

SOUTH JORDAN CITY
CITY COUNCIL STUDY MEETING

December 7, 2021

Present: Mayor Dawn R. Ramsey, Council Member Tamara Zander, Council Member Patrick Harris, Council Member Brad Marlor, Council Member Don Shelton, Council Member Jason McGuire, CM Gary Whatcott, Assistant City Manager Dustin Lewis, City Attorney Ryan Loose, Planning Director Steven Schaefermeyer, Director of Administrative Services Spencer Kyle, Director of Public Works Jason Rasmussen, City Engineer Brad Klavano, CFO Sunil Naidu, Strategic Services Director Don Tingey, City Commerce Director Brian Preece, Director of Government Affairs Melinda Seager, Police Chief Jeff Carr, Fire Chief Chris Dawson, IT Director Jon Day, GIS Coordinator Matt Jarman, City Recorder Anna Crookston, Meeting Transcriptionist Diana Baun,

Others: Carol, sllewellyn, Ryan Benson, Mirabela Eliason, Lorie Benson

4:47 PM
STUDY MEETING

A. Welcome, Roll Call and Introduction: *By Mayor Dawn Ramsey*

Mayor Dawn Ramsey welcomed everyone present and introduced the meeting.

B. Invocation: *By Council Member Brad Marlor*

Council Member Brad Marlor offered the invocation.

C. Mayor and Council Coordination

City Attorney Ryan Loose mentioned the Legislator meetings tomorrow morning.

Mayor Ramsey discussed the first council meeting of the year on January 4th, 2022, where there will be the work meeting at 4:30 p.m., followed by the 6:30 p.m. council meeting with the oath of office followed by a short recess and reception; after the reception the regular council meeting will reconvene at 7:30 p.m. There is a ribbon cutting for Chick-Fil-A at The District at 9:00 a.m. this Thursday, as well as a groundbreaking for Ultradent on Thursday, December 16 at 1:30 p.m. There is still an LPC Meeting coming up, she has no new information on items from the League with the UEOC, but they are getting close. The agenda for tomorrow morning's meeting with legislators has been adjusted based on priority, and they are looking forward to it.

Council Member Shelton asked when the new boundaries take place as a result of the last election.

Mayor Ramsey said they go into effect after January 1, 2023.

D. Discussion/Review of Regular Council Meeting

- **Presentation** Utah Independent Redistricting Commission Recognition of Matt Jarman's Service.
- **Presentation** Officer Cross Awards.

Police Chief Jeff Carr said these include the Lifesaving Award, several officers involved in a situation in the river bottoms with an armed parolee, and some awards for the McManagle incident.

Mayor Ramsey mentioned she would like to hear an update on the injured officer during the council meeting from the Chief. She also mentioned how much she appreciated KSL being so supportive when they came to interview her about it.

- **Resolution R2021-37**, South Jordan City Annual Moderate income Housing Report.

Planning Director Steven Schaefermeyer said this report was due on December 1, however the paperwork had not been updated from the County. We contacted the state in September and let them know the form and calculator hadn't been updated, asked them what they'd like us to do, and they said they'd get back to us. The League eventually told us to use the old form as the State said they are not updating anything. The report we are submitting is based on old data. We gave them a heads up that it would be late because we wanted to do it right.

Council Member Tamara Zander asked if the other cities in the state were faced with the same challenge.

Director Schaefermeyer said yes, all cities were faced with this issue. We could have tried to fix the calculator ourselves, but there is so much that goes into it and other cities would still be using the old data for their reports.

Attorney Ryan Loose said we may have been able to get the report in on time, but we were following directions given by the State.

Council Member Shelton asked if whether the changes to the ADU rules had created more ADUs in the city.

Director Schaefermeyer said our rules were already pretty lenient, so anyone who wanted one most likely already had one. There are still some discussions going on regarding ADUs in Daybreak.

Attorney Loose said any ADUs in Daybreak wouldn't be related to the statute passed because we don't consider Daybreak primarily residential; it is a mixed use of equal uses so they would be looking at clarifying or amending terms of the Master Development Agreement (MDA).

