MINUTES OF REGULAR MEETING OF

THE REDEVELOPMENT COMMISSION OF GREENSBORO

TUESDAY, MARCH 16, 2004

REGULAR MEETING

The Redevelopment Commission of Greensboro met in regular meeting in the Planning Conference Room, 3rd Floor, Melvin Municipal Building, Greensboro, North Carolina, on Tuesday, March 16, 2004 at 5:12 p.m. Present were: Jerry Leimenstoll, Nettie Coad and Scott Lilly. Dan Curry and Dyan Arkin represented the Housing and Community Development Department (HCD). Jim Blackwood, Esq., was present as legal counsel for the Commission.

It was decided that Scott Lilly would be the Acting Chair for this meeting.

Acting Chair Lilly called the meeting to order, introduced himself, and welcomed everyone to the meeting. He asked that anyone who wished to speak to come up to the microphone, identify themselves, and give their address.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF NOVEMBER 18, 2003, DECEMBER 16, 2003 AND JANUARY 20, 2004.

Mr. Leimenstoll move approval of the November 18, 2003 minutes as written, seconded by Ms. Coad. The Commission voted 3-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Lilly, Leimenstoll, Coad. Nays: None.)

Mr. Leimenstoll moved approval of the December 16, 2003 minutes as written, seconded by Ms. Coad. The Commission voted 3-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Lilly, Leimenstoll, Coad. Nays: None.)

Mr. Leimenstoll moved approval of the January 20, 2004 minutes as written, seconded by Ms. Coad. The Commission voted 3-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Lilly, Leimenstoll, Coad. Nays: None.)

2. UPDATE FROM SHILOH BAPTIST CHURCH ON DEVELOPMENT PLANS.

Clinton Gravely, architect, 500 Banner Avenue, said he was representing Shiloh Baptist Church. He said he would briefly try to update the Commission on activities during the past year. He outlined the property they acquired from the Redevelopment Commission, together with their existing church and the property they already had. He pointed out where they will add their Family Life Center. He said, based on their schedules, they would start on this at the beginning of 2006. They have divided it into phases and he pointed out where the phases would

be. They are raising funds and are pretty much on schedule as far as the deadlines are concerned. They will come back to the Commission next year and give a further update on the status of the project.

In response to a question from Ms. Coad, Mr. Gravely said they had not been in contact with the community neighborhood recently. They talked to the community earlier about it and nothing has changed since they talked with the community. Of course, the community is not familiar with the phases. He said they did not know for sure themselves until next year as to what is going to be in the first phase.

Ms. Coad added that the impetus for all of this was the property itself and the fact that it had become a hazard in the community. Once they got involved, the property has been cleared and there has been no uprising from the community and it looks good and decent when you ride through.

Mr. Leimenstoll asked staff if there were any other problems with which the Commission should dealing, beyond the schedule of development?

Mr. Curry said normally the Redevelopment Commission has established schedules and the responsibility to review the plans in their final form and actually approve the final development plans. So he would suggest that at whatever point the Church is ready to move forward with a construction project, that the Commission would want to ask them to bring the final plans in for the Commission to review. He said there were probably not any detailed development standards of which he was aware that the Commission has applied to this. He said he guessed they would have to refer back to the original Redevelopment Plan, which probably does not provide a whole lot of guidance for this project.

Mr. Gravely said he thought the only stipulation was that it be a Family Life Center.

Mr. Curry said he thought it would be appropriate for them to bring their plans in and the Commission can say whether it is acceptable and if the Commission has any other issues, the Commission should make the church aware of them. He did not know if the Commission wanted to make it any kind of requirement that they touch base with the community prior to moving forward with the construction.

Ms. Coad said she thought they should find a means of keeping the community informed since it was born out of a community interest.

Mr. Gravely said, as mentioned by Ms. Coad, before they took over this property, there were a lot of problems, not only from the Church's point of view, but also from the neighbors. Some of the community thought the land belonged to the Church to begin with and the Church was being blamed for problems on property that it did not own or control. He knew the problems had stopped and he did not think the City had gotten any complaints since they took over the property. They keep the grass cut and have the entire property patrolled.

Mr. Leimenstoll asked when the Commission reviews a site plan, what would the Commission be looking for? Are there any guidelines relative to this Redevelopment Plan of which they should be aware?

