

SPECIAL MEETING
SOUTH SALT LAKE CITY COUNCIL
March 21, 2016

As provided by Section 10-3-502, Utah Code Annotated, 1953, as amended, pursuant to Order of Special Meeting signed by two members of the City Council on March 15, 2016, the City Council of City of South Salt Lake met in a Special Meeting at 7:30 p.m. on March 21, 2016, in Council Chambers

PRESIDING Council Chair Deborah A. Snow

CONDUCTING Council Chair Deborah A. Snow

COUNCIL MEMBERS PRESENT:

Sharla Beverly, Mark Kindred, Portia Mila, Ben Pender
Kevin Rapp, Shane Siwik and Debbie Snow

STAFF PRESENT:

Mayor Cherie Wood
Charee Peck, Chief of Staff
Lyn Creswell, City Attorney
Randy Sant, Economic Development Consultant
Kyle Kershaw, Finance Director
Dennis Pay, City Engineer
Mike Florence, Community and Economic Development Director
Frank Lilly, Deputy Community and Economic Development Director
Sharen Hauri, Urban Design Director
Craig Burton, City Recorder

OTHERS PRESENT:

See attached list

ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION:

- 1. Mayor's veto of Ordinance No. 2016-02 Amendment to the General Plan Future Use Map Designation of the former Granite High School site, located at approximately 3305 South 500 East, from New Historical and Schools/Open Space to Master Plan. Application is made by Garbett Homes and Wasatch Commercial Management; including presentations of information.** Council Chair Snow explained to everyone that this is a Special Meeting of the City Council and that there will not be any citizen's comments tonight. She thanked everyone for their attendance. She explained that the discussion tonight is the change to the General Plan designation of the former Granite High site. They are not discussing a zone change, but a General Plan designation change. She introduced Ben Horsley, Communications and

Community Outreach Director and Don Adams, Assistant Superintendent of Support Services of Granite School District.

Mr. Adams reviewed a brief handout of the appraisal history of Granite High. A copy is attached to these minutes and incorporated by this reference. The 2013 appraisal is the one that the District School Board has held firm to. Through their sales process no fewer than four offers came in at ten plus million dollars.

The District shares the ongoing concerns of safety and security on the site. There is a substantial amount of drug paraphernalia and drug use that occurs on the site adjacent to the structures and inside the structures. They often respond with their police department and the City's police to many break in calls.

Mr. Adams said they are also here to talk about some questions that came from the City Council in late January early February inquiring about some of the items they have discussed and also wondering if the District could assist in the acquisition and development of some open space. They were provided a little more detail through Council Chair Snow about a deal. They brought it to their Board in a closed session. They believe the framework presented has merit and they are excited to continue those discussions, should the City desire, and the Board has given them some negotiating parameters to make that happen. They are optimistic that if things proceed through the City's process they could assist in development of open space.

Mr. Horsley said they feel strongly that the relationship that they have had working with the City has been very positive. They have worked over the past few years when the City was pursuing some deals and opportunities and they are here to continue to work with the City through this process as well.

Council Member Pender asked what they would do with the property if the City doesn't move forward with this developer and what is the long-term plan with the buildings.

Mr. Adams said they aren't sure. They will have to wrestle that through with the Board of Education. Given the rate of incursions into the site right now they will take steps to continue to secure the site. Most likely, at a minimum, you will see fencing around the entire site. Depending upon the directive from the Board, it could go further than that.

Council Member Kindred asked if they have given any consideration to demolition of the site and in regards to the deal that they referenced, is that just for the current plan in front of them or are they willing to do that on other plans if the veto doesn't get overturned this evening.

Mr. Adams answered that in 2010 they started looking at the costs for demolition of all buildings and leveling the site. They periodically refresh those. They don't

have a clear direction on what they are going to do. They do understand the cost estimates to get that done but they are not directed to take action on that at this point.

In regard to the offer before them, responding to the offer from the Chair, Mr. Adams said that is what they have today. He doesn't know if the Board will feel that is an opportunity that they want to invest in in the future. It depends on how much they continue to invest in the site. They currently spend about \$120,000 a year maintaining the site. That continues to be a budgetary burden on the District. If that continues into the future he is sure the Board will take that into account in any future negotiations and offers that the City may put before them. He assumes that budget constraint will also hold true with any security measures that would be taken in the next couple of years.

Mr. Horsley added that when they were initially considering the demolition it was based on the marketability of the property itself, after the initial deal fell through. Now the basis would be long-term securing the property from injury and liability to the District and to taxpayers.