Director Schaefermeyer said if you have a detached garage, we have been allowing ADUs in Daybreak per the MDA. Now, people want ADUs in their basements there, however our opinion is that was not allowed under the MDA in the past. The impact to the city and neighbors is likely the same, whether it's above a garage or in a basement. The question now is whether additional areas of Daybreak would be eligible to have ADUs, and that's what they're currently discussing. From a moderate income standpoint, the effects of ADUs is near impossible to measure.

- **Resolution R2021-38**, Public Finance Authority of bonds on behalf of Roseman University.

City Manager Gary Whatcott said the only reason we are involved in this is because a government entity can provide the public hearing for them, but we have already had the public hearing. There is no financial arrangements with the City. Their requirement for their bonding requires a public hearing, we are just the facility for that.

- **Resolution R2021-39**, Interlocal Agreement of the Recreation Center & Bingham Creek Regional Park.

City Manager Whatcott said we haven't transferred ownership of the Recreation Center yet, the County just manages it currently.

Strategic Services Director Don Tingey said this is a legal move for the County. The contractor is contracted with Salt Lake County for the construction and they can't release the contract with the contractor until the park is done.

The council agreed unanimously with consolidating all the consent items into one consent action vote during the regular council meeting (Resolutions R2021-37, R2021-38 and R2021-39).

- **Resolution R2021-34**, Development Agreement 1500 West 11400 South.
- **Resolution R2021-33**, Land Use Development 1500 West 11400 South.
- **Zoning Ordinance 2021-10-Z**, 1500 West 11400 South

Director Schaefermeyer mentioned the emails sent by neighbors, he will try to address those issues during his report in the regular council meeting. The changes since this was presented to the Planning Commission are more functional. Regarding the development agreement, there is still an issue with a setback of the single family homes; the neighbors want that setback the same as the Ivory agreement, however the planning commission didn't have that as part of their recommendation. They did include adding to the agreement some of the other concerns the neighbors had, like a wall.

Attorney Loose said, regarding a public hearing, we are doing an agreement that does not require a public hearing. However, the ordinance requires a public hearing, along with the resolution because it amends the future land use map.

Director Schaefermeyer reminded everyone that the development agreement has a provision stating if the rezone is not approved, the development agreement can't go any further at this time.

Mayor Ramsey asked to clarify that we would have to take a motion on Item I, and have a public hearing on Item J.1. and J.2.

Attorney Loose said we have four public hearings, it would be permissible to call the three items I.1., J.1., and J.2. at the same time and open a public hearing to hear public comment before voting on the agreement in Item I.1, and Item J.1. After voting on those two items, open another public hearing before voting on Item J.2. as a formality. By then, the public will have said their peace, but it will show everyone had a chance for each item to voice their concerns. He also recommended having Director Schaefermeyer do his presentation for all three items at once since they are all essentially the same thing. After that, they can open the public hearings and call for motions as described above.

- **Zoning Ordinance 2021-11-Z**, 11420 South 6680 West.
- **Ordinance 2021-21**, Vacating a portion of Right-of-Way.

Mayor Ramsey mentioned this is a tiny strip of land.

Director Schaefermeyer said we had the road dedication plat, which we liked, but when the plans were finalized, it was discovered there needed to be an adjustment.

- **Resolution RDA 2021-06**, Draft project area plan & budget, and directing necessary action.

Mayor Ramsey said at this point in the meeting we will recess to a Redevelopment Agency meeting to discuss this item.

City Manager Whatcott said we are just setting a boundary, nothing else.

City Commerce Director Brian Preece said approving this just means we can move forward, it doesn't guarantee anything will actually go in the space in the future.

E. Discussion/Presentation Item

E.1. Sagewood Ranch Barn PD Overlay Rezone and Land Use Amendment. Applicant, Megan Visser. (By Director of Planning, Steven Schaefermeyer)

