

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

**JANUARY 07, 2026**

A regular meeting of the Redevelopment Commission of Greensboro (RCG) was held on Wednesday, January 07, 2026, beginning at 5:30 p.m. via Zoom satellite. The following members were present; Chair Patricia Adams, Vice-Chair Thomas Sinclair, Stacey Greene, Patrick Lineberry, and Valerie Vincent. Staff present were Russ Clegg, Kelly Larkins, Hart Crane, and Christa Jordan (Planning Department) and James Dickens (Senior Assistant City Attorney).

Absent Commissioners: Pamela Turner (term expired 01/06/2025)

The Commission entered a Closed Session to consult with the Commission's Attorney, pursuant to NCGS 143-318.11(a)(3) concerning case number 17 CVS 8523 in the Guilford County Superior Court concerning the following parties: (1) Heritage House Homeowners Association, Inc; (2) Meridian Conventions LLC d/b/a Meridian Convention Center; (3) West Town Bank & Trust; (4) Neil Reality Co.; (5) Guilford County, NC; and (6) City of Greensboro. Also discussed was case number 21 CVS 9622 in the Guilford County Superior Court concerning the following parties: (1) Meridian Conventions LLC d/b/a Meridian Convention Center; (2) West Town Bank & Trust; (3) Neil Reality Co.

**Approval of Meeting Minutes**

When the Commission returned from Closed Session Vice-Chair Sinclair made a motion to approve the December 2025 regular meeting minutes. Commissioner Vincent seconded the motion.

The Commission voted 5-0 in favor (Ayes: Adams, Sinclair, Greene, Lineberry, Vincent; Nays: none).

**Staff Updates**

Mr. Clegg reported that City Council approved the Sales Development Agreement (SDA) for the East Block of the South Elm Redevelopment Area at its most recent meeting. He advised that execution of the agreement is underway and that Chair Adams should expect a DocuSign request in the coming days.

Mr. Clegg then presented on how budgets and funding operate within redevelopment areas. He advised that funding is made available on a project-by-project basis and depends on eligibility under applicable local, state, and federal programs. He described funding considerations both by project type and by funding source.

He noted that much of the Commission's work involves housing and neighborhood development. Developers often assemble a capital stack that includes local or federal subsidies in combination with private financing. These may include HOME funds paired with Low-Income Housing Tax Credits. Staff reviews proposals for financial feasibility, including developer pro formas, which may be refined as projects progress.

Mr. Clegg further explained that some assistance occurs on the buyer side, such as first-time homebuyer programs. Properties within redevelopment areas are eligible for enhanced assistance compared to non-redevelopment areas. He clarified that this benefit does not represent direct funding from the Commission but is an incentive associated with 'redevelopment' designation.

He discussed funding for project components that serve a public purpose, such as sidewalks, public parking, or site preparation. He emphasized that public funds must benefit the general public and cannot be used to

subsidize a specific developer once a development interest has been established. Site preparation and infrastructure may be funded when they improve general marketability rather than directly supporting a private project.

Mr. Clegg explained that revenue from projects funded with city funds returns to the City's General Fund, while revenue generated from projects funded with federal sources, such as Community Development Block Grants, becomes program income and must be expended prior to newer allocations.

Mr. Clegg reviewed common funding sources, including HOME funds, which are limited to housing and subject to strict income and affordability requirements, and Community Development Block Grants, which cannot be used directly for housing construction but may support a wide range of eligible activities that meet national objectives. He noted that the South Elm development proposal includes HOME funds as part of its capital stack, to be combined with Low-Income Housing Tax Credits and private capital.

He explained that use of Community Development Block Grant funds triggers extensive federal compliance requirements, including wage standards and income restrictions on future occupants. While income limits are typically lower, redevelopment areas may allow higher limits to encourage income diversity. Mr. Clegg provided the Willow Oaks community space as an example of CDBG-funded planning and potential infrastructure investment and cautioned about timeliness requirements associated with these funds.

Mr. Clegg also discussed local funding sources, including Nussbaum housing funds administered by Housing and Neighborhood Development and bond funds approved in 2016 for South Elm and Old Asheboro. He provided examples of bond-funded infrastructure projects intended to improve neighborhood amenities and development readiness.

Mr. Clegg concluded by explaining the environmental review process required for projects using HUD funds. He stated that environmental reviews evaluate potential impacts such as noise, historic resources, floodplains, wetlands, endangered species, and hazardous materials. These reviews are intended to prevent negative impacts on neighborhoods and often require finalized development plans and coordination with state and federal agencies. Mr. Clegg noted that environmental findings may affect project timelines and costs.

