, she stated that the developer intends to build a wraparound driveway for safety on English Street, and displayed preliminary illustrative architectural elevations and floor plans. Ms. Hopson stated that the Sales and Development Agreement (SDA) Section 3.14 lays out pre-closing requirement materials that the Commission will receive before voting on an SDA, and gave the timeline for the development with a maximum of 2 years, 8 months of completion but an anticipated completion within 16 months. The prospective developer anticipates an expected sale price of \$208,000 per unit.

Victor Johnson, on behalf of Johnson Construction Management, stated that he intends to clear the lots in such a way that future homeowners have an easier time maintaining the property. The larger driveway and enhanced efficiency standards for HVAC adds a little to the expenses, but will be worth it for the desirability of the properties.

Ms. Hopson stated that JCM is offering \$8,000 for the subject properties.

Dr. Greene asked if the anticipated timeline was for all three homes, and Ms. Hopson stated that was correct. Mr. Johnson stated that he wants to be in full compliance with the Commission's guidelines and expectations given supply chain difficulties, but he intends to complete construction in a timely manner.

Chair Heberle asked to confirm the appraised value of the properties and the land clearance expenses.

Hart Crane stated that value of each lot is \$21,000, with an estimated land clearance cost of \$5,300 per lot. Chair Heberle asked about the difference between the appraised value and the offer. Mr. Clegg stated that the estimates indicate a narrow margin for development, and a reduction in land costs may be necessary to make this development viable. Chair Heberle stated that the Commission's primary focus is ensuring the redevelopment of the area, and they must consider the recommendation of the community.

Andrea Harrell stated that this would require an upset bid process, and an alternative developer could present a different proposal if they see fit.

Councilwoman Nancy Hoffman asked about the condition of the subject properties. Ms. Hopson stated that there are many large trees on the lots. Ms. Hoffman asked if the developer intended to remove all the trees. Councilwoman Hightower stated that the developer would need to clear the properties to construct the houses with a sufficient setback. Mr. Johnson stated that he is only requesting a reduction in land sale prices, and will use the difference to pay for the land clearance while keeping the home prices beneath \$250,000.

Councilwoman Hightower asked to confirm that Mr. Johnson was offering \$8,000 per lot for the subject properties, and Mr. Crane stated that the offer is \$8,000 for all three lots. Chair Heberle stated he supports keeping the sale price of the completed homes lower, and asked if there was a mechanism available for the Commission to ensure the final properties sell for a lower price. Mr. Johnson stated that he does not intend to go over a price of \$218,000 even if it reduces or eliminates his developer fee.

Councilwoman Hoffman asked to confirm that would be the maximum sale price. Mr. Johnson stated that was correct, but he intends to keep it as low as possible while maintaining his standards. Chair Heberle stated that the community letter of support speaks to his positive appraisal of the proposal.

Vice Chair Adams left the meeting as part of a pre-arranged obligation at approximately 5:48 p.m.

Dr. Greene made a motion to enter into a Sales Development Agreement with Johnson Construction Management, Inc. for the development of Commission-owned lots located at 222, 224, and 226 South English Street, seconded by Mr. Sinclair. The Commission voted 3-0, (Ayes: Greene, Sinclair, Chair Heberle; Nays: 0).

Councilwoman Hightower thanked the Commission for their support in this development. These lots have had no activity for many years, and this will be a positive influence on the community.

#### **4. Presentation from Non-Profit Developer “The Housing Tree”**

Mr. Crane presented this item, and introduced Jeremy Simpson.

Jeremy Simpson, on behalf of The Housing Tree, stated that his group is a Community Development Organization that wishes to collaborate with the Commission to revitalize communities around Greensboro, integrating affordable housing with other services of community benefit for long-term sustainability. He displayed a case study of some of the previous activities of the organization to benefit veterans, and stated that their program has already demonstrated success.

Chair Heberle thanked Mr. Simpson for his presentation, and stated that the Commission looks forward to doing more work with him in the future.

Mr. Sinclair asked if the veteran used VA benefits to build the duplex, and Mr. Simpson stated that was correct. Mr. Sinclair asked if the organization would use FHA or other financing mechanisms as well, and Mr. Simpson stated they would use whatever is available to a recipient to maximize their benefit. Mr. Sinclair asked if the organization was facilitating grants for eligible recipients to make housing more affordable, and Mr. Simpson stated that was correct.

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

##### **b) Ole Asheboro**

Mr. Crane stated that staff is working with a design consultant to work on the Downtown Greenway spur to Douglas Park. Community outreach in July will prime the project for construction next year.

##### **c) Arlington Park**

Mr. Crane stated that Theodore Stevens, a previous prospective developer of properties on Plymouth Street, is interested in working with the Commission once more. His community outreach efforts have been positive thus far, and an SDA will likely be forthcoming.

Mr. Sinclair asked about the addresses of the properties. Mr. Crane displayed a map of the properties and stated the addresses were 1402 and 1404 Plymouth Street, close to Florida Street.

Chair Heberle stated that the Commission looks forward to future cooperation here.

**6. Additional Business**

Pat MacFoy, with New Hope Development Group, stated that she is excited to see the progress on the properties on English Street and the information Mr. Simpson shared about the plans. Chair Heberle thanked Ms. MacFoy for attending the meeting, and stated that the Commission values hearing from communities. Councilwoman Hightower thanked New Hope for their efforts in the neighborhood.

**7. Adjournment**

Mr. Sinclair made a motion to adjourn the meeting, seconded by Dr. Greene. The Commission voted 4-0, (Ayes: Sinclair, Greene, Chair Heberle).

There being no further business, the Commission adjourned at approximately 6:12 p.m.

**SPECIAL MEETING OF THE  
REDEVELOPMENT COMMISSION OF GREENSBORO**

**June 22, 2023**

A special meeting of the Redevelopment Commission of Greensboro (RCG) was held on Thursday, June 22, 2023, beginning at 5:04 p.m. online via Zoom. The following members were present: []. Staff present were Planning Director Sue Schwartz, Russ Clegg, Hart Crane, Cari Hopson, Kelly Larkins, and Andrew Nelson, Planning Department, and Andrea Harrell, Assistant City Attorney. City Councilmembers present included Nancy Hoffman.