Director Schaefermeyer introduced the amendment, passed out some related paperwork (Attachment A) and gave some background information. In September 2020 the council approved a development agreement. He referenced the concept plan attached to that agreement (Attachment A) which shows a 17 lot subdivision on the Jones' property. Megan Visser's brother represented the family in this application for a rezone to R-2.5. By development agreement (DA), we secured the layout which could have changed without the agreement in place, and

ensured some public improvements that were necessary like a right turn pocket on 3200 West. Part of the DA also specified that lots 6, 7, 14, 15, 16 and 17 were part of a phase 2, phase 1 is lots 1-5 and 8-13. The applicant's current proposal includes lots 12 and 13 from phase 1 only. If approved, her proposal would modify phase 1 which has received preliminary plat approval from the planning commission and has been sold to a developer; they are moving forward on getting it ready to record. Ms. Visser can speak about her relationship with the developer and what they have agreed to. Depending on the council's direction, it could change phase 1 with a new phase 2 and 3. The original agreement for phase 2 was to accommodate her parents who are currently living on the property, shown as lot 16. Ms. Visser approached the City in Fall of 2021 as we were getting the plat ready to record, with this new idea for the existing barn. For any residents interested in this item, this is a PD Floating Zone proposal. Due to its unique nature, it requires this extra meeting up front to get the council's input so Ms. Visser and those involved know whether or not this is worth pursuing. Tonight they are hoping to get the council's input regarding their concerns and support so she can decide if it is worth her time to move forward. After tonight's meeting a development agreement will be created, assuming the applicant chooses to move forward. They will also prepare an amendment to the existing development agreement with her proposal, as well as plan for public hearings at both a planning commission and future city council meeting. Her proposal would require that phase 2, lots 12 and 13 of phase 1, be rezoned to a commercial use rather than the current residential use zoning. It would require amending the land use map, and depending on the conversation tonight, it could require that phase 1 be rezoned from R-2.5 to R-3. Density is calculated by taking the total land involved in the subdivision and dividing it by the number of lots; that number has to equal 2.5 for the R-2.5 zone. She has been warned, if what she is proposing tonight is accepted she will have to rezone phase 1 to R-3 to meet the density. Many subdivisions include roads and parks in the calculations, so the lots end up being smaller.

Mayor Ramsey asked if changing it to R-3 would affect the number of homes the developer is putting in.

Director Schaefermeyer said except for lots 12 and 13, phase 1 would stay the same. Phase 1 relies on phase 2 to meet the density because of the lots in phase 2. By removing phase 2, we need to figure out the density problem that's left in phase 1. To keep the zone R-2.5, they would have to figure out a way to make some of the phase 1 lots bigger, or rezone it to R-3 to meet the density requirement. The lots along Alexander Park Lane are R-1.8, across the street is a retirement community.

Megan Visser (Applicant) reviewed her prepared presentation (Attachment B). She is the daughter of Otto and Amy Jones, they have lived in South Jordan for 51 years and been a big part of this community. They are in their eighties and some changes need to be made. As a family, they decided that some of their land needed to be sold. A plan was made, but as the process continued it was emotional and difficult. The thought of having things torn down was hard, so to accommodate the needs of her parents they moved forward with the portion of phase 1 being sold. Their hope is with phase 2 to renovate the interior of the barn, but keep it as a venue. This is to facilitate the desire to keep the property they have and make it a business; this was one way they felt they could afford to keep the property and still contribute to the community. They have been very mindful of concerns voiced. The outside of the existing

structure will not change, they plan to extend the back about 20-25 feet. They are trying to keep the integrity of the barn because that's what they have loved and grown up with. They feel it is a landmark for the city and when phase 1 went through they had lots of people reach out to the family expressing sadness about things changing, the animals leaving, and open space going away. If you compare when her parents moved here 51 years ago, 10400 South was a dead end with some trees and fields; they rode their horses to the Oquirrh Mountains. The change is inevitable, they are just trying to find a happy medium where they can preserve a portion of their family history and legacy. They feel this has been a huge part of South Jordan history. Their overall goal with the barn is to have a main area for events with an upstairs where nothing is changing. She continued to review her prepared presentation (Attachment B). They are trying to keep the integrity of what her parents have built, but also provide a beautiful area for the community to enjoy. They are proposing gardens and adding water features to help with noise. They are aware of concerns with parking, traffic and privacy; they plan to put a fence around the whole property and landscaping with trees on each side of the fence. They are specifically concerned about the residents on Alexander and don't want them to be affected by any traffic or parking. At a high cost, they are buying back the two lots shown on the overlay. Those two lots would be purchased back to move the parking as shown, with city regulations there will be no parking on Alexander. She discussed the available parking and that they have more spots than required for the size of the venue, they do not see parking as being an issue at any point in the future. She has researched many other venues in the area, everyone has city imposed regulations that include capacity for the building, parking and noise. They will have set hours of operations based on city regulations, they are also open to ideas. They want to be fair to the neighbors, but it has to be a happy medium. She doesn't want to see the barn go, she thinks it would be a tragedy to the city. This is a need for the city as there are not venues like this anywhere in our area. They have had some feedback, she spent time today over in the Harvest Village speaking with residents there who have misconceptions about this because of what they've heard. They thought the barn was being torn down, and once they heard it wasn't they said they loved the barn and that it's why they moved here. She is open to having this be somewhere that residents can walk through and enjoy the gardens whenever they want. They are only planning on a two hour window for events with coming and going, this is not a commercial site with people coming and going all of the time. She has brought a representative from the development, and they are hundred percent on board with this as well; they feel this is an asset to the community, but they also feel it will increase the value of their development. The two lots are being purchased back because they are bringing the parking away from Alexander, as that was a big concern of the neighbors.