Mr. Curry said he would have to go back to the Plan, which was put in place before his time.

Mr. Gravely said the whole idea was that they have a Family Life Center, something that could be used by the community. That was why they had the Family Life Center and multipurpose room. Even as they set up their phases, they will at least have that multipurpose room to satisfy those requirements that the community could use, as well as the Church.

Mr. Curry said when they did the next update, they would make sure that staff reviews the Redevelopment Plan and make the Commission aware of whatever the development standards are for the area, which he thought was what would apply here. This is the Warnersville Redevelopment Area. So it had development standards as part of that Plan. Staff will also review the transfer documents just to see if there is anything else in there that the Commission needs to be aware of in terms of their performance of the construction work. So staff will make sure they review all that and have it ready when they present their next update.

Mr. Gravely said the next update will be in a year and they should be in a position at that point to know the exact phases that they will be dealing with. From the architect's point of view, they need that last year to finish up the drawings and get it out for bids and that sort of thing.

Acting Chair Lilly said there were some funding problems from before and then there was the discussion that they do something by January of 2006. Mr. Gravely said he did not want to put up an aluminum building, for example, but if that was all they could afford, they would try to do it.

Ms. Coad reminded the Commission that they did not have a pastor at that time and didn't want to take on a huge project without leadership intact.

Mr. Curry said staff would get everything together shortly and if there are any issues that Mr. Gravely needs to know about, staff will let them know early on so that as they work on their design, they will be aware of it. He did not think there was going to be a lot of problems there, but staff will make sure.

Mr. Leimenstoll said he guesses there are two recommendations. One was to make sure that the community is informed and the other one is for staff to make sure that they communicate with Mr. Gravely any things in the Redevelopment Plan that relate to the further development of this project.

GORRELL STREET. UPDATE ON GATE CITY COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION PROPERTIES.

Mr. Curry said this again was just an update on where they were. Back in the late 1990s, the Redevelopment Commission put together some land on Gorrell Street as part of the Gorrell Street Project and worked with the Gate City Community Development Corporation (Gate City CDC) to come up with a development proposal for those properties. The Commission approved the transfer of those properties to the City of Greensboro, which then transferred the properties to Gate City CDC.

Once the corporation received title to the properties, they actually re-subdivided the land into the 6 lots that are out there now, had it rezoned (it was originally commercial) and hired a builder to build 2 homes, which was the first phase of that project. The Commission approved the plans for those homes and they were built, and Gate City CDC sold those houses. That was the extent of the work on that property. They did not move forward with the construction of the other four homes. It is staff's understanding at this time that Gate City CDC is working to basically dissolve or be incorporated into an entity at A&T. So from their conversations, they do not have any intent to develop the properties any further.

The City legal staff is working on a recapture deed to get those properties back, based on non-performance of the requirements of their deed to Gate City. Legal is working on getting that put together and he would hope that maybe in the next 30 days, staff would have accomplished getting those properties back in the name of the City of Greensboro. At that point, staff will probably come back to this Commission and bring a proposal to the Commission as to how to dispose of those properties. Even though it will be in City ownership, staff will probably ask the Commission to review the standards and the process for disposition since it really was this Commission's project. He said he did not know if they would necessarily put the property back in the name of the Commission and sell it or whether it would go straight from the City to another builder.

In response to a question from Ms. Coad, Mr. Curry said the title would be left with the City and it would basically be the same rules and requirements, as far as he could see, in terms of selling the property. The City would have to sell it through a bid situation similar to what the Redevelopment Commission would have to do. He said the City's legal experts would figure out the best method.

In response to a question from Ms. Coad, Mr. Curry said that staff would probably recommend that it be sold as a package of 4 lots to one builder. That would seem to be the direction in which the community wanted to go to get some consistency in design and marketing.

In response to a question from Acting Chair Lilly, Mr. Curry said the Commission had no other properties with Gate City CDC.
Ms. Coad asked if the City and Bennett College completed their arrangements for the Early College trailers?

Mr. Curry said they did put the unit on the lot, built a parking lot, landscaped it and that was pretty much what staff had expected them to do.

Ms. Coad said she was looking for some grand trailer to be put there. She was so sorry; she would not have approved it if she knew how it was going to look.