**1. South Elm Street Redevelopment Area West Block**

Russ Clegg presented this item and stated that Lidl requested this special meeting due to short time constraints. The request is to extend the Inspection Period by thirty days with no change in closing date or other scheduled activities. Displaying an illustrative sketch plan of the subject property, Mr. Clegg stated that Lidl has been active in Greensboro recently and remains committed to the development. The extension is necessary to mitigate technical issues on the site, including environmental remediation. The Commission funded remediation efforts prior but State guidelines may require additional work due to the proposed food sales use. Traffic engineering work continues to design the most safe and efficient ingress and egress arrangement possible for this site. Mr. Clegg stated that if the Inspection Period extension is granted, Lidl would furnish additional information to the Commission prior to closing which is to occur no later than November 20 per the Purchase and Sales Agreement (PSA).

Rick Jordan, real estate director for Lidl of the Carolinas, displayed the site plan and stated that the subject property needs remediation to mitigate petroleum vapors. Further testing indicates up to \$2,000,000 in remediation may be necessary to bring the site up to environmental standards by removing, safely disposing of, and replacing soil on the property.

The meeting was subject to malicious interference and suspended at 5:13 p.m.

The meeting was resumed 5:24 p.m. Mr. Sinclair did not immediately rejoin the meeting.

Chair Heberle apologized for the difficulties and stated that members in the audience are restricted to receive-only due to the issues.

Mr. Jordan stated that the initial remediation budget was approximately \$360,000 to mitigate coal contamination, but soil boring and testing indicates petroleum contamination that is more significant. He stated that work with DOT indicates difficulty with establishing safe truck exit along South Elm Street. The third issue is a high ground water table, part of which is contaminated. The complicated nature of the site means that the most viable location for the dry pond stormwater control mechanism is at risk of overflowing. These issues require Lidl to continue site-engineering efforts, which would require an extension of the Inspection Period.

Chair Heberle stated that Lidl's request is reasonable given the situation and their efforts, and he remains committed to this project.

Mr. Sinclair rejoined the meeting in progress at approximately 5:29 p.m.

Chair Heberle stated that the proposed motion does not extend the timeframe to open the grocery store.

Mr. Sinclair asked why the extension was necessary if there would be no changes to the timeline. Chair Heberle stated that it does not change the date of the closing, but allows Lidl more time to complete work on its due diligence. Mr. Sinclair asked if this was primarily about the earnest money. Chair Heberle stated that would be the case, but Lidl is expecting to spend multiple millions of dollars and the earnest money is approximately \$30,000.

Mr. Jordan stated that Lidl has already spent over \$200,000 in site design and testing, and they have to stop spending on these efforts when they are out of their Inspection Period. This would allow them to order additional testing.

Chair Heberle asked if this was procedural within Lidl as well. Mr. Jordan stated that was correct.

Mr. Sinclair moved that the Redevelopment Commission of Greensboro approve the extension of the Inspection Period in the Purchase and Sale Agreement, as amended in December of 2022 and March of 2023, by 30 days until July 20, 2023 to complete the necessary inspections per section 3, seconded by Vice Chair Adams. The Commission voted 5-0, (Ayes: Turner, Greene, Sinclair, Vice Chair Adams, Chair Heberle; Nays: 0).

Chair Heberle stated that the Commission remains committed to the project and is excited for what it will bring to the community. Mr. Jordan invited everyone to the grand opening of Lidl's new Pisgah Church Road store next weekend.

**2. Additional Business**

None.

**3. Adjournment**

Mr. Sinclair made a motion to adjourn the meeting, seconded by Dr. Greene. The Commission voted 5-0, (Ayes: Sinclair, Turner, Greene, Vice Chair Adams, Chair Heberle; Nays: 0).

There being no further business, the Commission adjourned at 5:36 p.m.

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

**July 12, 2023**

A regular meeting of the Redevelopment Commission of Greensboro (RCG) was held on Wednesday, July 12, 2023, beginning at 5:00 p.m. via Zoom satellite. The following members were present; Vice Chair Trisha Adams, Thomas Sinclair, and Pamela Turner. City Council present included RCG liaison Nancy Hoffmann. Staff present were Hart Crane, Russ Clegg & Cari Hopson, Planning Department, and Andrea Harrell, Assistant City Attorney

Absent Commissioners: Doug Heberle, Stacey Greene

**1. Approval of Meeting Minutes**

Mr. Crane stated that approval of minutes for the June regular and special meetings would be moved to the Commission's next regular meeting in August.

**2. 222-226 South English Street Sales Development Agreement Closing Items Approval Request**

Ms. Hopson led a presentation on the pre-closing requirements for the subject properties based on material provided by Victor Johnson, on behalf of Johnson Construction Management, LLC.

RCG entered a Sales Development Agreement (SDA) with Johnson Construction Management LLC on June 7, 2023, and fulfillment of the agreement was contingent on the following pre-closing requirements: (1.) Final site plan and elevations for approval; (2.) Final development program and phasing schedule; (3.) Proposed development budget; (4.) Marketing plan for units; (5.) Drawings and specifications; (6.) Projected cost of improvements.

Ms. Hopson stated that the development's final site plan had been approved by Dan Curry, Willow Oaks design reviewer, and was determined to be in conformity with the 2017 Willow Oaks Redevelopment Plan. She then showed illustrative images of the proposed developments, outlined their development timeline and estimated cost of construction, and shared a mockup of the development's marketing plan.

Mr. Johnson stated that he was considering changing the design of the windows on the properties and added that he would like to receive Mr. Curry's contact information to keep him updated on any changes in development going forward. Ms. Hopson acknowledged and advised that she and Mr. Curry would also conduct regular site inspections.

Ms. Turner asked if the developments would be energy efficient. Mr. Johnson stated they would be installing insulation foam throughout the properties to prevent energy loss.