Council Member Zander asked about the long term plan for her parents' residence.

Ms. Visser is proposing that they would purchase the property, to be able to accommodate the venue. The home would stay while her parents are still there. If and when changes need to be made, they would love to incorporate the home with the venue as a rental space for brides or something like that. That's the goal, but she can't say when or if that will happen.

Council Member Jason McGuire asked if phase 3, at her parents' passing, would go to the estate and then decisions would be made from that point. Could it be sold to a developer, purchased by the family to incorporate with the venue, etc.

Ms. Visser said yes, they will have to sell the property at some point if this doesn't happen because it has to be a business for all of it to make sense. Just thinking that through, one misconception is that it's zoned residential, but if its ten years down the road this is a very commercial and busy street. There is so much noise she can't imagine anyone ever wanting to live there, her parents say it's miserable. She pointed out that someone else could come in later and put in a Walgreens. There are regulations, but you don't know what time will bring and they don't want to see that any more than anyone else, they want this preserved.

Council Member Marlor asked about the two hour window for events, wouldn't there be multiple events scheduled per day.

Ms. Visser said she has done a lot of research with wedding planners and event coordinators, the overall consensus was not to do more than one event per day. People want a whole day to come in and decorate or prepare, so it is not part of their plan to do more than one event per day.

Council Member Zander asked if she had talked to the owners of the Azalea, the venue on SoDa Row in Daybreak. It is constantly booked, and this is something that is needed and wanted. She doesn't know if they have more than one at a time, but they have divided their venue into two spots so there is a smaller and larger section. Every night almost there is something there.

Ms. Visser likes the idea of having multiple rental spaces, they'd like to accommodate everyone's needs with this. If someone wants to have a baby shower in the orchard, that might be an option; they don't want overlapping events.

City Manager Whatcott asked about lighting, if she has any information on those plans. Also, if there a part of the space that goes outside, could there be dancing outside or even music outside. If there was, do they have an estimated time they would close the venue.

Ms. Visser said she has checked out a lot of event centers, they are all in residential areas. This includes Magnolia Grove, which is on the same street in the city; behind the building is all residential. They have gotten opinions from several architects, there are light shields that can be added, direct lighting that goes straight down, also landscape lighting that can possibly be done from the ground. Regarding noise regulations, there wouldn't be live music outside and all music would be controlled at a specific volume. These subjects are addressed very specifically in the contracts and the customer can be fined if they don't follow the rules.

City Manager Whatcott said those are the kinds of complaints that usually come across his desk, things like noise and lighting complaints.

Ms. Visser said they are open to any suggestions.

City Manager Whatcott said the way this is structured, he doesn't see any entrances on Alexander Place, this is all coming off 3200 West.

Ms. Visser said there is a wall around the entire thing, they can put up no parking signs but for someone to park on Alexander and walk all the way around to the entrance would be very unlikely. They wouldn't allow that to happen.

Director Schaefermeyer mentioned emergency access that would need to be discussed with the Fire Department. A challenge for both access and lighting is having Ms. Visser get too far down the road before getting the council's input. If those are the things the council wants addressed in the development agreement, then those are things they need to know up front so if she gets the feeling that the council is approving of her proposal she can start looking into more specifics.

Council Member Zander asked about noise ordinances.

