

Meeting of the Redevelopment Agency of Sandy City

July 29, 2025 – Online/In Person Meeting
City Council Chambers, Sandy City Hall
10000 South Centennial Parkway, Sandy, Utah

MINUTES

Present: Present: Chair Brooke D’Sousa, Vice Chair Ryan Mecham, Marcie Houseman, Alison Stroud, Cyndi Sharkey, Zach Robinson, Aaron Dekeyzer

Executive Director: Monica Zoltanski

Others in Attendance: Dustin Fratto, Council Director, Justin Sorenson, Assistant Director, Liz Theriault, Sr. Policy and Comms Analyst, Shane Pace, CAO, Lynn Pace, City Attorney, Ryan Kump, Public Works Director, Greg Severson, Police Chief, Martin Jensen, Deputy Chief Administrative Officer, Dan Medina, Parks and Recreation, James Sorensen, Community Development, Brian Kelley, Administrative Services, Kasey Dunlavy, Economic Development, Rob Sant, Economic Development, Bryce Baker, dbUrban, Dustin Holt, dbUrban, Josh Woodbury, Woodbury Corporation

1. Motion to convene Redevelopment Agency meeting.

Motion was made by Board Member Robinson to adjourn the meeting of the City Council and convene the Sandy City Redevelopment Agency Meeting. Board Member Mecham seconded the motion with all voting “yes”.

The Redevelopment Agency Meeting commenced at approximately 7:13 p.m.

2. Centennial Village Development Concept Presentation

Kasey Dunlavy provided a background on the Centennial Village property, located directly south of City Hall and the post office. The current property owner, who purchased the land in 2015, is in default due to unmet development obligations. To remedy this, the city and RDA are considering a new developer, subject to board approval. A Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) has been initiated with db Urban, outlining preliminary timelines and goals. Kasey explained that tonight's presentation is intended to gather board feedback on the development concept. If the board is comfortable with the concept, staff will continue working toward a formal Development Agreement, which will later be presented for approval. The project must also undergo the city's normal planning and site plan processes.

Bryce Baker (db Urban) introduced the development team, including Dustin Holt and Josh Woodbury, and emphasized that the presentation is informational and non-binding.

Board Member Robinson inquired whether the existing parking structure was required to remain as part of future development. Bryce clarified that the proposed plan includes demolishing the current parking garage due to its condition and proximity to the existing civic building (post office), which will be preserved. A new parking garage would be constructed as part of Phase 1.

Bryce presented an overview of the proposed phased development plan:

- * Phase 1: Demolition of the existing parking structure; construction of a new 750-stall garage and a mixed-use building along Monroe Street, including live/work units and townhomes to screen the garage.
- * Phase 2: Southeast corner development.
- * Phase 3: Remaining corners, including a minimum eight-story commercial building (potential uses: office, hotel, or hospitality) as required by zoning.

The project includes approximately:

- * 545 residential units, including 17 townhomes/live-work units
- * 100,000 square feet of commercial space
- * 750 parking stalls

The team aims to enhance the walkability and public realm, integrating with events and attractions in Sandy, such as the promenade and community events.

Bryce explained that the phased approach to the development plan is essential to secure financing and move forward. He noted that currently, a purchase and sale agreement (PSA) is not in place because the landowner is in default and cannot legally enter a binding agreement. The existing development agreement (DA), which includes high-rise towers, is not considered market feasible by the applicant. Therefore, they have created a new concept plan intended to serve as an exhibit for a new DA. Bryce emphasized that progress has been delayed over the past two years due to the need for the City's approval of the revised site plan and new DA. He highlighted the circular challenge: the development cannot proceed without City approval, and the seller cannot engage until that approval is secured.

