

HIGH POINT COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE MEETING

Tuesday, February 3, 2026 - 4:00 PM

Municipal Office Building

211 S. Hamilton Street

High Point, NC 27260

Community Development Committee - Council Member Tyrone Johnson, Chair

CALL TO ORDER

Chair Johnson called the Meeting of the High Point Community Development Committee to order at 4:00 p.m. and stated the following members were present. He noted that Council Member Dr. Patrick Harman was also in attendance.

Present: Chair Tyrone Johnson, Council Member Tim Andrew, Council Member Vickie McKiver, Council Member Chris Williams

PRESENTATION OF ITEMS

2026-29

Guilford County Homelessness Task Force Update

Staff from the Guilford County Government will provide an update on the Guilford County Homelessness Task Force.

Thanena Wilson, Community Development and Housing Director, introduced Natalie Craver, Assistant County Manager for Successful People with Guilford County Government, to provide an update on the Guilford County Homeless Task Force. Ms. Craver also introduced Debbie Radelin, the new Homeless Services Director for Guilford County, noting she began approximately two weeks prior.

Ms. Craver provided a history and overview of the Homelessness Task Force, explaining it was created to foster interlocal collaboration across Guilford County, High Point, and Greensboro to address homelessness and housing instability. She stated discussions began in 2022, with the task force formally established in October 2022. Ms. Craver referenced ARPA resources and indicated she would provide the committee with a handout describing how \$1 million in ARPA funding was allocated, including awards to High Point community organizations connected to the Continuum of Care.

She noted the task force engaged CSH, a national technical assistance provider, to develop a community-wide strategic plan aligned with the NC 504 Continuum of Care. She stated the NC 504 strategic plan was adopted by the task force in September 2025 and includes six priority areas: governance, partnerships, performance, culture and communication, programs and initiatives, and funding. She explained that the current focus is the funding priority area as jurisdictions enter their annual budget cycles and consider shared funding approaches to support implementation of the plan.

Ms. Craver discussed the current state of coordination, including that there are no cross-jurisdictional agreements at this time. She noted Guilford County has an existing Memorandum of Understanding with the NC 504 Continuum of Care supporting the County's role as the collaborative applicant and described Guilford County's recent role as the HMIS lead to support countywide data management.

She presented funding snapshots showing current investments across High Point, Greensboro, Guilford County, and the NC 504 Continuum of Care. She stated High Point currently contributes approximately \$250,000 locally to homelessness-related services in addition to federal funding. She noted that the total combined federal and local investments across Guilford County were presented as approximately \$13.6 million. She reviewed federal sources such as HOME and CDBG and summarized that High Point's funding profile includes approximately \$450,000 in HOME, approximately \$900,000 in CDBG, and approximately \$1.6 million in local investment.

Ms. Craver reviewed local investment categories and examples, including eviction mediation, winter and summer shelter, an Oakwood CDC day room, and other homelessness-related services. She discussed Goal 6 of the strategic plan, which focuses on leveraging municipal, county, and partner interests to reduce homelessness through a shared funding strategy, including the potential development of a mutual aid fund or pooled funding structure.

She provided a comparison of current contributions as a proportion of property tax rates and stated the jurisdictions currently contribute at different rates. She explained the task force has explored scenarios such as a quarter-cent contribution and other potential methodologies, noting that no final methodology or uniform rate has been determined. She identified priority needs discussed in the strategic plan, including strengthening coordinated entry and a unified crisis intake line, street outreach, family shelter capacity and bed availability, capital facility investments, emergency shelter capacity for single adults, and permanent supportive housing. She noted permanent supportive housing was described as at risk due to recent federal changes to the Notice of Funding Opportunity.

Ms. Craver concluded by outlining next steps, including evaluating funding needs and gaps, exploring what a mutual aid or pooled funding structure could look like, and considering interlocal agreements, funding allocation and budget management, award strategy, contracts and performance management, and continuous quality improvement.

Questions were asked regarding whether data exists showing where individuals experiencing homelessness originate within Guilford County and whether a breakdown is available that aligns with general population distribution across jurisdictions. Ms. Craver responded that she did not have that data available during the meeting and stated that improved data is one reason the task force is working toward a stronger coordinated entry process. She noted that individuals and families may be transient, and the task force intends to lean on existing information while improving data collection going forward.