Council Member Beverly said she knows they have one option on the table that the Council Chair has presented to them but she is curious why there has been an unwillingness from the District to participate in an RDA.

Mr. Adams said he thinks the initial concern is they are not in the mode to buy their property twice, meaning every tax dollar that is given back in a redevelopment project area is, in essence, contributing twice to what the taxpayers have already purchased or would expect to receive on the valuation of the site. Given that, the deal structure that is before them does not preclude a CA type of investment. However, they have to make sure the positive returns are there. They have expressed that over the last couple of weeks as the City Council has begun to investigate that. They would want to structure any of the open space dealings first to understand what the bottom line is to the District before continuing into any tax increment financing that could be on the table. They need to insure that they don't see negative returns, they would need to see positive.

Council Member Rapp asked if they were going to discuss the parks deal.

Council Member Snow said she is happy to dive into specifics. She asked Mr. Adams if he was comfortable sharing the specifics.

Mr. Adams said they could answer some of the basics. The Board offer is where they are at. If they want to begin negotiations he is happy to do it but he is not sure they will get very far tonight. They are firm in their commitments to help the City out.

Council Chair Snow shared the deal she had proposed. It was basically working out an arrangement where the developer pays the majority of the money up front to the School District and then the City would get an owner financed loan from the School District between \$1,000,000 and \$1,500,000 which would then give the City ten to twelve years to make payments on that loan. The point would be to allow the City to purchase the four acre park parcel. That's what she understands Mr. Adams and Mr. Horsley have taken to their Board and gotten preliminary approval for is a loan up to \$1.5 million to the City to help assist them in acquiring the four acres of park space.

Council Member Siwik said part of the concern of the community is the big box store, the square footage and the size of the retail component. He asked if the whole twenty-seven acres, less the open space, was all residential, would the Board be amenable to that seller finance program or is there a condition of some retail being put into the mix so it is able to generate revenue.

Mr. Adams said they are a school district and they educate children, they are not really into the entitlement and land use business for the City. The only caveats they would have is to look at the ability of the City to repay the loan that would be proffered. Not knowing the City's finances or ability to pay, they would weigh that. When it comes to the CDA TIF questions that again, would alter significantly based upon the commercial residential mix that the City has. It is a challenge for them to give back funds when the residential is generating children that are in their schools and cost them a little bit more money.

Council Member Pender asked what the terms would be for the loan.

Mr. Adams said they didn't want to tax the City with undue burden on payment so they were somewhat flexible. They are needing to cover some basic interest costs but it would be very low rate, a few points above the State investment rate, which he believes is currently .75 percent. They have some interest concerns but, at the end of the day, the term could be extended to make sure it fits the City's budget constraints.

Council Member Mila said in the very beginning green space was the number one issue with the residents that live in the area so she appreciates their willingness to come to the table and help secure the City having some green space on that property. Over time some things have changed and she feels Walmart is the biggest issue right now.

Council Member Rapp said Wasatch Group and Garbett Homes approached the City last year in February and the City has not reached out to the School District until now. He wonders why because there have been a lot of unanswered questions in the last year and a couple of months.

Mayor Wood responded that staff came to the City Council numerous times and requested policy direction, if they were going to negotiate with the School District, as to what acreage of green space, what was important to the City Council. They have asked for that.

Council Member Rapp said he was more concerned with why they hadn't got in touch with Granite.

City Attorney, Lyn Creswell, said he was advising both the Mayor and the Council that with a contractual agreement between Wasatch and the School District, they should not be involved in that relationship by trying to negotiate, or have significant discussion with either of the parties. About a year ago they had requested an assignment or an involvement with Wasatch so they could participate in the discussion but Wasatch said no. That was the City's opportunity to be at the table and have those discussions but they declined that relationship. The City has tried to keep open lines of communication but as far as negotiating specific terms, that was not the advice of the City Attorney either to the Mayor, City Council, RDA Director or anybody else.

Council Chair Snow next asked the developers to give their presentation.

Adam Lankford, Wasatch Group, said they want to create a win-win situation with this project and with the City. They want to be a good neighbor.

Mr. Lankford, Jacob Ballsteadt, with Garbett Homes, and John Gust, with Arbor Development reviewed a presentation with the Council. A copy is attached and incorporated by this reference.