Chair Adams asked whether most properties are acquired using bond funds. Mr. Clegg responded that while bond funds are occasionally used, most properties have historically been acquired using Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) funds, with some use of local bond or Nussbaum funds. He cited the Eastside Park property as an example, where CDBG funds were used to acquire and demolish a blighted apartment complex, satisfying the applicable national objective. He explained that, absent additional federal funding, the property may now be marketed without repeating the environmental review process.

Chair Adams asked how decisions are made regarding which properties to acquire. Mr. Clegg explained that redevelopment plans require certification of blight levels, with review by Planning and Zoning, the Redevelopment Commission, and City Council. As part of that process, an acquisition list is developed, authorizing negotiation with property owners. He noted that Heritage House was the most recent redevelopment area and required acquisition of all properties due to demolition needs. He further explained that acquisitions in South Elm were completed through negotiated purchases rather than eminent domain.

Chair Adams confirmed that the City prioritizes negotiated purchases over condemnation. Mr. Clegg affirmed this approach and noted that few new redevelopment areas have been established in recent years, aside from Heritage House and the Hampton School site.

Chair Adams asked how redevelopment opportunities typically arise. Mr. Clegg responded that redevelopment efforts generally occur at the direction of City Council, often when a specific problem or opportunity is identified, such as the Hampton School site.

Mr. Larkins introduced a discussion regarding the handling of developer offers for Commissioned owned lots, and explained that while staff currently manages these situations, there has been some discussion of shifting greater responsibility to the Commission.

Mr. Crane elaborated on the proposal. He described the concept of a rotating subcommittee comprised of two Commissioners that would meet in advance of regular meetings to review discounted offers. Commissioners would serve for defined terms rather than indefinitely. He explained that developers requesting a reduced purchase price on Commission owned lots would be required to submit written justification, site information, and a simplified preliminary budget.

Mr. Crane stated that the purpose of the subcommittee would be to provide Commissioners with additional time and information prior to formal action, and to reduce the perception that staff advocate for individual developers. He emphasized that formation of the subcommittee is optional and subject to Commission approval. He added that a brief survey would be distributed to gauge interest, willingness to serve, and preferred meeting time.

Vice-Chair Sinclair asked what tools staff currently uses to evaluate developer bids. Mr. Crane responded that staff relies on professional experience, internal review, consultation with inspectors and the Neighborhood Development Department, and general assessments of cost reasonableness. He noted that Commissioners themselves bring subject-matter expertise and may request additional staff analysis as needed.

Vice-Chair Sinclair asked whether Commissioners would engage developers directly prior to meetings. Mr. Crane explained that communication would typically occur through staff, with project managers serving as intermediaries. He clarified that the proposed subcommittee would not function as a forum for developer presentations.

Mr. Clegg added that detailed financial scrutiny is generally unnecessary unless a developer requests a reduction from the appraised price. In such cases, staff and Commissioners would assess whether costs and assumed developer fees are reasonable, recognizing that more complex projects may require greater analysis.

Vice-Chair Sinclair suggested developing a standardized checklist to evaluate development costs and assumptions. Mr. Crane agreed that such a tool could be developed and reiterated that the subcommittee would convene only for discounted offers. He noted that land values have increased significantly in recent years, resulting in larger gaps between appraised values and developer offers.

Further discussion addressed rising appraisals, long-term holding and maintenance costs, affordability requirements, and uncertainty related to construction costs, inflation, and interest rates.

Chair Adams noted that acquisition and maintenance costs could be considered when evaluating reduced-price offers. Mr. Crane acknowledged that while maintenance costs historically exceeded land value in some cases, this is increasingly less true as property values rise.

Mr. Larkins announced that Commissioner Turner has resigned due to personal circumstances. Her service to the Commission was acknowledged. He explained that the resignation creates an opening for a new Commissioner position as well as alternate appointments, noting that recent turnover in the Clerk's Office may affect timing of the appointment process.

Chair Adams asked whether Commissioner Vincent would move from alternate to full Commissioner. Mr. Larkins confirmed that Commissioner Vincent is now a full Commissioner, leaving two alternate positions available.

## **Administrative Updates**

Mr. Larkins reminded Commissioners to complete Code of Conduct forms, explaining that this longstanding requirement is now being enforced at the request of the City Attorney. Commissioners were advised that forms may be completed via DocuSign or by signing and scanning, with submission requested by the end of the week.

Mr. Clegg and Ms. Jordan provided a final update that the Brownfields Agreement for the West Eugene Street property has been fully certified by the state, allowing the property to be marketed.

Mr. Larkins announced that the February meeting will be held in person in Council Chambers, with the September meeting also planned as an in-person meeting.

Adjournment

### **Additional Business**

N/A

### **Adjournment**

Vice-Chair Sinclair made a motion to adjourn the meeting. Ms. Vincent seconded the motion.

The Commission voted 5-0 in favor (Ayes: Adams, Sinclair, Greene, Lineberry, Vincent; Nays: none).

There being no further business, the Commission adjourned at 7:00