Mr. Sinclair asked for clarification on the design of the windows. Mr. Johnson stated that they would be some variation of clear glass on the bottom with gridded glass on the top, a design that was chosen to mimic the other homes in the surrounding area.

Ms. Turner asked if the foundations would be contained or if they would have a crawlspace. Mr. Johnson stated that the foundations would be slab designed to resemble closed foundation.

Mr. Clegg advised that there were development guidelines for Willow Oaks that permitted slab foundation where necessary, so long as the design resembled closed foundation.

Mr. Sinclair made a motion to approve pre-closing obligations from Johnson Construction Management, LLC. regarding the development of Commission-owned lots located at 222, 224, 226 South English Street, seconded by Ms. Turner. The Commission voted 3-0-1, (Ayes: Sinclair, Turner, Vice Chair Adams, Nays: 0).

### **3. Staff Updates**

There were no updates from the staff

### **4. Adjournment**

Mr. Sinclair made a motion to adjourn the meeting, seconded by Ms. Turner.

The Commission voted 3-0. (Ayes: Sinclair, Turner, Vice Chair Adams, Nays: 0).

There being no further business, the Commission adjourned at 5:18 pm

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

**August 9, 2023**

A regular meeting of the Redevelopment Commission of Greensboro (RCG) was held on Wednesday, August 9, 2023, beginning at 5:00 p.m. via Zoom satellite. The following members were present; Chairman Doug Heberle, Vice Chair Trisha Adams, Thomas Sinclair, and Stacey Greene. City Council present included Sharon Hightower, and RCG liaison Nancy Hoffmann. Staff present were Hart Crane, Russ Clegg, and Kelly Larkins (Planning Department) and Andrea Harrell (Assistant City Attorney).

Absent Commissioners: Pamela Turner

**1. Approval of Meeting Minutes**

Mr. Sinclair moved to approve the minutes for the June 6 regular meeting; seconded by Vice Chair Adams. The Commission voted 3-0 in favor (Ayes: Heberle, Adams, Sinclair; Nays: none).

Mr. Greene joined the meeting following this vote but was not able to connect.

Mr. Sinclair moved to approve the minutes for the June 22 regular meeting; seconded by Vice Chair Adams. The Commission voted 3-0 in favor (Ayes: Heberle, Adams, Sinclair; Nays: none).

Chair Heberle recused himself on the vote to approve the July 12 regular meeting minutes on account of his absence during that meeting. Without Mr. Greene, there was no quorum and the vote was moved to the end of the meeting.

Ms. Harrell advised that there would need to be a formal motion to reorder the agenda.

Mr. Sinclair made a motion to amend the regular agenda, moving the approval of the July 12 meeting minutes until the end of the meeting, seconded by Ms. Adams. The Commission voted 3-0 in favor (Ayes: Heberle, Adams, Sinclair; Nays: none).

**2. South Elm East Block Agreement Request**

Mr. Clegg began a presentation on the East Block project site of the larger South Elm Street Redevelopment Plan.

Mr. Clegg provided background on the site, noting that the original parties to the Sales Development Agreement (SDA), approved in April 2021, had backed out and were replaced by Cagan Properties Management (CPM) in September 2021.

CPM proposed two amendments to the SDA, both of which were approved in September 2022. These were: (1.) Changes to the development mix (building 150 apartments, a public plaza, 1,000ft of retail space, & 250 parking spaces); (2.) Updating the development time line (setting the deadline to close the SDA on August 29, 2023 & deadline to begin construction to October 25, 2023).

Mr. Clegg stated that CPM would be requesting another amendment that would: (1.) Further extend the SDA's closing deadline to November 30, 2023; (2.) Require construction begin within 365 days of closing; (3.) Require completion of construction within 3 years after the SDA's closing. Mr. Clegg added that the amendment is being sought by CPM due to a request brought by the North Carolina Department of Environmental Quality (NCDEQ) for additional information on the development which has complicated the design and planning process.



Mr. Clegg advised that the Commission would be voting on whether to recommend approval of the amendment by City Council.

Bryan Cagan, on behalf of CPM, presented on a proposed redesign of the East Block project site. Mr. Cagan shared illustrative images of the site, showing the current layout of the development.

Mr. Cagan stated that they had originally wanted to satisfy parking requirements by building a parking deck on the site, adjacent to the proposed apartments and retail space and the existing Union Square campus. They decided against this after discussions with NCDEQ, who advised them that environmental regulations would require them to install vapor filtration devices and other such environmental mitigation infrastructure on the site. Mr. Cagan stated that they now plan on building the parking spaces underneath the site, noting that this would not only circumvent the environmental improvements required of a raised parking deck, while satisfying other state regulations on environmental mitigation, but it would also increase construction space and allow for the development of more units on the site (an estimated 208 apartment units, up from 150). Mr. Cagan stated that underground parking also offers the added benefit of providing leveled foundation for the site, fixing a 20ft north-south slope that has complicated construction.

Chair Heberle asked if the retail component of the project had been moved further north from its original location on the southern end of the site. Mr. Cagan stated that it had been moved.

Mr. Cagan stated that their request for an amendment extending the development timeline is the result of testing of hazardous material and vapors required by NCDEQ. The testing requires them to take samples of communal spaces (e.g. the retail, common space, elevators, etc.) and submit them to NCDEQ for review which will determine whether passive or active environmental mitigation measures must be included in the design of those spaces. Mr. Cagan stated that the process takes 10-12 weeks to complete and their request for an extension of the SDA's closing deadline to November 30 will allow them to properly complete the process.

Chair Heberle asked for an example of passive and active environmental mitigation measures. Mr. Cagan stated that passive measures can be as simple as barriers that separate spaces, but active measures are more complex (e.g. a system of pipes and fans to divert harmful gases).

Councilwoman Hoffman asked what the timeline for construction would be. Mr. Cagan stated that, should they close the SDA by the start of November, they will begin construction 10-12 months thereafter and that construction would last 25-30 months, placing preliminary occupancy of the site sometime in 2026.

Councilwoman Hoffman asked why construction could not begin sooner than 10-12 months after the SDA's closing. Mr. Cagan stated that labor issues and administrative concerns with contractors like the architects and engineers that actually prepare construction plans will likely mean that it will take time to begin construction even if it is allowed to begin immediately.