Mr. Lankford said a vote "no" tonight kills the application. They agree with the Mayor that the site is unique and presents opportunities and challenges. They disagree with the land use amendment approval with conditions. The land use amendment needs to stand on its own merit. Several times in the Mayor's veto it states that the Mayor is supportive of a mixed use designation. If that is the case, the land use issue is what's at hand and that is what needs to be discussed. Is the current land use appropriate and if not, what do they need to change it to? They believe it is unfair of the applicant to ask of them something different than what is outlined as the City process. The South Salt Lake entitlement process is a three step process that you can't combine. So, to ask them to apply for a land use amendment but require for them to get into site planning details without giving them those types of approvals is unfair. They would love to combine everything together. They believe it is unfair to hold them to the land use amendment application but then also want site specific details, which it talks about in the veto. In all the jobs he has worked, on across the Western United States and the Wasatch Front, he has never taken a land use application to a city by itself, without a rezone or a site plan, and been asked for things like specific amenities in a park, park sizes, or traffic studies without being combined and with some other

types of approvals. There was no response to their last presentation in the veto. They went through the traffic findings they had at the time. They went through their ideas of preserving a historic legacy on Granite. To ask for details and they give them and then have a veto that doesn't respond to what they presented, they feel lost in the process. They haven't had the back and forth communication they wish they did have with the Mayor and staff. There seems to be a disconnect in what is policy issues and what is development issues. It talks about being supportive of mixed use designation going forward but the issue seems to be, without policy direction, the project shouldn't move forward. There is a difference between development issues and policy issues. The General Plan document and the Land Use Map is a broad policy document but they don't agree that policy is specific location and shapes of park space. That is not broad policy, it is site specific issues. They would love to get into those issues but there is a process set up and they have to follow that process and that's what they are trying to do.

Mr. Lankford also addressed the City Attorney's comments saying he disagreed a little bit. They were approached at one time by the City asking them to assign their contract to the City. His understanding and recollection of that meetings was that it was about the City wanting to take down the entire piece of land for the bond the second time. It was not so the City could discuss open space with the District. All along they have told the City they were welcome to go talk with the District and he thinks the District has been open in saying, "Come and talk to us." That was not his recollection of that meeting regarding the assignment. They didn't have any issues with the Mayor, staff, Attorney, anybody speaking with the District.

Jacob Ballsteadt, with Garbett Homes, said they want to address the specifics that the Mayor outlined in her veto. One was a concern about the legacy of the site. It has always been their intent to preserve some items from the school. About nine months ago they started engaging with the Alumni Association. They have meet with them many times discussing items they can save. This afternoon Marilee Carter, of the alumni association, sent an email to the City Council and the Mayor about her experience with Garbett Homes. In the email she stated she had complete faith that the proposed development would benefit South Salt Lake and give great remembrance to Granite High and the alumni who grew up there. The Alumni Association has built a strong association with Garbett Homes and intends to maintain that relationship through the entire development to help ensure the Granite legacy lives on in the new development.

Mr. Ballsteadt said some of the things that are most important to the alumni are the seal and the entry. The seal is important to students there and is an important legacy item. They have tried to create a little legacy area within the green space where they can transplant some specific items and display them. He believes the alumni association has expressed their satisfaction and confidence in Garbett's

ability to preserve these items and thus satisfy the concerns of the Mayor in the veto.

Mr. Lankford advised they are committed to a grocery store tenant. They feel the return trips that a grocery store use brings to this site are important for the inline retail. Walmart is one of the tenants they are looking at. They are very interested in the site. He read a letter from Draper City that is included in their presentation regarding how having a neighborhood Walmart store in their community has been a good addition.

John Gust, with Arbor Development, reviewed how the different size big box stores fit in the project. He also reviewed how the park and residential fits in the project area.

Ron Mortimer, with Horrocks Engineers, said they have concluded the traffic impact study and sent it over to the City for review. The overall site generates about 8,000 trips. A lot of those trips are being captured. They are already on the roadways. That is one of the reasons why you want to see commercial at this location is because there is traffic already being generated in the vicinity. What they are trying to do is capture that traffic, bring it into the site, have it as their customers and then send it back out of the way. This particular project would be a neighborhood shopping center, not a regional center. It doesn't have a big anchor to it so it is going to primarily attracted trips that are fairly close in the area. In the p.m. peak hour they see about 620 trips that are being generated on the site. Those are dispersed over the entire site. There will be challenges during the p.m. peak hour if you are making a left turn movement on any of the particular roadways. There will be a delay there. That is consistent with any of the shopping centers they have in the valley. They recommend a right turn pocket on northbound 500 East at 3300 South. They also identified Eastbound 3300 South at 700 East will need a right turn pocket as well. They will also need to put a shoulder on the south side of 3300 South in front of that corridor to provide a little bit more room for safer movements getting in and out of the project.