Mr. Curry said that was a lease agreement and he guessed it would come back up in about a year as it was a 2-year lease. The Commission will have an opportunity to review it at that point.

WILLOW OAKS NEIGHBORHOOD. RECONCILIATION APPRAISAL FOR 2137 McCONNELL ROAD.

Ms. Arkin said the Commission had asked at its January meeting that staff get a reconciliation appraisal because there was a substantial difference the two competing appraisals, the one done for the Commission and the one done for the owner.

Ms. Arkin said that had been done and was in the Commissioners' packets, but there is new information and she would let Barbara tell the Commission what that new information is.

Barbara Harris said John Troxler, who represents the heirs that own the property on McConnell Road, requested that the Commission continue this to the next Commission meeting because his attorney could not be here this afternoon.

Mr. Leimenstoll asked if staff had any reason why the Commission should not do as requested?

Vice Chair Lilly said he was trying to recall the last meeting, but he did not think the Commission was on a time line.

In response to a question from Counsel Blackwood, Ms. Arkin said this matter was not up for mediation or anything else of which she was aware.

Vice Chair Lilly asked what was the purpose for having the attorney present?

Ms. Coad said he came by himself the last time and she did not know that he was fully aware of everything about the property and about the appraisal.

Ms. Arkin said she thought at the last meeting the discussion revolved around the fact that it is in the condemnation process, he is represented by counsel, and as such, his counsel should probably be present at anything that involves the matter.

Mr. Leimenstoll moved that Item 4, reconciliation appraisal for 2137 McConnell Road, be tabled until the April meeting, seconded by Ms. Coad. The Commission voted 3-0 in favor of the

motion. (Ayes: Lilly, Leimenstoll, Coad. Nays: None.)

WILLOW OAKS/HOPE VI. NEIGHBORHOOD UPDATES.

Ms. Arkin said a couple of months ago, as staff was working through the process of getting the Commission's approval to execute a disposition agreement, they had talked about the need for regular updates and the need for more continuity of updates. In light of that, she had taken what is actually already a document that she uses for other updating purposes and she had adjusted it specifically to the Commission to kind of try to address the things in which the Commission is interested and that the Commission will want to be seeing.

Ms. Arkin said the first 3 sections of the update are the standard pieces that she reported to everybody because those are the 3 main responsibilities of the City in this project. The City's responsibilities are to assembly the land, provide for relocation of tenants or owners of those properties in that process, and to work on some of the infrastructure as part of the City's financial commitment. She presented a map for anyone who wanted to look at any specific lot. She pointed out Phase I and Phase II. They are now looking at Phase III, which are the pieces down McConnell and up on English Street. She went over the map and pointed out the different components.

Ms. Arkin went over the update sheet, answering questions of Commissioners and explaining what had been done and what was to be done in each step.

Ms. Arkin said the last section of this document, (which she called: “Current and upcoming activities”) addresses the things that she heard the Commission express interest in and the things that she felt the Commission has a right to address as they come up. These are things in progress that staff is working on. She then went over each bullet point and explained what each meant.

She said she had brought some documents that are not final documents, but she wanted to make sure that there was a good understanding of what types of things they are working on. She presented an example of the Plan Book, which had been reviewed by Greensboro Housing Authority, City staff and the developer, Urban Design Associates, (UDA). She said it becoming very common to do sort of a graphic representation of how you want your community to look and then when you invite people to build in your community, you have something you that says: "These are the standards we expect you to build to." This is a work in progress. When there is a final draft, it will be presented to the Commission for its review.

Acting Chair Lilly suggested that perhaps staff's best estimate of the timing of this project would be helpful. The Commission understands that it is a work in progress, but there are current and upcoming activities and maybe a date range between here and there, next quarter or a year from now. It might not be appropriate to put in the Plan Book, but such information for the Commission would be helpful.

Ms. Arkin said she did intend to give the Commission sort of a time frame so that the Commissioners can get a feel for where they are at any given time.

Ms. Arkin said the conceptual sketches had been reviewed by the Town Architect, who actually works for the City of Greensboro. That is the City's review architect who looks at things in terms of the Master Plan and makes sure that each component fits in with the bigger concept.