Mr. Sinclair clarified that while design concepts are complete, the construction documents and required approval documents are not prepared and will take time.

Chair Heberle asked if there were any further comments or questions. Hearing none, he requested a motion.

Mr. Sinclair moved that the Redevelopment Commission favorably recommends that the City Council approve the Second Amendment to the Sales Development Agreement between NC Triad Associates LLC and the Redevelopment Commission of Greensboro for the property at 100 East Gate City Boulevard, 757 and 727 South Elm Street, and 508 and 518 Arlington Street. Mr. Greene seconded the motion. The Commission voted (4-0) in favor of the motion (Ayes: Heberle, Adams, Greene, Sinclair; Nays: none).

### **3. Staff Updates**

Mr. Clegg provided an update on the South Block project site of the larger South Elm Street Redevelopment Plan, reminding the Commission that Lidl, the original developers of the site, had allowed their SDA to lapse citing an inability to adhere to their development timeline. Mr. Clegg stated that Lidl was prepared to re-enter into a new SDA for the site with a newly negotiated development timeline. Mr. Clegg added that staff had been in discussion with NCDEQ regarding their ground-fill agreement and the complicated timeline around environmental mitigation requirements. Mr. Clegg stated that the site had been remediated in accordance with the ground-fill agreement and that current discussions concerned mitigation of existing soil gases in the area, the timeline of which had made it difficult for Lidl to stick to the development window outlined in their original SDA.

Mr. Sinclair asked if there were any alternate sites on the eastside that do not have the complications of the South Block project site that Lidl may be interested in. Mr. Clegg stated that there are several other sites, not all of which are owned by the Redevelopment Commission.

Councilwoman Hoffman asked if there were any other developers, besides Lidl, interested in the South Block project site. Mr. Clegg stated that there were.

Councilwoman Hightower expressed concern that staff's efforts to court other developers was neglecting the criticality of a grocer like Lidl within a larger food desert. Mr. Clegg advised that staff was still in contact with Lidl concerning the development, adding that they cannot control Lidl's decision making regarding profitability and return on investment from developing on the site.

Councilwoman Hightower clarified that Lidl had not reached out to NCDEQ. Mr. Clegg stated that Lidl had been in contact with NCDEQ in some capacity, but that they had not reached out directly regarding the timeline for environmental mitigation requirements, adding that staff had offered themselves as a liaison.

Kelly Larkins shared photos of developments at the Phillips-Lombardy Twin Home Project and provided an update on construction.

#### **4. Additional Business**

Chair Heberle asked if there were any questions. Hearing none, he requested a motion on the July 12 regular meeting minutes.

Mr. Sinclair moved to approve the minutes for the July 12 regular meeting; seconded by Mr. Greene. The Commission voted 3-1-0 in favor (Ayes: Adams, Greene, Sinclair; Abstain: Heberle; Nays: none).

#### **5. Adjournment**

Mr. Greene made a motion to adjourn the meeting, seconded by Mr. Sinclair.

The Commission voted 4-0. (Ayes: Heberle, Adams, Greene, Sinclair; Nays: 0).

There being no further business, the Commission adjourned at 6:20 PM.

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

**SEPTEMBER 6, 2023**

A regular meeting of the Redevelopment Commission of Greensboro (RCG) was held on Wednesday, September 6, 2023, beginning at 5:00 p.m. via Zoom satellite. The following members were present; Vice-Chair Trish Adams, Thomas Sinclair, Pamela Turner, and Stacey Greene. Also present were Councilwoman Nancy Hoffmann (RCG Liaison) and Councilwoman Sharon Hightower. Staff present were Hart Crane, Russ Clegg, and Cari Hopson (Planning Department). Sue Schwartz (Planning Director) and Andrea Harrell (Assistant City Attorney) were also present.

Absent Commissioners: Chair Doug Heberle

Staff requested a motion to add a temporary use agreement for 2115 Everitt Street to the agenda.

Mr. Sinclair moved to add the item on to the agenda; seconded by Ms. Turner.

The Commission voted 3-0 in favor (Ayes: Adams, Sinclair, Turner; Nays: none).

**Approval of Meeting Minutes**

Mr. Sinclair moved to approve the August 2 regular meeting minutes; seconded by Vice Chair Adams.

The Commission voted 3-0 in favor (Ayes: Adams, Sinclair, Turner; Nays: none).

**2022-2023 RCG Annual Report**

Mr. Crane presented on the Redevelopment Commission's annual report, highlighting improvements in the Willow Oaks, Phillips-Lombardy, and Ole Asheboro redevelopment areas. He noted that the majority of the Commission's expenditures for the year stemmed from the demolition of Heritage House.

Mr. Crane asked if the Commission had any questions on the report. Hearing none he asked for a motion to approve the report.

Mr. Sinclair moved to approve the 2022-2023 RCG Annual Report; seconded by Ms. Turner.

The Commission voted 3-0 in favor (Ayes: Vice Chair Adams, Mr. Sinclair, Ms. Turner; Nays: none)

Mr. Greene joined the meeting following the vote.

**1520 McConnell Road Sales Development Agreement Request**

Ms. Hopson presented on the development proposal associated with the sales development agreement (SDA) request for the RCG owned lot at 1520 McConnell Road.

RISA Construction, LLC owns parcels on either side of the subject lot and plans to develop the area for single family homes. Ms. Hopson noted that the subject lot was located in the Willow Oaks redevelopment area and was exceedingly narrow at a width of 32 feet. RISA Construction LLC intends on buying the subject lot and combining it with their adjacent parcels at 1514, 1516, 1518, 1522, 1524 McConnell Road. RISA Construction, LLC gave an initial offer of \$5,000 for the subject lot.

Mr. Crane advised that the subject lot was appraised at \$23,000 based on its existing zoning for residential multi-family. An appraisal based on the zoning of the proposed development, which would be residential single-family, would have been lower.

Ms. Hopson displayed site plans for the proposed single-family homes that would be built on the site.