Council Member Pender confirmed that the traffic study goes out for twenty years and they don't see anything changing with the roadway in the twenty years assuming this project is what is put in there.

Mr. Mortimer agreed.

Council Member Pender confirmed the right hand turn lane on 500 East would come out of the developer's property.

Mr. Lankford agreed.

Council Member Kindred asked if Mr. Lankford could elaborate on the City asking them to assign the contract.

Mr. Lankford said it was the second time the City was interested in purchasing the whole site and passing the second bond.

Mr. Creswell said it was in the May timeframe when the Council was considering a possible bond and there was a potential for some, but not all, of the site to be acquired as part as of the bond. They had one meeting with representatives from Wasatch Development that included Economic Development Consultant, Randy Sant, and Community and Economic Development Director, Mike Florence and Mr. Creswell. The statement was made that the City would like to consider some kind of assignment to allow them to participate going forward and have some involvement in the relationship with the acquisition of property if the bond was to pass. Mr. Florence followed up multiple times with the developer and got no response. Finally they decided to quit pestering Wasatch. Mr. Creswell wanted the City to participate as a partner in the project if, at the back end, there was going to be any kind of acquisition. His assumption from the Council that stood at that time was at no point was the City going to acquire the entire property. The bond, as it was set up, was not funded to acquire the entire property. At the point time when the bond was to pass, if it did, the City needed to be in the position legally to be able to start working with Wasatch and the School District to acquire whatever the citizens felt was an appropriate amount of property. Once that discussion ended he advised the Council and Mayor to be very careful in having discussions with either the developer or the School District regarding specific acquisition that the City wants to be involved in because they had been told by the developer that they didn't want the City involved. It is true they may have taken it that the City wanted the entire property but it was surely not his intent to convey that.

Council Chair Snow said she participated in numerous discussions with various people who indicated that it was the intent to acquire all twenty-seven acres. From personal experience she knows otherwise. She cannot say that is a fair representation.

Mr. Lankford agreed with Council Chair Snow saying it was the full twenty-seven acres because he remembers replying and saying, "What opportunities are left for Wasatch if we assign the whole contract to you?" He is not an attorney but he doesn't know how you can assign a portion of a contract, or a portion of the rights to a contract, to somebody without assigning the entire contract.

Council Member Kindred asked if the veto is not overturned tonight is this applicant banned from coming back before the Council again.

Community and Economic Development Director, Mike Florence, answered no. The requirement is one year if it is zoning. This is for a General Plan amendment and they could file again tomorrow if they wanted to.

Council Member Kindred said Mr. Lankford mentioned that many other cities let you come with the zoning and Master Plan change at the same time. They are asking the developer to do something unique with park space and he wondered if the City could do something unique with regards to this application and have them come back and do both at the same time.

Mr. Florence answered that they could. The reason the City normally has them come through for a General Plan amendment first is because they don't want the developer spending a lot of money if it is not going to pass. The purpose is to get the General Plan amended first and see the temperature of the Planning Commission and City Council then have them bring back the master plan and zone change at a future date.

Council Member Mila agrees with them coming back with the whole thing because, as they stated a few minutes ago, it seems like some of it is backwards because you don't do specific site things but it has been talked about a lot over the last few months. She would like to see some more discussion and things move forward and get the right thing for the community. She went to two of the Walmart neighborhood stores, one in Herriman and in Ogden, and they are very nice locations but there is not a lot of residential around those two stores. It is a little different in South Salt Lake and that is still why there is a lot of hold up there.

Council Member Pender said he went to the one in Herriman as well and you can throw a rock from Walmart and hit new housing right behind it. So they have quite a bit of housing going up by the Herriman one.

Council Member Siwik said the vote was to address whether or not the existing school historic and open space designations were now compatible. That's all that vote was. The Mayor still has the ability to veto again. Council still has the ability to vote no again. To say start over and come back, or to say, "Let's keep going from this point forward" the same checks and balances still exist and it allows for progress to be made. He doesn't see any gain in sending the whole thing back to start over when, through those checks and balances, people can still have the input and make the changes and keep it going as staff, the Mayor and the Council feel it needs to be done.