A question was asked regarding whether there is a recommended contribution amount for jurisdictions or whether the funding level is still to be determined. Ms. Craver stated the task force has discussed developing a model that reflects each community's needs while also creating parity across contributions. She indicated current funding levels are insufficient to fully meet the needs identified in the strategic plan and stated the specific amount needed is not yet defined. She noted the task force has modeled what revenue could be generated under different property tax scenarios but has not established a required contribution level.

A question was asked about the contribution rates being discussed and whether High Point specific homelessness figures could be used to help determine an acceptable contribution level. Ms. Craver stated a key next step will be to review data and continue evaluating figures between now and July to help determine what contribution rate makes the most sense. She noted that comparing property tax rates is a starting point for the conversation but not necessarily an apples to apples comparison due to differing tax bases and other factors.

A question was raised regarding whether the local funding figure presented includes the City's nonprofit allocations. Greg Ferguson, Deputy City Manager, responded that the figure captures allocations to nonprofits that relate to homeless services within the categories presented and clarified that some federal resources available to Greensboro are not available to High Point. He further explained the local figure represents the total of local funds used for homelessness related services shown in the funding breakdown and referenced categories such as eviction mediation, winter and summer shelter, and the Oakwood CDC day room.

A comment was offered that the City's contribution level was a good start and that additional data would be helpful.

A question was asked requesting clarification on federal versus local sources shown in the funding slide and which items are considered federal. Ms. Radelin clarified that sources such as CDBG, HOME, HOPWA, and ESG are federal sources or state pass-through funds and that the local line represents local funding. A follow-up question was asked regarding whether federal amounts are allocated by population. Ms. Radelin responded that federal dollars are based on community need and size, including factors such as poverty and homelessness. Ms. Radelin stated the Point in Time Count had been conducted the prior Thursday night and data was still being collected, which would help provide clearer information on sheltered and unsheltered counts and where individuals are located at the time of counting.

A question was asked regarding whether the task force connects to outside agencies and best practices beyond local coordination and whether strategies from other jurisdictions are reviewed. Ms. Craver stated best practices are reviewed through national and state conferences and other research, while noting differences in funding structures, policy environments, and governmental frameworks across countries and jurisdictions.

A question was asked regarding how unsheltered individuals are counted and whether known areas such as parking lots are checked. Ms. Radelin described the Point in Time Count process, including outreach teams, coordination with law enforcement, identifying known encampments and hotspots, and conducting counts overnight and into the next day to improve capture of unsheltered individuals. She also noted that under HUD standards, families staying in hotels are generally not counted as homeless unless they are sleeping in cars.

Concerns were raised about broader system challenges affecting homelessness response, including changes in provider capacity, shelter availability, and the sustainability of volunteer-driven structures. Ms. Radelin responded by describing the Continuum of Care as a HUD mandated entity required for receiving funding and noted that a broad stakeholder board, including jurisdictions that make funding decisions,

supports stronger outcomes. Ms. Craver added that models differ across jurisdictions and stated that the shared strategic plan places Guilford County, High Point, and Greensboro in a strong position to operationalize shared priorities and reduce duplication.

A question was asked regarding shelter availability for women and families. Ms. Craver stated that shelter capacity for families and women with children is identified as a priority in the strategic plan and noted the need to assess capacity and demand while supporting rapid transitions from shelter to permanent housing.

Chair Johnson thanked the presenters for the update and presentation.

2026-28

Local Codes Enforcement Strategic Plan Update

Staff will provide a local codes enforcement strategic plan update for the period July 1–December 31, 2025.

Kaylie Parrish, Code Enforcement Manager, provided an update on the Local Code Strategic Plan as part of the City's 2024–2027 Strategic Plan. One of the primary goals for Code Enforcement under the Strategic Plan is fostering a resilient community. The objective of this goal is to improve community character and reduce blight through targeted code compliance initiatives, proactive enforcement in high priority areas, partnerships with local nonprofits and businesses to support property improvement projects, and streamlined enforcement processes through enhanced interdepartmental coordination and expedited legal actions for repeat offenders.

Progress toward the resilient community goal is measured through key performance indicators, including the number of code compliance cases resolved, average response time to reported violations, and the number of blighted properties rehabilitated or demolished.