Board Member Robinson expressed appreciation for the confidence demonstrated by the development team. He acknowledged the complexities surrounding the current situation and appreciated the clarity brought to the conversation. Robinson stated that he supports the overall vision, scale, and mixed-use approach of the proposal, and believes it is well suited to the location. However, he raised a concern from a resident's perspective regarding foot traffic, noting that in his experience working near similar developments,

there appears to be less pedestrian activity than expected. While he admitted this was anecdotal, he questioned whether the environment in Sandy would be conducive to the project's success. Nonetheless, he appreciated the developer's candor and confidence in their ability to deliver a viable and vibrant project.

Bryce affirmed their confidence in the project's success.

Board Member Houseman thanked the development team for their thoughtful approach, noting the clear consideration of various community needs. She inquired specifically about the 800 square foot units referenced as live-work spaces, seeking clarification on their functionality and potential market demand.

Bryce clarified that the 800 square foot figure is an average across the entire project, with unit sizes ranging from approximately 500 to over 1,600 square feet.

Board Member Houseman followed up, referencing the 313 traditional residential units listed separately from the larger live-work units. She asked for more detail about the target demographic for these smaller units and their market appeal.

Bryce responded to Board Member Houseman's question by explaining that each building in the project will target different market segments. The development will offer a variety of unit types, from 500 square foot studios to larger three-bedroom units, accommodating a wide spectrum of income levels and household types. Bryce also noted that the development agreement (DA) will include affordability requirements, with units set aside for residents earning below 60% and 80% of the area median income. These affordable units will be integrated throughout the buildings to ensure consistency in quality and experience, rather than being isolated in separate structures. The intent is to create a mixed-income community that meets both market demand and broader housing needs.

Board Member Houseman expressed appreciation for the comprehensive and inclusive approach, acknowledging the project's potential to appeal to a diverse demographic and support affordability goals.

Board Member Mecham voiced strong support for the project, praising its thoughtful design, particularly the visual interaction of buildings with the streetscape. Mecham inquired about the residential units' tenure, specifically, whether they would be rental or ownership opportunities.

Bryce explained that while the development agreement has not yet finalized the details, the current memorandum of understanding (MOU) allows for both lease and ownership options. There is a particular interest in placing for-sale units on the upper floors to help offset costs such as structured parking. He noted that future conversion to condominiums is a possibility and that homeownership remains a key component of the project's financial and community strategy.

Board Member D’Sousa noted her enthusiasm about the condominium opportunities mentioned earlier. She expressed hope that this market shift would encourage developers to revisit ownership opportunities and address barriers that have historically discouraged condominium development. She then asked the development team to outline a realistic timeline for the project’s three phases, as well as for the first phase alone, assuming economic conditions remain relatively stable.

Bryce explained that following DA execution, the next major step is site plan approval, which includes completing full building design, coordinating with city staff, and securing a code-compliant permit set. He estimated that this process would take approximately 9 to 12 months, placing the potential groundbreaking for Phase 1 around this time next year.

When asked about total project completion, Bryce shared that the development team has engaged multiple reputable general contractors to assess construction timelines. Based on their input, the first building is expected to take approximately 30 to 32 months to complete, with subsequent phases following. He projected that full occupancy of the first phase could occur in about three years.

Board Member DeKeyser raised concerns about the proposed parking count—approximately 720 stalls—and noted that a parking study could result in adjustments. He suggested that the project would either need to significantly reduce parking (to a ratio as low as 0.75 stalls per unit) or increase it if serving a broader area. He also asked about the flexibility in various components of the plan—such as parking, owner occupancy, and affordability—and questioned whether the current eight-story proposal was a minimum or maximum height.

Bryce responded that the current concept represents the development team’s working model, reflecting an economic balance between height, density, and cost.

DeKeyser pointed out that parking is one of the most expensive aspects of the project, and asked whether reducing garage size could free up resources for more affordable housing.

Bryce acknowledged that while there’s some merit to that idea, the relationship isn’t one-to-one. Parking decisions are often market-driven, and different demographics have different parking needs. For example, a high-end condo buyer is likely to require parking. Reducing parking might lower costs, but could also change the target demographic and marketability of the units. He emphasized the complexity of these tradeoffs.