Council Member Beverly said she has been at every meeting for the Planning Commission and all the neighborhood meetings. At the first Planning Commission meeting she attended they were almost ready to deny the application. However, staff recommended that they have a neighborhood meeting and reach out to people which the developer did. At the neighborhood meeting there was a drawing and all of a sudden instead of around a one acre of green space there was three to four acres of green space. When she asked how the City is going to pay for that she was told they will work with the City but the City had just lost the second bond election. That has always been a source of confusion for her on how

they are going to pay for it. They have heard some options tonight but there are still a lot of ifs. She feels like the green space is a huge part of the compromise that is necessary to make any plan work there. There are some options and things they are considering but there is nothing firm and that bothers her.

Council Chair Snow thinks that is one of the primary purposes Granite School District came tonight was to give the City their assurances that they are going to be financial partners with the City and insure that they are willing to help the City acquire the four acres if that is what is decided. She is comfortable that that concern has been met.

Council Member Beverly said she is not comfortable because the Board has not voted anything for sure, they've only had discussion and she is not confident that the members on this Council are willing to fund this fully. They know the budget is tight. There are things that have been put on pause because of budget restraints. She feels that saying at this time they will all vote to spend money on green space in a little premature.

Council Chair Snow believes the proposal was taken to the Board on Tuesday night and they did vote on it and gave direction, which is why they came tonight. She asked the representatives from the District to come up. The Council wants some assurances that the City will have funding for their four acre park.

Council Member Beverly said she would like to hear it. Is it a hundred percent sure done deal?

Mr. Adams said if the proposal was similar to the one that was emailed to the District the answer is yes. He doesn't see any way it would be derailed if it fits the framework that was sent to the District. They have discussed many ways to make it work. They couldn't find, outside of someone saying they need five million dollars or a very large amount outside of the framework, the Board is committed to making this happen, absolutely.

Council Member Kindred asked if \$1.5 million gives the City four acres. He said he sees Economic Development Consultant, Randy Sant, shaking his head no.

There was in audible taking because no one spoke in a microphone.

Council Chair Snow said she heard the developer gives the City one acre as their green space requirement and the \$1.5 million loan from the School District allows the City to purchase the other three acres.

Council Member Beverly recalled that is wasn't a full acre the developer was required to give and wondered if that was accurate. She asked how much the developer would be contributing.

Mr. Adams answered said they will give one acre plus the development of that acre.

Council Chair Snow asked if the meaning of the development of the acre meant to put in grass and trees.

Mr. Adams said grass, trees, sprinkling system, everything that would be required in a park.

Council Member Mila asked if part of that development would be the historical preservation of the High School.

Mr. Gust thinks it will be participation on everyone's part. As developers they come in to try and build communities, they don't try to tear them down. He thinks they can help facilitate a much nicer facility there being partners with the City. They don't want to be adversaries. If the City turns them down they will move on. There are other projects. He is pretty confident they can work with Granite School District and they can help facilitate this project to be something that the whole community will be proud of. They have listened to the City Council and the Planning Commission. They have gotten affirmative votes all the way along. The Mayor's veto didn't hurt. It brought them all to the table to be more constructive and to really bring something better to the Council. They would like to work with the Mayor and engage with her and the staff to make this something the Council and neighbors will be proud of. He doesn't feel the renderings shown tonight are obtrusive at all. He has seen over the years that Walmart is the whipping boy in a lot of ways on these things but Walmart really has improved over the years. It's not like it used to be. He feels like the committee in some ways is saying, "We don't want anything there other than a twenty-seven acre park" but we know that's not going to happen. Walmart is probably a pretty good excuse to beat them up and they won't do a good job there. But they've seen letters from other communities and they are going to do a good job. They are in his neighborhood. The back of the stores are clean, they take care of the air conditioning. All of the things the people have complained about, these guys do it whether it is Smith's, Harmons, or Walmart. They are there to sell groceries and not any of them are any better than the other.

Mr. Ballsteadt referred to figures that Randy Sant provided the Council in a work meeting that addressed the tax revenue that was generated for the development of the site. That included sales tax revenue from a grocer, property tax revenue generated from the commercial and also property tax generated from the residential. In all, on an annual basis, there was over \$330,000 generated from the development on this site. It is more than enough to pay for the park and have a surplus into the City's coffers that they can use for whatever they want. In essence, saying yes today is saying yes, they want a four acre park, yes, they want the development to pay for it on its own, and yes, they want a little extra off the top that can be used for whatever. This, in essence, is a deal that benefits

everybody. It provides open space, it provides for a means to pay for it and the School District has made compromises to allow the City to fund this park which otherwise they couldn't do. The City tried to bond for it and the citizens voted it down twice. There wasn't other means for it to happen. Garbett has made compromises on their development. He feels it is time for the City to make a compromise. In his mind the City is not making a compromise. This is an absolute win. They are bringing in eighty plus families into the neighborhood. They are helping the weighted people unit of the City. Everybody knows that the City is facing a big decline in sales tax revenue because they don't have enough people. These are eighty-five new people in the neighborhood that will contribute to the City. There is no compromise here by the City. This is a benefit to everyone and a win-win for everyone. He hopes they convey that and they do it in a responsible way and the Council sees the benefits of what they are proposing.