Salvador Santana, on behalf of RISA Construction LLC, stated that the proposed sales price for their homes (presented as \$265,000-\$280,000) would be closer to \$230,000. He stated that the homes would also reflect the aesthetic of the surrounding neighborhood.

Ms. Hopson presented on the SDA requirements, development timeline, and clarified Mr. Santana's sales offer.

Mr. Greene asked how many properties would be built if the subject lot was sold.

Mr. Santana stated that the subject lot was unbuildable at its current size and that, after purchase, he would integrate it alongside the other five parcels he owns. The six parcels would then be replotted to five parcels (increasing the width of the subject lot), allowing construction of five single family homes.

Mr. Sinclair asked if the five parcels owned by Mr. Santana were similarly priced.

Ms. Hopson stated that they had not appraised those lots since they were sold privately.

Mr. Crane advised that, if zoned similarly to the subject lot, the other five lots would likely have been comparably priced.

Councilwoman Hightower asked how many homes were going to be built.

Ms. Hopson reiterated that five homes would be built.

Ms. Adams asked what the potential build time would be, citing concerns about a drift in sales price by the time of completion.

Mr. Santana stated that, although presented as two years and eight months, he would like to finish the project in a year.

Mr. Greene asked what would happen if the developer lapsed on the agreement's stated build time.

Mr. Crane, noting that the presented build time of two years and eight months was standard for SDAs and not unique to Mr. Santana's development, stated that developers could request a one year extension on build time if necessary (this extension is reflected in the two year and eight month build time).

Mr. Clegg added that there would also be recourse available to reclaim the property should further complications arise.

Commissioner Turner asked for clarification on how the subject lot's width was used to determine the offer of \$5,000 against its appraised value of \$23,000.

Mr. Santana, noting that he had paid \$125,000 for the other five lots, stated that he would incur substantial costs from replotting the parcels after purchasing the subject lot (e.g. surveying and readjusting sewer and water tabs). He stated that, with a larger width, the subject lot may be accurately priced at the appraised value, but with its current dimensions it is unbuildable.

Commissioner Turner suggested that the subject lot was only unbuildable by Mr. Santana's own assessment.

Mr. Santana stated no structure could be built within the subject lot's dimensional requirements, clarifying that the City requires a 10 foot setback on either side of the property, leaving only 13 feet of available construction space.

Mr. Sinclair suggested that Mr. Santana could make up for any lost profit from the sale of the property.

Mr. Clegg reiterated that the subject lot had been appraised based on residential multi-family zoning and that an appraisal based the proposed residential single-family use would have been lower. He added that, the purchase would allow an otherwise unbuildable lot to be developed.

Mumtaz Ameer, on behalf of RISA Construction, LLC, clarified that the subject lot would be combined with the adjacent five parcels and widened.

Councilwoman Hightower asked whether the subject lot could be used for greenspace if it was not sold.

Mr. Santana stated that it could, but cautioned that in its current condition as an undeveloped lot it would not add any value to the surrounding properties. He added that, with the required 10 foot setback on each property, there would already exist a 20 foot buffer of open “greenspace” between proposed developments.

Ms. Schwartz stated that, although the City encourages the development and preservation of greenspace, the subject lot existing as an undeveloped parcel would not serve as functional greenspace. She advised that the subject lot would have a higher community benefit, and be in closer accordance with the goals of the Willow Oaks Plan, if it were developed into housing, noting that there would be little else that could be practically developed or maintained on the site if it was not sold.

Mr. Crane asked if the Commission had any further questions. Hearing none, he requested a motion.

Mr. Sinclair moved to enter a Sales Development Agreement with RISA Construction, LLC for the development of Commission-owned lot located at 1520 McConnell Road. Mr. Greene seconded the motion.

The Commission voted 4-0 in favor (Ayes: Vice Chair Adams, Mr. Sinclair, Ms. Turner, Dr. Greene; Nays: none)

### **2115 Everitt Street Interested Developer Presentation**

Ms. Hopson presented on the proposed development of the RCG owned lot at 2115 Everitt Street. She noted that the subject lot was located within the Willow Oaks redevelopment area and stated that The Housing Tree, a non-profit, in conjunction with JGR Development, the principal developer, planned on building three twin homes on the site. Ms. Hopson displayed a 3D rendering of the proposed development along with site plans.

Mr. Sinclair asked whether the proposed twin homes would have split ownership.

Jeremy Simpson, on behalf of Housing Tree, stated that the properties were twin homes and as such would have split ownership. He clarified that although three structures were being built they would be, in effect, six individual properties.

Mr. Simpson presented on their proposed development and sales offer. He noted that the sales price for the twin homes would be \$235,000 with the build time for the project estimated at 18-24 months. He stated that the total assessed value of the subject lot was \$31,600 and requested a discount of \$15,600, setting the proposed sale price at \$16,000.

Mr. Crane reminded the Commissioners that Mr. Simpson’s presentation was strictly informational at this time.

Mr. Greene asked if there were any restrictions on selling the proposed homes to investors or be rented out.

Ms. Hopson advised that the Willow Oaks redevelopment area has homeownership restrictions that require properties sold to be owner-occupied. She added that, although the subject lot is not currently limited by them, Mr. Simpson would like to place the proposed developments under Willow Oak’s covenants and restrictions based on discussions with the community.

Mr. Sinclair asked how long an owner must live in the property before they can re-sell.

Ms. Hopson stated that the must live in the property for 15 years with a renewal of 10 years until termination.

Mr. Sinclair asked if restrictions on who the property could be sold to apply to subsequent owners.

Ms. Hopson stated that subsequent owners would could not rent out the properties either.

Mr. Crane thanked Mr. Simpson and advised that the Commission should expect an SDA on the subject lot soon.

### **Alexander Homes Limited Partnership – Transfer of Limited Partner Interest Request**

Ms. Harrell spoke on the limited partner interest transfer for the Alexander Homes Limited Partnership (LP). When the project began in 1995, an LP agreement was entered between a general partner (Wynnefield Properties) and a limited partner (WNC) that syndicated tax credits for the project's funding. Now, at the end the tax credit compliance period, the limited partner is requesting to transfer its interests in total to the general partner.