Bryce elaborated that the project’s standalone parking garage is intentionally designed on a separate parcel to support future flexibility. For example, the garage could be expanded to support a larger parking district—an idea that’s been under discussion since the Cairns planning process began over 15 years ago. This flexibility is not possible with podium-style parking, which is fixed beneath residential units. If district needs or site conditions evolve, the parking structure can potentially be scaled accordingly.

Board Member DeKeyser concluded by expressing general support for the project, appreciation for the developer's professionalism, and optimism about the proposed plan.

Board Member Sharkey commended the development team for the depth of information shared and noted a unique aspect of the proposal—the inclusion of an office tower, which has been absent in recent mixed-use proposals. She inquired whether the development is envisioned as a largely self-contained community offering residents access to essential amenities, or whether the plan relies on nearby developments to fulfill those functions.

Bryce noted that the development's role is to complement and contribute to district-wide vibrancy, not isolate itself.

Board Member Stroud expressed concern about parking availability potentially limiting patronage of retail and dining establishments. Bryce acknowledged these concerns and noted that budgeting and cost modeling are ongoing with general contractors to address such issues. Stroud also asked about rental pricing; Bryce indicated rent figures are being refined but not finalized. Stroud queried about delays in project progress. Bryce explained that delays resulted from negotiations with a landowner in technical default and the need for a new development agreement. He emphasized that the current focus is on securing development plan approval and finalizing site planning to move forward. Regarding the Housing and Transit Reinvestment Zone (HTRZ) application, Kasey provided an update that the application is under review, with notifications sent to taxing entities and an expected vote in September.

3. Discussion of a potential Interlocal Cooperation Agreement between Sandy City and the Redevelopment Agency of Sandy City to acquire real property located within the TOD Community Development Project Area.

Kasey Dunlavy introduced the discussion on an interlocal agreement between the City and the RDA concerning the potential purchase of right-of-way property. Brittany Ward and Ryan are leading negotiations with the property owner.

Brittany Ward explained that the parcel in question is on the northeast corner of 100 South and State Street, part of the Dry Creek Trail system. Purchasing this parcel completes an east-west segment of the trail, allowing a continuous non-grade crossing from Mount Jordan Road to State Street. The RDA is financing the purchase from the Fairbanks family.

Kasey clarified why the RDA is purchasing the property: it lies within the TOD Community Development Agency (CDA) project area, where tax increment funds have been allocated for infrastructure improvements, including this right-of-way and a potential pedestrian bridge over State Street. This approach avoids using City General Fund money.

Board Member Robinson asked if the purchase would negatively affect the prospective tenant's use of the site. Brittany and Ryan confirmed the tenant's plans, including a drive-through, are compatible with the purchase and that the RDA acquiring the land would not impede development.

James Sorensen added that the developer's plans have been reviewed and are advancing through the Planning Commission with positive reception, including outdoor dining.

Board Member D'Sousa requested a map of the property and trail system to visualize the easement area better. Kasey agreed to provide it and noted the item will return for a formal vote. Board Member D'Sousa also asked why the RDA, rather than the City, would purchase the parcel. Kasey explained that the purchase aligns with the goals of the CDA project area to promote economic development and quality of life improvements such as trails and infrastructure, leveraging tax increment funds and preserving General Fund resources.

4. Motion to approve the RDA minutes from June 24, 2025.

Board Member Mecham made a motion to adopt the minutes from June 24, 2025. Board Member Robinson seconded the motion, with all voting "yes".

5. Motion to adjourn Redevelopment Agency Meeting:

Board Member Mecham made a motion to adjourn the meeting of the RDA. Board Member Robinson seconded the motion, with all voting "yes".

The meeting recessed at 8:23 p.m.

ATTEST:

Brooke D'Sousa – Chair

Hannah Knudson- Secretary