Council Member Siwik asked Mayor Wood if some of her concerns have been address well enough and what her thoughts are.

Mayor Wood said some of her concerns have been addressed. She thinks the largest one, that is still on the table and doesn't seem like it is going to move at all, is stated in the veto memo under 4.b.ii which is direction regarding retail development. She thinks that is still a deal breaker for her.

Council Member Siwik asked if she is talking about the anchor itself, Walmart, or the scope of the twelve acres.

Mayor Wood answered that she has heard her constituents and they do not want Walmart. Walmart to them is a deal breaker.

Council Member Siwik asked the Mayor how she feels about the open space and the funding.

Mayor Wood says she thinks they have moved the needle within the last two weeks since the veto was published on March 10. She thinks conversations that staff and administration were begging to be addressed are finally being addressed. Are they solved? She doesn't think so. This is a good start to conversation but she still has concerns.

Council Member Siwik acknowledged that the Mayor holds veto power at the zone change level. She can veto anything done by ordinance. After the zone change comes the final approval of the sight. He asked for confirmation that the Mayor would have veto power there as well.

Mr. Florence advised that if this was overturned by the Council the next step would be the zone change which would be done by ordinance and the Mayor would have veto power. For plat approval, the plat would be approved by the

Planning Commission so the next time the Council would see this application there would be a master plan and the application for a zone change.

Council Member Siwik confirmed that the plat approval is all done through the Planning Commission and will not come to the Council or to the Mayor.

Mr. Florence agreed with that for plat approval.

Council Member Rapp asked Mr. Gust if this plan was denied would they come back.

Mr. Gust said no.

Council Member Beverly said her and Council Member Mila's districts are right by Granite High and are highly impacted by this decision. She is starting her third year of service on the Council and she has never had more emails or more phone calls about any issue. People are passionate about it. She has only had two people that are for this project and for moving forward. She was curious to see, if after the veto, she would have more people contact her. She has just had one person, who had already contacted her, who again reiterated her views. She agrees with what the Mayor is saying. The biggest thing she is hearing is the big box, the anchor, their retail. What her constituents want to see is smaller, local businesses. They feel that would be a better fit. That's the feedback she is getting.

Council Member Kindred felt the single family homes are the least controversial portion of the project. They need that. Bringing eighty new families would be a great thing. He said he asked Mr. Gust outside of the meeting if the Walmart was to go away, or if they were to do any other site plan, have they looked at the numbers on that? Has it worked where they can condense the acreage dedicated to the commercial to make it smaller? He has heard him say no, that if Walmart isn't a part it doesn't work. He asked Mr. Gust if that was correct.

Mr. Gust said retail is a really competitive business these days. What they call fast casual stores, the Zupa's and Viva Chicken are spending on interiors fifty to sixty dollars a foot. Although they are not full-scale restaurants, they really put a lot of money into them. They really need the grocery unfortunately. When they are financing the first question the bankers ask is, "Is this a grocery anchored center?" The reason for that is they know people come four or five times a week to buy groceries. With that they will maybe stop by and get an ice cream, a sandwich or whatever. So, a lot of these folks just won't come. You might pick up second tier tenants that are willing to come but you've seen them over the years. Just up the street on 3300 South and 700 East on both sides, you really don't have a national tenant in those centers. To get the national tenants and quality that is needed you need to have the grocery as your tenant. They know that the grocery guys are going to bring people in. they have talked to Smith's and they turned them down on the site. And Harmons is too close up the street. The City only has one other

grocery within it currently. The point is, it just doesn't work. It is too much of a risk. With the grocery store that is going to go in there, they will put in sixteen to seventeen million dollars, about ten million of it is Arbor's. It is really a high risk thing not to have grocery anchor tenant.

Council Member Kindred asked if it would work if the out parcel went away and they just had a grocer that took up five acres.