Mr. Curry said the Town Architect had an official role because of the traditional name of development zoning and the Traditional Neighborhood Development Plan, which the City has adopted. As a result of that plan, there is the requirement that you have a Town Architect that actually reviews and signs off on each piece of the development. The real requirement is that the project has to pass the Town Architect. The Town Architect uses as a base for making decisions the design standards and the design philosophy that was developed for the project, originally by DPZ. DPZ started out as the Town Architect for this project and for a number of reasons, they chose to step out of the project and so the City has contracted separately with other firms to provide the Town Architect services. Seth Harry will do the multifamily and the community building architectural review. Tony Sease, who is an engineer in Chapel Hill, is providing the Town Architectural review services for the Master Plan and infrastructure design work. One of the things that the City and the whole team that have authority in the developer, are very committed teams, making sure that the design integrity of this project is intact.

Mr. Curry explained that each component had a developer. In the case of the first two tax credit projects and the community building, that developer is Mid City Urban. They hire their own architects. For the first two projects, the architect was Steck & Company. For the third piece, which was the community building, they hired UDA to do the conceptual work and now actually UDA has a separate contract with an architect to do the details. Each developer is responsible for design and construction of their own component completely, start to finish.

In response to a question from Ms. Coad, Ms. Arkin said John Steck, who did the design for the first two projects, was local.

Larry Holt, of the Greensboro Housing Authority, said local builders will do the single-family piece and the builder has not been selected for the community center and childcare.
Mr. Leimenstoll said that as a Commissioner, they are often faced with the situation of talking about at the same meeting Southside, Willow Oaks and MLK. So what he was always trying to do was keep in his mind what the structures of those are relative to one another. Some of the players are the same, many of the players are different and the structure if obviously different too. For Southside, DPZ was the designer and then Nate Bowman became the developer, and he sells off parcels to local builders who will hire their own designers, etc., and they are responsible for each of their particular pieces.

Mr. Leimenstoll continued saying, where they were in MLK was a little different. They have UDA involved, which is UDA involved over here in one role, which is really the role that DPZ played

in Willow Oaks; correct? That basic plan is still at that point.

So in this project, there is a developer for the senior villas; right? And we have a developer for all of the sort of beige units.

Ms. Arkin said the developer was the same for senior villas and the beige units, Mid City Urban. They acted in a dual role for those first 150 units as the Lead Developer, which is sort of a management role, and as the Component Developer, which is the actual hands-on development role.

Mr. Leimenstoll said these were all still operating under the DPZ guidelines. So then they will hire architects to design the individual units?

Ms. Arkin said they had been designed. The villas are built and they did hire Steck to do the other designs. Weaver-Cooke did the construction.

Ms. Arkin said on the red component, the developer would be a company called Crosland Bradsher. They are out of Raleigh. It is a tax credit project and they've hired an architect, Cline Designs, which is an architect with which they work very closely, and they have taken some of their designs, and modified them and customized them for this particular project. Those designs have now been reviewed by the Town Architect, Seth Harry, and they are in that sort of interim process, the design process, where it kind of goes back and forth and the architects work together to try to make it as close to the original concept and as well fit to the bigger picture as possible.

Mr. Leimenstoll said the update and explanations were very helpful.

Mr. Larry Holt said 6 of the former tenants chose to return to the senior villas. The others were given the opportunity to return, but declined. They do have a couple of other site developments that are replacement housing where they do have some former residents who are going in. Those developments are Parkview and Wind Hill, which were two scattered site replacement housing developments.

Ms. Arkin said that for HOPE VI projects, only 20 to 30 percent of the original residents return and some of the projects are much less than that and a few that are much more. She said she had the statistics for Greensboro, but she did not bring them. However, she would furnish that information to the Commission at a future update. She said they were in contact with everyone who came out of Morningside.

Mr. Holt pointed out that there was a "Right to return policy," which was developed by the existing residents who were there at the time. All residents in good standing will be in a priority position to come back. There are standards. You have to be employed or elderly or handicapped to come back, or be participating in the family self-sufficiency or community supported services program, which is designed to provide education, job training, whatever, to

help the residents to become financially self-sufficient. A part of the problem was the concentration of extremely low-income residents in that community. This is to be a mixed income development and rental opportunities are available for families that are participating in the program and are becoming financially self-sufficient. The elderly and handicapped are excluded from these provisions. They also will have homeownership opportunities because they have a number of their residents who have participated in the program that are going to be in a position to become homeowners in the new development. So it was a little distressing with the elderly because the number of seniors that they wanted to come back were saying, "No, I really don't want to move again." They had a number to pass away, they had a number to go into nursing homes and in many cases, the families have said, "No, let's leave them alone. They really don't want to move again." However, the 6 who have come back are very happy and they may have some more of the seniors as they really see the neighborhood grow and develop.

