

CITY COUNCIL WORK SESSION
Tuesday, August 29, 2017 6:00 p.m.
Community Recreation Center
10640 N Clubhouse Drive, Cedar Hills, Utah

Present: Mayor Gygi, Presiding
Councilmembers: Denise Andersen, Ben Bailey, Mike Geddes, Jenney Rees,
Daniel Zappala (6:04 p.m.)
Chandler Goodwin, City Manager
Charl Louw, Finance Director
Greg Gordon, Recreation Director
Jeff Maag, Public Works Director
David Shaw, City Attorney
Colleen Mulvey, City Recorder
Others: Lt. Gregg Ludlow, Craig Gardner, Reed Bromley, Scott Powell

This work session of the City Council of the City of Cedar Hills, having been properly noticed, was called to order at 6:01 p.m. by Mayor Gygi.

Discussion on St. Andrews Estates

Mayor Gygi stated that the Council needed to start having a discussion on what the City would like to do regarding St. Andrews Estates. He turned the time over to Craig Gardner.

Craig Gardner said that in speaking with Mayor Gygi and City Manager, Chandler Goodwin, they had discussed different possibilities for developing the vacant property near Harts. One idea that surfaced through those meetings was a controlled storage complex. However, Mr. Gardner said he didn't feel that would be the best commercial use of that property and he alternatively suggested the St. Andres Estates for this particular use. He mentioned having previously lived in Cedar Hills and having served as the Planning Commission Chair and Little League President. Mr. Gardner said that when he was on the Planning Commission they came up with the design guidelines that remained intact today. At the time those guidelines were determined; the Commission's intent was for future development in the City to be uniform. When determining ways in which to develop St. Andrews, they wanted something that would conform to the beauty and aesthetics of the area in a non-intrusive way. Mr. Gardner turned the time over to Scott Powell.

Scott Powell used the aid of a PowerPoint presentation to provide the Council with an overview of their project proposal on the St. Andrews Estates. The presentation included several concept drawings of the proposed project, including landscaping plans from all directions. He noted that the storage units (south side) would be condominiumized and were in high demand. Individual business owners purchased them outright for a variety of different reasons. Mr. Powell noted there would be an apartment on the north side if the property for the person managing the storage units. Mr. Powell described the pros and cons of having commercial versus residential development on the subject property and the key points included:

Commercial (highest and best use):

- Commercial designation allowed the developer to pay more for the property
- One entrance allowed the project to be visually attractive and cut down on traffic
- Project provided an annual residual benefit to the City higher than residential would allow (i.e., property taxes and inclusion of voluntary tax to City)
- A commercial project was significantly more compatible with the golf course

Residential:

- Residential designation reduced the property value considerably due to the total number of lots feasible for this land parcel, the prohibitive cost of improvements, (i.e., utility services/lift station) and safety and liability complications because of the close proximity to the golf course
- Annual revenue to the City was significantly less than commercial would provide
- Golf ball damage to personal property and Cedar Hills residents would be handled by individual residents, thereby causing potential safety and liability pitfalls

C. Rees asked if the storage units were livable to where people actually lived in them. Mr. Powell responded in the negative and explained that people liked to own the units outright so as to build equity in the space. Furthermore, owning the units allowed them to customize the space. Mr. Powell continued that within the onsite management office there would also be a conference room and restroom that could be used for business purposes.

In response to a question from C. Geddes, Mr. Powell clarified that the manager's apartment would be the only livable space onsite. He explained that most storage facilities have someone living onsite to manage the units 24/6. C. Geddes asked if the storage space and onsite apartment would be taxed separately and Mr. Powell answered affirmatively.

C. Andersen asked if there was also RV storage available. Mr. Powell said some of the units were large enough for an RV. However, they had not targeted any specific areas just for the sole purpose of parking RVs/boats. Most storage facilities did have this space; therefore, even though the initial concept plan didn't include RV parking space, it was possible that it could include these spaces at some point in the future.