Mr. Gust said it still wouldn't work. The store they are talking about is a mid-box store. The big-box is over 60,000 square feet. People only go to the clothing stores maybe once a month. They are not reoccurring trips. They need the outside parcels to work for them because they are smaller stores but they get higher rents from them. They help bring the whole center together and make it work financially. That is part of how this whole thing works. Unfortunately all the stores they have talked to, the spacing does not work for them. There is lots of interest in the small tenants. He thinks they can fill the site up with good quality national tenants and there is a void in that area. That is why they feel like it could be a success. As they get going on the project, if they need more help from the District, they have expressed their openness and willingness to do it. He thinks they all need to move it along, jump in with these guys, and work through this stuff and design the stores and buildings so they look right and the people will be satisfied.

Council Member Pender recalled in talking about green space in the past, someone from the developer team talked about Walmart, or whatever anchor store ends up there, maybe participating in helping with landscape and playground equipment. He asked if that was something that is still...

Mr. Gust said he couldn't speak for them but he would certainly ask them to participate. The developers want it to be a success and work though it with the City. He thinks through good conversation with the Mayor, they would love to sit down and really make her proud and satisfy the people in and around where you live so in another year when they run for re-election they will probably overwhelmingly elect you because it will be so good. Unfortunately, life is all about decisions and they have to make them. And whether the Council makes them for them, or against them, that is what they will have to do. He thinks they can put together a good that they will be proud of. In answer to the question, Mr. Gust said when he was Parks Director for Salt Lake City they did a three acre park in Magna. It was putting in 120 trees, doing the grass and sprinkling system. It was about \$220,000 just to do that portion. Generally, they don't like to do playground equipment. They would rather give the City the money and let them buy it because they always have a liability to them. With this project, taking their acre out which they would be doing themselves, if it was three acres the City would be buying two. With everyone involved this could be a pretty nice development for everyone.

ITEMS FOR VOTE:

- 1. Reconsideration of Ordinance No. 2016-02 Amendment to the General Plan Future Use Map Designation of the former Granite High School site, located at approximately 3305 South 500 East, from New Historical and Schools/Open Space to Master Plan. Application is made by Garbett Homes and Wasatch Commercial Management.**

Council Chair Snow called for a motion for the reconsideration of the Mayor's veto.

There was no motion made and no vote was taken.

Council Member Siwik moved to adjourn.

MOTION: Shane Siwik

SECOND: Kevin Rapp

Voice Vote:

Beverly Aye

Gold Aye

Jones Aye

Rapp Aye

Rutter Aye

Snow Aye

Turner Aye

The Special Meeting of the Council adjourned at 9:07 p.m.


Deborah A. Snow, Council Chair


Craig D. Barton, City Recorder

March 21, 2016

CITY COUNCIL - SPECIAL MEETING
LIST OF ATTENDEES

<u>NAME</u>	<u>ADDRESS</u>	<u>REPRESENTING</u>
Codie Massley	3537 S 500 E	SELF
TRAVIS MASSLEY	3537 S 500 E	SELF
ADAM LANKFORD	299 S. MAIN #2400, SLC	WASATCH GROUP
Jacob Bellstedt	213 N. East Capital St.	Garkett Homes
Trish Christensen	126 W. Segoly Dr.	Arbor Commercial
John Gust	"	"
Scott Maxwell	Howell Group	Self -
Paul RACE	639 E. 3585 SO	"
Eugene Reverend	3421 So. 620 E,	"
Heinrich Groebbs	658 Riviera Cir.	self
Rosemarie Groebbs	658 Riviera Cir.	self
Isaac Higham	2556 S 300 E	Self
Reed Thomas	331 E Park Creeke Lane	self
Robert Orme	3583 Solaris	" "
Miguel Medina	317 E FENTON AVE	Self.
Stuart Engstrom	3183 S 500 E	"
Kimarie Small	3165 S 500 E	self
George Merisich	3165 S 500 E	self
Johnny	568 E Water Lily Dr	self
Lance Strong	" " "	self
Joe Anderson	358 Vidas Ave	Self
Mel & Melanie Christensen	3183 SO 500 E	Sub
Judy Muncher	3232 So Water Lily Dr.	Self