Ms. Arkin said on the homeownership, there would be information on how the subsidies will work and what the proposed mix is and how the different levels of income will be offered opportunities within this area. All of that is part of the homeownership plan and much of that work has been done. It just needs to be packaged into something that is easy to digest and comprehensive with all the pieces together.

Mr. Holt gave some of the history of the neighborhood before HOPE VI was begun.

Mr. Holt also said that homeownership would be market driven and would probably be from 30 percent of area median up to 120 or 150 percent of the area median in terms of the ownership. The rental range will possibly even lower than that on the low end. The single-family homes will be market driven, as will be the rental because they can't tell anybody where to live. They have to choose this neighborhood. There will be a variance in the marketing programs to encourage any and all citizens interested in rental for the opportunity will be there for the full spectrum.

Ms. Arkin said there would be declarations and covenants put in the deeds and all other instruments dealing with this land, from the first developer through the neighborhood associations.

Ms. Arkin said that the commercial/retail center is hoped to be neighborhood commercial. They hope it will be local folks who live near the area having small businesses within it. Again it will be market driven. There may be a CVS or one of the drug stores that come into neighborhoods and build smaller stores. There are a lot of different opportunities that are going to be available. When they reach that point, some of it will be market driven. The developer will have the opportunity to look at the market and see what is a good prospect for success in this particular neighborhood. In the charrettes that were done, they have a lot of public input on what sorts of services are needed.

Mr. Holt said there were many owner residents who came to the original charettes and who have stayed involved in what they want to see come back to the neighborhood and what they do not want to see come back to the neighborhood. They are very much involved.

Ms. Arkin said the original documents from the charettes are the documents that were still guiding the decisions that are being made. Some of those people have moved away, some of them are not coming back to give us their opinion now, but they are carrying their opinions forward as they made decisions. She said they probably would do some more public process for the community building and for the retail. There will be more opportunities to look at what is being developed and what the possibilities are. So definitely, this Commission will be invited to any public process that occurs.

Ms. Arkin said she would add to this document. She might modify the way it looks a little bit so it's easier to read, but she will add some dates and time frames to the different pieces of it, the different activities that are going on. She said if anyone had any suggestions on how to make it better, they should feel free to send those to her or bring them up at the next meeting.

Mr. Curry said there was also a Steering Committee that continues to guide the whole process and the Steering Committee has 3 leaders from the original neighborhood who are still members of the Steering Committee and still very active.

The Commissioners expressed their gratitude for the comprehensive update.

ADDITIONAL BUSINESS

Mr. Curry said as a result of some discussions like this one, and particularly issues that Mr. Lilly has been bringing up for awhile concerning the provision of information on a consistent basis to the Commission, staff has put together a format for publication that they plan to have available starting at the next meeting that staff believes they can do quarterly, and it will give you some basic update information about each neighborhood that we work in so that you can start to have some continuity and look back and see what staff said they were going to do three months ago, what we actually did, establish some time frames and give you some of the information like when we plan to be finished here and we're here. So they have a format for that document and are working on getting some production going so that hopefully by your April meeting, staff will have their first quarterly update available.

Ms. Coad asked Mr. Curry how the Music Garden project was going?

Mr. Curry said they had not worked on the Music Garden property itself. The Asheboro Plan goes to City Council for final public hearing on April 6 and assuming that they give their blessing to that plan, then they start the implementation. For the Music Garden property, they

have the Memorandum of Understanding with the parties, which basically says that we would work together and try and figure out what the design and development of that particular parcel will be. Staff will start that process as soon as they get Council approval of the overall plan.

* * * * * * * *

There being no further business before the Commission, the meeting was adjourned at 6:27 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Dan Curry, Assistant Secretary
Greensboro Redevelopment Commission

DC/jd.ps