During the reporting period from July through December 2025, staff handled a total of 119 minimum housing cases. Of those cases, 35 were city initiated and 84 were initiated through citizen complaints. Zoning enforcement activity included a total of 328 cases, with 208 city initiated cases and 120 citizen complaints. Public nuisance activity totaled 984 cases, with 473 city initiated and 511 initiated through citizen complaints.

Public nuisance case outcomes were explained using the current case status categories within the City's enforcement software. A total of 160 cases were abated by the City, 421 cases were corrected by the property owner, and 371 cases were closed with no violation. Cases closed with no violation may include situations where no ordinance violation was found or where the concern was aesthetic in nature and not enforceable under City ordinance, such as complaints related to toys in yards. Two cases were closed as duplicate entries due to an existing active case already on file. Twenty-two cases were closed as invalid, which may occur when an incorrect address is provided or a notice of violation was issued without valid violations listed. Four cases were closed after invoices were paid, indicating the City corrected the violations and the property owner paid prior to lien filing. Four cases remain in progress, with property owners demonstrating consistent compliance efforts during re-inspections.

Zoning compliance outcomes included 214 cases brought into compliance, 74 cases closed with no violation, 27 cases currently incurring civil penalties, and six cases actively progressing toward compliance. Two zoning cases were closed as duplicates and five were closed as invalid.

Minimum housing activity was also reviewed. For the July through December reporting period, 12 cases were closed following owner repairs, and 78 cases were closed with no violation. Cases closed with no violation in minimum housing may include complaints related to mold, which Code Enforcement is not authorized to inspect under state licensing requirements and which are not directly addressed within the minimum housing ordinance. Two cases were closed as duplicate entries, two cases were closed as invalid, and 25 cases remain in various stages of the enforcement process. These include newer complaints still under review, cases in order enforcement where property owners are actively working toward compliance, and situations where owners are in the process of evicting tenants prior to making repairs.

For the full period from January through December, 12 housing units were demolished either by the property owner or through Code Enforcement action, with four of those demolitions completed directly by Code Enforcement. During that same period, 117 housing cases were rehabilitated by property owners.

Response time continues to be a key performance indicator, and staff reported that Code Enforcement typically responds within 24 hours of a complaint being issued.

An example of a successful rehabilitation was presented. The property received a certificate of occupancy on February 11, 2025. The property had been purchased in September 2024 for \$75,000 and, following substantial repairs, was sold in May 2025 for nearly \$200,000. The property is currently occupied by the new owner. Photographs showed the condition of the property prior to rehabilitation, including rotted floor joists, lack of subflooring, outdated kitchen fixtures, the presence of a kerosene heater, and deteriorated flooring. Post rehabilitation photos demonstrated a full interior and exterior renovation. At the time of the presentation, the property's tax value remained at \$40,600 but was expected to increase during the upcoming reevaluation period.

A question was asked regarding whether the rehabilitated property was sold to a family or an investor. Staff responded that the initial resale was to an investment company, which subsequently sold the property to an individual owner rather than a business entity.

2026-25

Consideration of a Demolition Ordinance - 1211 South Downing Street

City Council is requested to consider the attached Ordinance to demolish the single-family dwelling located at 1211 South Downing Street and authorize the appropriate City Official(s) to execute all necessary documents.

Kaylie Parrish, Code Enforcement Manager, presented the item. She stated that the complaint notice of hearing for the property was held on February 6, 2019. An order to repair or demolish was issued on February 7, 2019, with a compliance deadline of March

7, 2019. As of January 26, 2026, no repairs have been completed and no permits have been obtained to repair or demolish the dwelling.

Ms. Parrish explained that this is an older case dating back to 2019 and provided a timeline to clarify the history of enforcement activity. From January 2019 through January 2021, the property was occupied by tenants. According to inspector notes, some repairs were made during that period, but not enough to bring the property into compliance and close the case. From January 2021 through September 2022, the previous owner remained in contact with the inspector while attempting to secure a contractor to complete the repairs, and the property was vacated during that timeframe.

In September 2022, the property was sold to the current owner. In October 2022, the current owner contacted Code Enforcement and indicated plans to demolish the structure using DH Griffin. From October 2022 through March 2024, the owner continued to assure staff that demolition was forthcoming. From March 2024 through February 2025, no demolition permits were obtained. During that period, the owner remained in intermittent contact with the inspector and continued to state that they were waiting on DH Griffin to proceed with the demolition.