C. Geddes asked about the price range per square foot. Reed Bromley described the variables that went into determining a price per square foot. At this point he didn't know an exact price range, but guesstimated that it would cost north of \$5.00 per square foot. Mr. Bromley stated that they were still in the conceptual planning phase. There was further discussion on reasons why a commercial development would work better on the St. Andrew's property over a residential development.

C. Geddes stated that he liked the open space and was not inclined to say whether or not this property should be developed residential or commercial. He opined that it could possibly be a parcel for a future park. He did not feel that there was a pressing need to develop the subject property at this time.

C. Zappala stated that in his opinion, Mr. Bromley and Mr. Gardner were wasting their time in presenting this type of proposal to the City. He said the citizens of Cedar Hills had indicated that

they were not interested in developing the St. Andrews property commercially, especially for storage units. C. Zappala said he was personally also not interested in storage units. He explained that this property was originally part of the golf course; when the golf course was developed, the City took away development rights for this particular parcel with the intention that it remained as open space. Furthermore, the City held a conservation easement on the property at the time. He felt that it would be underhanded for the City to take those development rights back 10 years after the fact, only to sell them off to somebody else. He said that in this sense, the original developer was getting stiffed. C. Zappala said he was fine sitting on the property until as a City they were able to reconfigure the space and repurpose it for a dog park or mountain biking trail.

C. Rees echoed C. Zappala's remarks. She stated that residents were extremely opposed to rezoning the area commercial. Therefore, she was not inclined to rezone the property.

Mr. Powell expressed appreciation for the Council's time on the matter.

Mayor Gygi reviewed the agenda for the Executive Session. He said he emailed the Council regarding the Harvey property and mentioned that the Council had proposed the idea of naming a park after the Harvey family. Initially the Harveys rejected this offer; however, they had since reached back out to the City because the Harvey children changed their minds, and they indicated they would appreciate the park being named the Harvey Memorial Park. Mayor Gygi asked the Council for their feedback on the matter.

C. Rees asked if the City was still in negotiations with the Harvey family, to which Mr. Goodwin responded in the negative. The sale of the land had gone through and been recorded. C. Rees explained that they had discussed naming the park after the Harvey family as part of the negotiation, because they were going to get less than developer prices in purchasing the property in question. She suggested that the matter of naming the park be deferred to the Parks and Trails Committee, and felt that it was their proper role to determine the park's name. Mayor Gygi said the City probably should have brought the Parks and Trails Committee into the loop beforehand. Now that negotiations were over, he explained that they were retracting a previous offer; this was an action which he felt was disingenuous. There was further deliberation on the matter.

C. Geddes said even though the Harveys initially declined the offer, he still believed that it would be a nice gesture to name park after them. He explained that the Harvey family owned a lot of property in Cedar Hills, and honoring them in this way was the least that they could do. He was of the opinion that they should maintain their previous offer, and that the matter did not need to be deferred to the Parks and Trails Committee.

C. Zappala said the City had been in conflict with the Harveys for a really long time. This gesture would put to rest a long standing issue and it would be a good faith effort on the City's part. He suggested they let "bygones be bygones" and indicated that he did not mind naming the park after them. The Mayor and Council briefly discussed what the park should be named, and Mayor Gygi mentioned having sent an email to the Parks and Trails Committee asking them to weigh in on the matter.

MOTION: C. Zappala—To go into closed session pursuant to State Code 52-4-204 and 52-4-205(1)(c)(d) and (e) to discuss pending or reasonably imminent litigation, to discuss the purchase, exchange or lease of real property and to discuss the sale of real property, closed session held in the Community Recreation Center. Seconded by C. Andersen. Vote taken by roll call. (6:35 p.m.)

Yes - C. Andersen
C. Bailey
C. Geddes
C. Rees
C. Zappala Motion passes.

MOTION: C. Zappala—To exit closed session and reconvene work session. Seconded by C. Geddes. (6:54 p.m.)

Yes - C. Andersen
C. Bailey
C. Geddes
C. Rees
C. Zappala Motion passes.

This meeting was adjourned at 6:54 p.m. by Mayor Gygi.

Approved by Council:
September 19, 2017

/s/ Colleen A. Mulvey, MMC
City Recorder