Attorney Loose said there is a Salt Lake County noise ordinance, but there is also an hours of operation ordinance regarding deliveries by large trucks. Deliveries usually are required to end by 10:00 p.m. and can begin again at 7:00 a.m.

City Manager Whatcott said we do have some approved conditional uses that specify the times lights need to go out and when the business has to be closed.

Attorney Loose said things like that can be specified in the agreement, but he believes our current rule is that noise has to end at 10:00 p.m. That's the nice thing about the overlay zone with the development agreement, we can address unique issues in the commercial zone that this brings.

Council Member Patrick Harris said this is a unique situation. Usually we are looking at stuff where a new structure is being built, but this is an existing structure that is just being changed. He understands this requires some rezoning, but he asked for someone to address property rights since we have an existing structure on property and they are wanting to change things up.

Director Schaefermeyer said if the Jones' have done something on their property for many years that was allowed under the zoning, they can continue to do that. When you request a change, that's when some of these things come up in terms of existing buildings. There are some parts of our ordinance that encourage preservation; we don't have a lot of it in South Jordan. If this were a proposal for a farm, this might be a different discussion, but this is for an events center. What's there now is their existing rights, either under the zone or traditionally how they've used it over the years.

Attorney Loose said once they apply for a rezone, any existing rights to things like farm animals, etc., would leave and you get the rights in the new zone.

Council Member Harris asked if their current property rights have already been abandoned.

Attorney Loose said not necessarily as of right now. He would have to look at the development agreement and the current zone, but they have changed their rights from what they were before the development agreement. They got new rights with the development agreement, but they have added some of the things they were already doing.

Council Member Harris asked if Ms. Visser were to work with city staff, would they be able to understand the neighbors' needs and work things out in a way that adequately addresses things like parking, lighting, sound, etc.

Director Schaefermeyer said the early proposals were hard to swallow, but they continued through the process. They listened to the neighbors and came up with a solution that seemed satisfactory, and that made it through the public hearing. She has been able to think through a lot of the issues, but it is hard to get consensus with an amorphous group of citizens. He thinks as long as the city council agrees what the issues are, then the staff can address those issues. He can't address every issue any neighbor has, as people have competing issues. One of the issues he has heard about from residents of Alexander Park is that they want homes across from them with a neighborhood feel. One of the early proposals was to put a wall along Alexander Park, to have a cut through street and a cul-de-sac; they weren't in favor of that because it turned the backs of homes to them. With this proposal, they are trying to find some sort of compromise. Phase 1 is homes along Alexander Park, but not along the entire street. If this were approved, having homes along the entire street is obviously something that can't be done. In terms of lighting, operations and how it's managed that isn't something we have control over; if it's in the agreement and there are complaints, there is something for us to go back to. There is also the balance between how detailed we get. She has provided a lot of detail up front, which is really helpful in terms of potential issues. Anything that is not in the development agreement would have to be in city ordinance, so if concerns are already addressed by our ordinances we don't put those in the development agreement unless we really want to highlight it. For instance, we have a commercial lighting ordinance that requires things like shielding, but in practice shielding can mean a lot of things. If we wanted to be very careful about the lights along the perimeter, we could specify what the actual lights look like in the agreement. Speaking with neighbors is hard, especially for someone who isn't a developer. The city has recommended that she engage with the neighbors because that is important to the city council, that they understand what the neighbors think.

Mayor Ramsey said she thinks if the majority of South Jordan were to weigh-in about the barn being historic, many people would agree with her.

Ms. Visser said along Alexander there is a retention pond, with two and a half homes that front it, with the development next to that. They have spoken to the owners of the two homes and they are fine with it. She mentioned that once they had spoken with the residents of the 55+ community and shown them the plans, those residents felt much better about it; they thought the barn was going away and had a lot of misconceptions.

Council Member Harris asked for more information on why this would be historic and why it should be preserved.

Ms. Visser said her parents moved here 51 years ago. In 1980 her dad, four brothers and a contractor friend built this barn by themselves. Every architect who has looked at it has said it is over-built and incredible, they can't believe what great condition it's in. Her parents have been very open with sharing their animals, and in a way it has been a free zoo for the city. They had

someone actually try to give them money for being their therapy all these years. To the historic side of it, she feels it has been a part of South Jordan history and people know it. When she mentions she lives near the buffalo and elk, or the big barn, everyone knows where that is. She feels it has housed so many community events, youth activities, school field trips, high school dances, musical recitals; it has been a place of community.