Ms. Parrish reviewed a site map showing the location of the property and shared photographs documenting existing conditions. Exterior photos showed broken windows, including a broken window on the side of the structure, and roof deterioration, particularly toward the rear of the home. Interior photos showed broken glass, deteriorating floor coverings, moisture issues along interior walls, incomplete patchwork repairs, missing sheetrock, missing light fixtures, and exposed areas near the water heater. The structure was described as remaining in substantially the same deteriorated condition.

A question was asked regarding the roof configuration. Ms. Parrish noted that the front of the property appears to have a standard shingle roof while the rear portion appears to have a tin roof.

A motion was made by Chair Johnson, seconded by Council Member Andrew, to approve agenda item 2026-25.

Motion passed with the following vote:

Aye: Chair Johnson, Council Member Andrew, Council Member McKiver, and Council Member Williams

Nay: None

2026-32

Consideration of a Demolition Ordinance - 514 West Ward Avenue

City Council is requested to consider an Ordinance to Demolish the single-family dwelling located at 514 West Ward Avenue and authorize the appropriate City Official(s) to execute all necessary documents.

Kaylie Parrish, Code Enforcement Manager, presented the item. She stated that the complaint notice of hearing was held on November 7, 2022. An order to repair or demolish was issued on November 8, 2022, with a compliance deadline of December 8,

2022. As of January 26, 2026, no repairs have been completed and no permits have been obtained to repair or demolish the dwelling.

Ms. Parrish provided a timeline to clarify the history of the case. From October 2022 through October 2023, the property owner informed the inspector that the property was in the process of being sold. The current owner is an LLC. In April 2024, the property owner requested an extension prior to additional civil penalties due to involvement in a legal case. Ms. Parrish noted that the owner holds other properties within the City of High Point. In April 2025, a property sale was reportedly in progress but ultimately fell through. Staff noted that contact with the property owner has been very limited, and the last communication occurred during an on-site meeting to document property conditions. At that time, the owner acknowledged that the structure should be demolished but did not provide a demolition plan or timeline.

Ms. Parrish reviewed a site map and photographs of the property. Exterior photos showed the structure boarded up with vegetation growing from the gutters and exposed or hanging electrical components on the side of the home. Additional photos showed deterioration to the rear of the structure. Interior photos indicated significant disrepair, including accumulated trash, missing plumbing components, deteriorated flooring, removed electrical fixtures, holes in walls, damaged carpeting, and evidence of water intrusion. Damage to the ceiling and sheetrock was visible, particularly near the front bedroom and rear entry, where forced entry appeared to have occurred prior to the property being secured.

A question was asked regarding the property tax status for this property as well as the previous property. Ms. Parrish confirmed that the properties are current on taxes.

A motion was made by Chair Johnson, seconded by Council Member McKiver, to approve agenda item 2026-32

Motion passed with the following vote:

Aye: Chair Johnson, Council Member Andrew, Council Member McKiver, and Council Member Williams

Nay: None

2026-30

Land Use Incentive Grants Presentation

Staff will provide an overview of Land Use Incentive Grants for affordable housing.

Thanena Wilson, Community Development and Housing Director, provided a presentation regarding land use incentive grants as part of the City's ongoing development of its housing implementation strategy. She explained that staff is researching funding tools and mechanisms used by other communities, particularly in the affordable housing and homelessness arenas, and that some of the strategies being explored have come from Council input as well as staff research. The purpose of the

presentation was to share information about land use incentive grants that had been forwarded to staff for further review.

Ms. Wilson explained that a land use incentive grant is a local government incentive structured as a grant that rewards a developer for delivering a defined public benefit tied to land use. These grants are typically designed as pay-for-performance incentives. Rather than providing a tax exemption by default, the local government issues the grant only after the public benefit has been verified.

She reviewed common forms of land use incentive grants, including incremental property tax rebates in which taxes are paid and then rebated as a grant, fee grants or rebates for items such as permits, plan review, and water and sewer connections, and reimbursements for eligible costs tied to specific performance milestones.

Ms. Wilson outlined typical public benefits associated with land use incentive grants, including affordable or workforce housing with income-restricted units and long-term affordability covenants, location-based outcomes such as transit-oriented development or proximity to job access and amenities, and community priorities identified in the City's housing needs assessment, including rehabilitation projects, mixed-income developments, and housing for special needs populations.