Mr. Crane asked if there were any risks that the Commission should be made aware of regarding this request.

Ms. Harrell stated that there were no risks, adding that the presentation of the item for the Commission's approval is largely a formality.

Mr. Sinclair moved that the RCG approve the signing of a letter dated August 30, 2023 allowing the transfer of limited partner interest in the Alexander Homes Limited Partnership so that the limited partner can exit the deal. Ms. Turner seconded the motion.

The Commission voted 4-0 in favor (Ayes: Vice Chair Adams, Mr. Sinclair, Ms. Turner, Dr. Greene; Nays: none)

### **2115 Everitt Street Temporary Use Agreement Request**

Mr. Clegg presented on a temporary use request by Mr. Simpson for use of the subject lot, noting that Mr. Simpson had just presented on his intent to purchase the site in the future.

Mr. Clegg stated that Mr. Simpson had been building a property at 804 and 806 Green Oaks Street (up the road from the subject lot) and had been using an adjacent undeveloped property at 803 and 805 Clapp Street for staging. With the construction of the property at 804 and 806 Green Oaks finished, he would like to use the subject lot to store dirt during the construction of the property at 803 and 805 Clapp Street.

Mr. Sinclair asked if Mr. Simpson would be storing construction materials on the subject lot.

Mr. Clegg stated that Mr. Simpson would only be storing dirt at the site and that he would likely use another nearby parcel for staging.

Ms. Harrell noted that the language for the suggested motion, as presented, would need to be altered and provided a correction.

Mr. Sinclair moved that staff negotiate a temporary use agreement with JGR Construction that will allow the temporary storage of soil at 2115 Everitt Street as necessary for the construction at 803 and 805 Clapp Street. Mr. Greene seconded the motion.

The Commission voted 4-0 in favor (Ayes: Vice Chair Adams, Mr. Sinclair, Ms. Turner, Dr. Greene; Nays: none)

**Staff Updates**

There were no updates from staff.

**Additional Business**

Mr. Crane stated that there was no additional business and asked if there were any comments from the audience members present for the meeting. Hearing none he requested a motion to adjourn the meeting.

**Adjournment**

Mr. Sinclair made a motion to adjourn the meeting; seconded by Ms. Turner.

The Commission voted 4-0 in favor (Ayes: Vice Chair Adams, Mr. Sinclair, Ms. Turner, Dr. Greene; Nays: none)

There being no further business, the Commission adjourned at 6:30 PM.

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

**October 4, 2023**

A regular meeting of the Redevelopment Commission of Greensboro (RCG) was held on Wednesday, October 4th, 2023, beginning at 5:00 p.m. via Zoom satellite. The following members were present; Chair Doug Heberle, Vice-Chair Patricia Adams, and Thomas Sinclair. Also present was Councilwoman Sharon Hightower. Staff present were Hart Crane, Russ Clegg, and Cari Hopson (Planning Department) and Andrea Harrell (Assistant City Attorney).

Absent: Commissioner Turner

**Approval of Meeting Minutes**

Chair Heberle recused himself from the vote to approve the September 6 regular meeting minutes on account of his absence during that meeting. With only 3 commissioners present, there was no quorum and the vote was moved to the end of the meeting.

Mr. Sinclair made a motion to amend the regular agenda, moving the approval of the September 6 regular meeting minutes until the end of the meeting. Ms. Adams seconded the motion. The Commission voted 3-0 in favor (Ayes: Heberle, Adams, Sinclair; Nays: none).

**Interested Developer in Arlington Park (1401-1402 Plymouth Street)**

Mr. Crane presented briefly on the subject lots, showing their orientation and stating that they were zoned R-3 (Residential Single-family). He then turned the floor to Dorian Carter, the developer interested in the subject lots.

Mr. Carter introduced himself as the CEO of Advanced Wealth Education Corporation, a Charlotte-based non-profit focused on neighborhood and workforce development. He noted that his organization is primarily geared towards providing college students (typically juniors and seniors) with training and entry-level experience in the commercial real estate industry, and added that this is done in combination with the organization's redevelopment work. He spoke briefly on some of the organization's projects, building homes in Charlotte.

Chair Heberle asked if the workforce development element of the program is confined to a practice setting or if it runs parallel to the organization's redevelopment projects.

Mr. Carter stated that students would work in a training environment alongside the organization's staff and experience the full lifecycle of a redevelopment project.

Mr. Sinclair asked if there was any illustrative material of Mr. Carter's proposed development on the subject lots or any of his previous projects.

Mr. Carter stated that he did not have anything on hand but that he would provide relevant material to Mr. Crane for distribution to the Commission.

Councilwoman Hightower, introducing herself as the representative of the area, asked for clarification on Mr. Carter's intention for the subject lots.

Mr. Crane advised that Mr. Carter was looking to purchase and develop the lots for homeownership/sale projects.



Councilwoman Hightower asked if there were any specific design standards for homes in Arlington Park. Mr. Crane stated that there were none, although projects would still have to respect the character of the surrounding neighborhood.

Mr. Carter acknowledged this and noted his experience with developments in historic neighborhoods. He added that his organization's banking relationships and its status as a 501(c)(3) allows it to tap into Community Reinvestment Act funds for any potential projects in the area.

The Commission thanked Mr. Carter for his time.

### **Amendment Request-Willow Oaks RCG & GHDP Agreement**

Mr. Clegg presented on a requested amendment to the agreement between RCG and the Greensboro Housing Development Partnership (GHDP) for properties in Willow Oaks.

Mr. Clegg briefly described the history and function of GHDP, stating that it is a non-profit, operated as a collaborative effort between the City of Greensboro and the Greensboro Housing Authority. It assists RCG in the redevelopment of its properties across the city with a focus on affordable housing. He added that GHDP may only operate in areas that have been agreed upon by RCG (e.g. Willow Oaks, Ole Asheboro).