Council Member Harris said other than the business side, what does this continue to bring to the surrounding neighborhood, besides tax dollars.

Ms. Visser said they are going to make it a beautiful place to be, they hope people will walk around the gardens and enjoy it. They told the residents earlier that they will leave the gate open and they can come walk around whenever they want, bring their grandkids. There is a huge need, but she feels like it is a way to bring people together and provide a place for that; there isn't a place like this in South Jordan.

Council Member Zander asked what the barn is being used for currently.

Ms. Visser said it is a working barn with tools, no animals.

Council Member McGuire asked about buildings shown on the plans, if they were being built or currently there. He also asked to clarify that the building being moved to another corner is not part of the current proposal.

Ms. Visser said they are existing buildings. The corner belongs to their old neighbors, the Bass Family, and they are really good friends with them. Both of their parents passed away and their home was torn down when the road was widened, as were most of their neighbors' homes. They held on to it for sentimental value, now the siblings want to sell it and as they were told about this plan they decided not to sell it until it could be a part of this new project. Her family would be purchasing that corner piece to include it as part of the preservation.

Council Member Shelton had a chance to tour the barn and the area. He is sympathetic to the idea of retaining the barn as a historical piece, but he is also sympathetic to the neighbors who have concerns. If the staff can look at those concerns and mitigate them as much as possible, then he can feel supportive of this project and feel good about preserving something that is historical.

City Manager Whatcott asked, regarding the remaining lots on 3200 West, the accesses that were originally platted don't line up anymore, what happens to lots 12 and 13 with access to their property.

Director Schaefermeyer said those lots become the parking area in phase 1. Parking you can see from the street is more likely to be used, the parking on 3200 West is more helpful than parking you wouldn't be able to see from the street.

Council Member Marlor is generally pro-commercial and we need the commercial tax base, he is supportive from that perspective. The rendering is nice, but she will need to do more work with the public to either appease them or come up with something they will feel good about.

Council Member Shelton said his concerns are similar to Council Member Marlor's, but he does like the idea of preserving a historical site and open space.

Council Member Zander appreciates all the hard work she has put into this, it's obvious she has gone the extra mile. She asked if her whole family is supportive of this plan.

Ms. Visser said yes, there are four brothers, her and her sister, and they said they just don't want to be the ones serving the food. They are dealing with that by her, her husband and her sister purchasing the property. A portion of the property would stay in the family trust and they hope to be able to include and purchase that part at a later point.

Council Member Zander said this is great, they are always looking for historical opportunities. This isn't just a historical opportunity, it's also usable, unlike some of the historic places in our city that are there but not used. She would love to see a historical venue that is frequented. We are always asking developers to give us open space, but they don't. Of course, as mentioned, they will need to work with the surrounding neighbors. However, as the mayor said, if we asked the residents of the city about this, they believe the majority of residents in the city would be thrilled with this option. If we're thinking big picture, the city could use this; it would be charming, historical, and for all those reasons she thinks it's a great idea and applauds the fact that she's keeping an open space and something historic.

Council Member McGuire said he feels torn about this. His heart sunk when he heard the property had been sold to begin with, as it meant the animals and barn would be gone and it's something he has enjoyed driving his kids by. At the same time, he thinks about the original agreement and what was promised to neighbors, which is why they showed support to the original agreement. He has a lot of concern about her parents' home no longer being protected by an agreement, as in the agreement in the future phase 2 another house would be built there. Now, they could have a future gas station there or a car wash. He agrees with many of the comments, he likes the idea of preserving a historic landmark in our city; we have to figure out how we can resolve the issues with the neighbors, and if it's really possible.

Ms. Visser asked if he felt they had done a good job with addressing those concerns with this current plan.

Council Member McGuire said he hasn't had a chance to sit down and talk to the neighbors directly. This is his area, but he does feel that she has presented a lot of good information in terms of lighting and sound, along with the fact that the entrance is off 3200 West and not Alexander. He mentioned a possible knockdown gate onto Alexander for safety and fire, but that would be up to the Fire Department.