She explained that local governments use these incentive grants because they allow for targeted outcomes such as specific area median income bands, geographic locations, or affordability terms. The grants can be structured using a transparent scoring rubric tied to an application process, which creates a predictable and consistent framework for staff, developers, and the public. She noted that land use incentive grants leverage private capital and other subsidies such as Low Income Housing Tax Credits, can be paired with zoning tools like density bonuses and expedited review, improve project feasibility for mixed-income or income-restricted developments, are often paid annually after stabilization and compliance verification, and signal local commitment that can strengthen other funding applications.

Ms. Wilson described the general structure of a land use incentive grant, noting that a developer constructs or rehabilitates a project and, once the project reaches certificate of occupancy or stabilization, the property is reassessed at its improved value. The developer pays the applicable taxes or fees with no automatic exemption. The City verifies compliance through documentation such as rent rolls and confirmation that affordability covenants and reporting requirements are in place. The City then pays the incentive grant, often on an annual basis pursuant to an agreement with the developer. She emphasized that this approach keeps the property on the tax rolls, ties public subsidy to verified outcomes, allows the City to pause or adjust future payments if compliance lapses, and improves transparency by clearly identifying the grant value on an annual basis.

Ms. Wilson further explained that scoring rubrics can be structured so that points equate to funding levels. Factors that may receive additional points include lower income targets such as households at 50 percent or 30 percent of area median income, longer affordability terms such as 30 years versus 15 years, unit mix including bedroom count and accessibility, proximity to transit, schools, grocery stores, and job centers, alignment with adopted plans such as the Comprehensive Plan, leveraging of additional funding sources including Low Income Housing Tax Credits and federal programs, and projects

servicing displaced residents or special populations such as permanent supportive housing.

Ms. Wilson shared an example from the City of Asheville's land use incentive grant policy. In the example, a property with a current assessed value of approximately \$1.6 million generated about \$6,600 in annual property taxes. After project completion, the estimated assessed value increased to approximately \$14.5 million, resulting in an estimated annual property tax of \$58,504. The annual land use incentive grant was calculated as the difference between the pre- and post-development tax amounts, resulting in an annual grant of approximately \$52,000. Over a 15-year period, this equated to a total land use incentive grant of approximately \$778,000 to \$800,000.

She also described an example from the Town of Carrboro, which has a land use and building permit fee waiver policy for affordable housing projects. Under that policy, development and building permit fees are waived, excluding engineering fees, provided the waiver directly benefits low- to moderate-income occupants over a sustained period of time, the project is funded or subsidized by a governmental or qualifying nonprofit entity that guarantees long-term affordability, and the waiver aligns with the goals and objectives of the Town's affordable housing plan. Ms. Wilson noted that Carrboro uses its affordable housing special revenue fund to reimburse the waived fees. She added that while Asheville's policy requires a funding source for the incentive grant, it does not specifically identify a dedicated revenue source such as a bond.

A comparison was raised to tax increment financing, noting similarities in the use of increased future tax revenue, though it was clarified that land use incentive grants are not true tax increment financing but may resemble a synthetic structure. Reference was made to the Catalyst Stadium District as an example of using increased tax revenues within a defined area to support debt service for public improvements.

Ms. Wilson responded to questions regarding scoring rubrics, explaining that they primarily benefit developers by clearly identifying priorities and allowing applicants to structure projects to maximize points, similar to the Qualified Allocation Plan used for Low Income Housing Tax Credits. She noted that while the rubric benefits developers, it ultimately helps the City achieve its desired housing outcomes.

Additional discussion addressed whether developers had been engaged regarding these approaches. Ms. Wilson stated that while formal discussions had not yet occurred, staff is developing the housing strategy and is working on short-term surveys to gather feedback from both for-profit developers and nonprofit housing partners regarding what tools and incentives would assist development in High Point.

Council members discussed broader policy changes in other communities and acknowledged that incentives do not guarantee housing development success. Ms. Wilson agreed and noted that best practices must be evaluated in the context of each community's character and resources. She stated that pilot programs are often used to test approaches and that staff will continue evaluating strategies that may be effective for High Point as part of the housing implementation strategy.

Chair Johnson thanked Ms. Wilson for the presentation.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business to come before the Community Development Committee, the meeting adjourned at 5:05 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Tyrone Johnson, Chairman

Attest:

Sandra Keeney, City Clerk