Mr. Clegg noted that, although it is an independent organization, GHDP's board includes several city officials as voting members, and that he himself serves as secretary for the organization. He stated that the advantage of GHDP to the Commission is that it streamlines the redevelopment process by fielding bureaucratic hurdles and interactions with builders. In this role, it also incurs several fixed costs (e.g. insurance, hiring lawyers, accountants, auditors).

Mr. Clegg explained that when GHDP sells a lot to a builder, the revenue is split between GHDP, the City, and the builder who may receive a reduction in the lot price as part of certain incentive structures. According to a 2010 agreement for GHDP's operation in Willow Oaks, as reimbursement for expenses incurred in performing its obligations (e.g. selling an RCG lot), GHDP receives the greater of either those expenses or \$2,000. Mr. Clegg stated that, due to cyclical fluctuations in the economy and the housing market, GHDP has experienced several budget shortfalls over the years. In the last fiscal year, GHDP sold 10 lots and made at most \$2,000 per lot. After expenses, it was left with a deficit of \$18,266.

In light of a projected deficit of \$20,000 for their next budget, they are requesting an amendment to GHDP's Willow Oaks agreement to increase the amount they can receive as reimbursement from \$2,000 to \$4,000.

Mr. Clegg advised that any change to the revenue split would not harm the Commission, as all City profits in such agreements are retained as part of the general fund and do not go back to RCG accounts.

Chair Heberle asked how much revenue is generated for the Commission by GHDP's sales and if the increase places the Commission in jeopardy of losing money on settlement statements.

Mr. Clegg stated that he did not have exact figures but was confident that with most lots starting at \$15,000 the increase would not result in the Commission running a deficit on a sale.

Ms. Hopson stated that developer incentives can reduce lot prices to a minimum of \$5,000.

Chair Heberle, supposing a lot was sold at the minimum price and that the \$4,000 reimbursement to GHDP left \$1,000 profit remaining, asked if there were any costs associated with the transfer that could exceed that remaining \$1,000.

Mr. Clegg stated that there would not be, adding that GHDP would typically pay for any closing costs.

Councilwoman Hightower, noting her service in the Mayor's role on the board of GHDP, reiterated the criticality of the budget deficit and the need for the reimbursement increase.

Chair Heberle asked if there were any further comments or questions. Hearing none, he requested a motion with added language that would require the fee increase to scale accordingly to keep the Commission from running a deficit on any individual sale.

Mr. Sinclair affirmed and moved to authorize the Chair to sign an amendment to the 2010 agreement between the Redevelopment Commission of Greensboro and the Greensboro Housing Development Partnership changing item 5(c) to increase the fee paid to GHDP from \$2,000 to \$4,000 per lot, with the caveat that the Commission not lose money in the event that the associated fees are more than allotted. Ms. Adams seconded the motion. The Commission voted 3-0 in favor (Ayes: Heberle, Adams, Sinclair; Nays: none).

### **Staff Updates**

Mr. Crane stated that there were no significant staff updates, but noted that without a quorum there would need to be a motion to table the approval of the September 6 regular meeting minutes to the next regular meeting. Mr. Sinclair made a motion, seconded by Chair Heberle. The Commission voted 3-0 in favor (Ayes: Heberle, Adams, Sinclair; Nays: none).

### **Additional Business**

Sidney Gray introduced himself as the co-owner of 741 South Elm Street and requested a \$125 per month increase on the encroachment fee for the subject property. He stated that in 2013 the City encroached on the his property by 24 feet during the construction of the parking lot for the Union Square Campus and was required by court order to pay an encroachment fee in perpetuity. Since 2013 the subject property has been reappraised such that he is now paying 24% more in property taxes. His reason for the request is that this increase had not been reflected in the monthly encroachment fee.

Mr. Gray added that he had requested two encroachment fee adjustments from Mr. Crane in August 2022 and August 2023, both of which were denied. He decided then to bring the issue before the Commission.

Chair Heberle stated the Commission had only been made aware of this issue the day before and that they would need some time to review the relevant documents. He also asked Mr. Gray if he had appealed the evaluations of his property with the taxing authority.

Mr. Gray stated that he had not but may look into it. Chair Heberle stated that he would look into the reason for the tax increase as well.

Mr. Crane noted that the denials referenced by Mr. Gray were not solitary or dismissive actions, adding that they had been discussed in detail with staff and the City Attorney's Office before being delivered.

Chair Heberle stated he would like the Commission to convene with Ms. Harrell to review and discuss the documents before they formally consider Mr. Gray's request.

Ms. Harrell acknowledged and advised that the matter be placed on an agenda for formal consideration during a future meeting.

### **Adjournment**

Mr. Sinclair made a motion to adjourn the meeting, seconded by Ms. Adams. The Commission voted 3-0 in favor (Ayes: Heberle, Adams, Sinclair; Nays: none).

There being no further business, the Commission adjourned at 5:45 pm.

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

**NOVEMBER 1, 2023**

A regular meeting of the Redevelopment Commission of Greensboro (RCG) was held on Wednesday, November 1st, 2023, beginning at 5:00 p.m. via Zoom satellite. The following members were present; Chair Doug Heberle, Vice-Chair Patricia Adams, Thomas Sinclair, Pamela Turner, and Stacey Greene. Also present were Councilwoman Nancy Hoffman (RCG Liaison) and Councilwoman Sharon Hightower. Staff present were Hart Crane, Russ Clegg, Cari Hopson, and Kelly Larkins (Planning Department) and Andrea Harrell (Assistant City Attorney).

**Approval of Meeting Minutes**

Mr. Sinclair moved to approve the October 4 regular meeting minutes; seconded by Vice Chair Adams. The Commission voted 4-0 in favor (Ayes: Heberle, Adams, Sinclair, Turner; Nays: none).

**Amendment Request to South Elm East Block SDA**

Mr. Clegg presented on the Sales Development Agreement (SDA) between RCG and Cagan Properties Management (CPM) concerning the East Block project site of the larger South Elm Redevelopment Area. He advised that this request did not originate from CPM or the development team but noted that they had reviewed and approved the terms of the request. Mr. Clegg added that the request would not slow down the development or closing process on the site.