March 21, 2016

CITY COUNCIL - SPECIAL MEETING
LIST OF ATTENDEES

NAME ADDRESS REPRESENTING

D. ADAMS		GRANITE SCHOOL DIST
AARON JENSEN	3450 S. 500 E.	SELF & WIFE & 3 CHILDREN
BILL ANDERSON	602 E 3665 S	SELF
COWIE ANDERSON	"	"
STEVE MEEKER	561 E. WATER LILY DR	SELF
CHRIS MEEKER	"	SELF
TERRILL MCPHEE	535 E. 3195 SO	SELF
KATRINA JENSEN	3781 S. 530 W.	SELF
BRENT JENSEN	"	SELF
MARIAH NOBLE	West Jordan	St. Tribune
MERILL CARTER	granite high alumni	granite high alumni
AMY LYONS	391 E. Penney	self
RON LYONS	" " "	my children + future grandchildren
JOYCE NOSHIRAVAN	3759 S. 645 E	self
ADAM NOSHIRAVAN	GRANITE HIGH ALUMNI	GRANITE HIGH ALUMNI
RYAN HORNIP	429 E Wendell Way	self
JESSICA THOMAS	351 E Terra Sol Dr.	Self
WHITNEY WALKER	351 E Terra Sol Dr.	Self
AMIR NOSHIRAVAN	3759 SO. 645 East	Self
DEREK PERAZZINI	597 E 3790 S	SELF
CLAUDIA LEMONE	3148 SO PARK COURT	Self
BOB LEMONE	3148 South Park Ct	Self

To anyone who votes yes to Walmart, I will personally go door to door with my family, my friends & my neighbors & we will VOTE YOU OUT. *

~~To anyone who votes yes to Walmart, I will personally go door to door with my family, friends & neighbors and we will VOTE YOU OUT. *~~

March 21, 2016

CITY COUNCIL - SPECIAL MEETING
LIST OF ATTENDEES

<u>NAME</u>	<u>ADDRESS</u>	<u>REPRESENTING</u>
Dave Hall	473 Scott Ave	Self
Joreen Hall	473 Scott Ave.	self
Ryan Good	356 E. HAVEN AVE	Self
Nicole Pappas	575 E Scott Ave	Self
Matt Dyer	575 E SCOTT AVE	SELF
James D. Smith	3774 So. 645E.	Self
Jerold D. McPhee	535 E 345 S	Self
Shayne Wilhite	321 E. Georgia Cir.	Self
Kate Wilhite	321 E. Georgia Cir.	Self
Steve Norr	3162 PARK CT	Self
Shelly Norr	3162 Park CT	Self
Nancy Aruscavage	3478 S 500 E.	Self
Joe Aruscavage	3478 S. 500 E	Self
Don Mears	32145 Water Lily Dr.	Self
ERRAL REMINGTON	3171 So. 500 E.	Self
Debra Dyer	2335 South West Temple	Utah Arts Alliance
Charijeta Thunbome	3442 S. 500 E. SLC	self
JASMIN KUCUKOVIC	3442 S. 500 E. SLC	SELF
Ed Winsen	2992 So 600 E SW	Self
Jackie Rogers	329 E Penney Ave	Self
Jennifer Allred	3512 So. 300 E # L	myself
Terry Bawden	3372 So. Island Way	Granite School Dist.
Becky Harty	2500 S State	11

* To anyone who votes YES to Walmart, I will personally go door to door with my family, friends & neighbors & we will VOTE. YOU. OUT.

March 21, 2016

CITY COUNCIL - SPECIAL MEETING
LIST OF ATTENDEES

<u>NAME</u>	<u>ADDRESS</u>	<u>REPRESENTING</u>
Sheila Hutchison	3491 S. Citrus Cir	Self
Mike Florence	220 E. Morris Ave	CED Dept.
Randy Sawt	"	Consultant
FRANCIS X LILLY	"	CED
Chavez Peck	220 E Morris	Mayor's office
Sharen Hauri	220 E Morris Ave	Urban Design
David Reimschuessel	3546 S Park Meadows St	Self
Dennis Peay	77 220 E. Morris	Engineering
RON MORTIMER	2162 W. GROVE PKWY P.6.	HORROCKS ENGINEERS, INC.
John Dornay	" "	" "
Zelda Emerson	666 E. 3390 South	self
Janet Brewer	3416 S. RIVIERA DR.	self
Mark Brewer	3416 S. Riviera Dr.	Self
Darcie Tew	3426 S. Park Meadows St	Self
Polly Hough	3110 So. 602 E.	self
Martin Burr	415 Scott Ave	self
Peggie Burr	415 Scott Ave	Self
Ronald Burr	415 Scott Ave	Wife
Lola Bickley	464 Scott Ave	Self
Connelynn Kozlowski	439 E Scott Ave #1A	Self
Marion L Smith	3774 So. 645 E.	Self
Cheryl P. Johnson	3396 So 500 East	Self
Jim Davis	4907 W. 200th Blvd. 56 West + 2700 So.	self

* To anyone who votes YES to Walmart, I will personally go door to door with my family, friends & neighbors and we will VOTE. YOU. OUT.