Council Member Harris said we only have so many areas like this left in the city, and he realizes that there were original plans out there. He is glad she has re-thought this after neighbors

reaching out, and that they have worked together to decide how they can preserve this. Our city council has had these discussions about what they can do to preserve the historic nature of our city here. We have another property in our city that the city has spent around one million trying to renovate a building that isn't even being used. It will take that same amount of money to even make it useable, and it's just sitting there. Here she is coming to them with a plan, that isn't requesting city funds. Even though the other building is certainly historic, it takes the right planning and vision to be able to preserve these historic areas in our city. He understands that the neighbors around this had a different vision of what it would look like. It's not cheap to buy back these additional lots, and even though the plans are changing, he thinks this is being addressed to make it something nice. They are going to address the things like lights and sound, and if he thought for one second this was going to diminish the value of these properties around it he wouldn't be for this. He thinks, if anything, this adds something with a little more character to the neighborhood, which will only add value. He encouraged them to reach out to their neighbors and used Fred Lampropoulos from Merit Medical as an example of how to reach out to those neighbors. He thinks it would be a miss if we didn't see this for what it is, and he encouraged the council members to visit this property to get a feel of the area.

Ms. Visser said they would love neighbors to use this for their neighborhood and personal activities.

Council Member Marlbor asked if they were contemplating any kind of retail during other hours, or will it just be a reception center.

Mayor Ramsey said she thinks Ms. Visser has done a good job trying to address what was brought up by the neighbors initially. Having the entrance exactly where it was going to be is helpful, along with moving the parking off Alexander. She hopes the neighbors feel the same way, as that was significant in bringing the cars away from them. She does think we have a need, but she also knows how much this place means to people and she thinks that if we polled people there would be overwhelming support for keeping this barn there. It is a historic landmark in our city. The neighbors that have moved in after 2020 and the agreement did think this would be all homes, and this changes things a little bit, but she is impressed with the work Ms. Visser has done. It won't be easy, but she is impressed with their efforts to make the best project possible and preserve the historical integrity of the site and barn, and to work with the neighbors to try to mitigate concerns. This is intimidating to do this kind of presentation, but most people are able to come up with something that works; she is confident that can happen with this project. The council is supportive of saying it's not a waste of your time and money to proceed with working on this.

Director Schaefermeyer asked regarding the R-3 versus the R-2.5.; is the council comfortable with what is shown in phase 1, with a need of a rezone? They can explore other options to make people comfortable with what's on the zoning map, or do they need to increase the lot sizes of one or two lots to meet the density.

Council Member Harris said regarding density, they are always encouraging open and green space. He doesn't imagine they can come up with anything that would have more open and green

space then what they're seeing here tonight. As a result, if that does change to an R-3, he's supportive of that.

Mayor Ramsey said it maintains what was already drawn for phase 1, and it stays with what the neighbors and builder knew was coming.

Director Schaefermeyer said they could zone part of this RM, and then limit it to what is shown. He would rather rezone it as single family, rather than zone it as multi-family and then restrict it to single family as that can get confusing to people. What she is showing is what would be followed from the development agreement.

Mayor Ramsey said this would keep ten exactly as they were. She doesn't want to create unnecessary or unjustified stress for anyone, but what they know is supposed to go there is what is currently approved.

Director Schaefermeyer said sometimes it is hard to summarize neighbor concerns, but they really do try to address as many as possible given the constraints and what the applicant is willing to do. They will try to zero in on what those are so that if or when this comes back it will be clear what is being addressed and what couldn't be addressed.

Council Member Marlor mentioned there will only be nine residential lots.

Director Schaefermeyer encouraged them to not define what's possibly going to happen in the corner if they don't know yet. They can talk about limiting uses through the development agreement.

Attorney Loose said the development agreement might be hard, but it depends on whether it is included in the application; we can't do something in an agreement that's larger in scope than what the application is for. The city council does have zoning authority for that corner, and they could rezone it now if it's currently zoned as something they are uncomfortable with.

Council Member Zander said it would be a good time to address this while we have the family on board and in agreement.

Council Member McGuire asked Ms. Visser to let him know if she has sit down meetings with the neighbors so he can attend.

ADJOURNMENT

Council Member Shelton motioned to adjourn the Study Meeting. Council Member Marlor seconded the motion; vote was unanimous in favor.

The December 7, 2021 City Council electronic study meeting adjourned at 6:20 p.m.