Mr. Clegg stated that the amendment request concerned the relocation of a cell tower near the property at 508 Arlington Street, on the western end of the subject area.

Mr. Clegg noted that the relocation is not a Commission problem, however, the City has been involved in the relocation of the cell tower and equipment because they wanted to ensure that there would not be a lapse in cell coverage for the area and because the LDO emphasizes the colocation of wireless facilities, where applicable, to limit their density and reduce visual clutter.

Mr. Clegg stated that the cell tower was built as part of a lease agreement between the City and American Tower Company (ATC) that lasted from 1992 until May 14, 2022. The City reminded ATC of the expiration twice (2019, 2021). A 90-day extension was requested in April 2022 and granted, pushing the expiration of the lease agreement to August 14, 2022. At this time language was added to the lease agreement that required ATC to remove the cell tower and clean up the site themselves. Another extension was requested and granted, pushing the expiration until November 12, 2022. At this time the City became more involved in the process and was informed that Verizon (the coverage provider of the tower) was unaware of the issue. A subsequent extension was denied and the agreement entered a holdover period as the City worked with Verizon to relocate the cell tower and equipment.

Access issues prohibited the relocation of the cell tower and equipment to a nearby tower owned by the city. The water tower near the corner of Gorrell Street and Murrow Boulevard was chosen as a secondary site.

Mr. Clegg stated the amendment request is unique in that the relevant parties already have a settled course of action. Verizon has submitted permits to develop the site which are currently under review, and they are prepared to move operations to a temporary platform. Mr. Clegg stated that the City is prepared to contact

ATC to demolish the existing cell tower once the temporary platform is established and coverage is no longer tied to the site.

Mr. Clegg stated that, while the cell tower is being cleared, the development and closing process for the South Elm site will continue as planned.

An extension of no later than April 1, 2024 been granted for the closing of the property.

Chair Heberle thanked CPM for their patience during this process and expressed approval of the firm timeline established for the completion of the project. He invited Bryan Cagan to speak on how the relocation would affect their development timeline,

Bryan Cagan, on behalf of CPM, stated that the relocation will not impact their development timeline and that they would be working on fulfilling their closing requirements in tandem with the negotiation between the City and Verizon.

Chair Heberle asked when construction would begin if they achieved closing on the April 1, 2024 deadline.

Mr. Cagan stated that, after closure, construction is slated to begin in fall 2024.

Ms. Harrell advised that further minor amendments to the SDA would be brought before the Commission in January as it relates to topics brought up during discussion between relevant parties (e.g. who will take title of the property after the relocation, CCRs, etc.)

Chair Heberle asked if there were any further questions from the Commission. Hearing none, he requested a motion.

Mr. Sinclair moved that the Redevelopment Commission of Greensboro approve the third amendment of the Sales Development Agreement with NC Triad South Elm, LLC and South Elm Development Group that changes the closing date from November 30<sup>th</sup> to on or before April 1, 2024. Vice Chair Adams seconded the motion. The Commission voted 4-0 in favor (Ayes: Heberle, Adams, Sinclair, Turner; Nays: none).

Mr. Greene joined following this vote.

### **Staff Updates**

Mr. Crane presented illustrative images of properties built by Dorian Carter, a developer who came before the Commission during its October 4 meeting and expressed interest in developing properties at 1401-1402 Plymouth Street in Arlington Park.

Mr. Crane added that there were some design notes provided by staff based on the images provided, e.g. narrow support columns on the façade of one of the buildings, but he stressed that the structure's compatibility with the surrounding neighborhood and support from residents should be the primary factor for the Commission to consider, adding that residents of Arlington Park will have seen the images by the time Mr. Carter came before the Commission again.

Mr. Crane asked if the Commission had any comments based on the images.

Chair Heberle and Mr. Sinclair agreed with staff notes on the narrow columns and suggested that the design of the structure could be improved.

Chair Heberle asked that Mr. Carter provide additional images of his properties from different angles and that staff also provide comparative images of surrounding properties in Arlington Park.

Councilwoman Hoffman asked what the square footage of the property in the image was.

Mr. Crane advised that the property was 1,200 sqft. He acknowledged that the size was small for a proposed four-bedroom structure and noted that he had informed Mr. Carter of this.

Councilwoman Hoffman suggested that the design could be improved.

Mr. Crane advised the Commission that this was an informational item and that there was no action required. He noted that the Commission's comments would be relayed to Mr. Carter

### **Additional Business**

Kevin Walker introduced himself co-owner of L&K Builder's Inc. and expressed interest in working with the Commission in the future. He presented on properties he has developed and spoke on his experience as a custom home builder.

Mr. Walker indicated that he is still searching for a redevelopment area to focus on and that he will have additional material for the Commission regarding his interests in the coming weeks.

Mr. Crane advised that Mr. Walker has been looking at properties primarily in Ole Asheboro but has not narrowed his search completely.

Vice Chair Adams asked Mr. Walker to speak further on the kinds of homes he typically builds.

Mr. Walker stated that he builds a variety of homes (e.g. two-story, ranch homes, etc.).

Vice Chair Adams asked Mr. Walker how many homes he typically builds in a year.

Mr. Walker stated his most recent properties took 13-15 months to build and noted that the timeline was influenced by changes in material costs as a result of the COVID-19 pandemic. He added that the last four properties he built were selected for the Greensboro Builder's Association Parade of Homes and spoke to their specifications.

Vice Chair Adams, in reference to redevelopment properties, asked Mr. Walker if he would give prospective buyers options in the design of their homes or if he planned to build homes with set specifications.

Mr. Walker stated he was unclear on the specifics of the Commission's development process and how custom homes could be built within that process. He added that he was open to the idea of allowing some choice for potential homebuyers and stressed the importance of quality design and aesthetics.

The Commission thanked Mr. Walker for his time.

### **Adjournment**

Ms. Adams made a motion to adjourn the meeting, seconded by Mr. Sinclair. The Commission voted 5-0 in favor (Ayes: Heberle, Adams, Sinclair, Turner, Greene; Nays: none).

There being no further business, the Commission adjourned at 5:45 pm.