



MINUTES OF THE CITY OF WEST JORDAN
COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE
Wednesday, June 21, 2023 – 6:00 pm
Waiting Formal Approval

Thomas M. Rees Justice Center
8040 S Redwood Road • West Jordan, UT 84088

1. CALL TO ORDER

Chair McConnehey called the Committee of the Whole to order at 6:00 pm

COUNCIL: Council Chair Chris McConnehey, Council Member Zach Jacob, Council Member Melissa Worthen, Council Member David Pack, Council Member Kelvin Green, Council Vice Chair Pamela Bloom, Council Member Kayleen Whitelock

STAFF: Council Office Director Alan Anderson, Council Office Clerk Cindy Quick, Policy Analyst Cassidy Hansen, City Administrator Korban Lee, Administrative Services Director Danyce Steck, Public Services Director Isaac Astill, Public Utilities Director Greg Davenport, City Planner / Zoning Administrator Larry Gardner, Community Development Director Scott Langford, Fire Chief Derek Maxfield, Economic Development Director Chris Pengra, City Attorney Josh Chandler, Assistant City Administrator Jamie Davidson

2. DISCUSSION TOPICS

a. *Western Stampede Report*

Events Manager Ashley Dupler reported plans for the upcoming Western Stampede, and answered questions from the Council.

b. *Discussion regarding a petition by Peterson Development regarding a General Plan Map Amendment, Rezone (to the PC zone), Master Development Agreement/Plan and an Annexation for Copper Meadows approximately 75 acres located at approximately 7339 West 8200 South*

Community Development Director Scott Langford said staff had been working with Peterson Development on the subject proposal for over a year. Senior Planner Tayler Jensen oriented the Council with the proposal to rezone property at approximately 7339 West 8200 South to PC (Planned Community) Zone to develop 161 single-family units, 175 carriage homes, and 69 townhomes, with 17.9 acres of passive open space and 4.4 acres of active open space. Mr. Jensen explained staff concerns regarding proposed private lanes, and the staff recommendation to require sidewalk access from units to the street separate from the private lanes.

Mr. Jensen shared the following feedback from the Design Review Committee (DRC):

- Concern about the number of guest parking stalls, and the need for a strong HOA to keep guest stalls open in the carriage home portion.
- Did not feel high density residential was appropriate that far from transit.
- Concern the proposal did not comply with the purpose of the PC Zone as it was only residential.

- Felt the project would be more appropriate if the development standards were more in line with standards already established in Code.
- Felt the cluster lot/carriage home portion of the development should only have 2 lots off a private drive.
- Liked the elevations and the proposed signage.
- DRC voted (4-0) to recommend the proposal be revised based on the above. Under the current design, they recommended denial of General Plan Amendment and rezone to PC.

Public Works Utility Manager Greg Davenport said the proposed development area was in both Zones 6 and 7. He said Zone 6 did not currently have water storage for the project, Zone 7 had zero facilities, and requirements with Jordan Valley Water Conservation District would need to be changed. If the proposed development were approved, no homes could be built in Zone 7 until a source and tank were provided. Responding to a question from Council Member Jacob, Mr. Davenport said not many development applicants would be in a position to bear the cost of the needed infrastructure.

Mr. Davenport spoke of the cost of the potential sewer impact, and said the proposed storm water pond would need to be larger than shown. He said the size of the pond could be decreased if low-impact development (LID) methods were utilized; however, most of the proposed open space was on hillside slopes where water could not be stored. The proposed plan did not show use of LID methods. Responding to a question from Council Member Whitelock, Mr. Davenport said the proposed development would take 300 ERUs, and said he could take a look at how the proposed development would affect water availability for other potential future development.

Mr. Davenport said infrastructure cost would not be excessive if development were to occur at the size included in the Future Land Use Map. An increase in the density would increase the cost to develop the area. Vice Chair Bloom said she liked the proposed layout with the buffers, and said she hoped the developer could find a balance and make the project work.

Council Member Jacob asked if the infrastructure lines were upgradable to accommodate the proposed project, and said he was concerned about collapsible soils in the area. Council Member Jacob pointed out that UTA would not route bus lines to the area without enough people, and said he preferred four-unit access per driveway instead of six. He said the density seemed well done, and expressed confidence in engineers' ability to deal with the slopes.

Mr. Jensen said the public facilities designation on the Future Land Use Map was intended for a school, but the Jordan School District (JSD) had not shown interest in the property. Council Members shared their understanding of whether or not the JSD had plans for schools on the west side of West Jordan.

Council Member Whitelock said she had concerns, and expressed the opinion that a very strong MDA and MDP would be needed to guarantee that the City did not end up paying for the needed infrastructure.

Council Member Green said the proposed development had some high-density components, but was about 5.6 units per acre overall, which he did not consider high-density residential. He commented that the PC Zone required commercial, but expressed the opinion that commercial would perhaps not be appropriate at that location and suggested the ordinance may need to be modified for flexibility. Council Member Green said he had concerns with the cottage driveways, lack of sidewalks, and soils issues, but felt the overall layout was not bad.

Chair McConnehey said he was not terribly worried about the proposed concept. He said that although the concept did not fit the PC Zone, the City had approved PC Zones without commercial in the past. Chair McConnehey said he agreed a strong MDA would be needed to support all potential future impacts. He said he was interested in hearing if the proposed development was the type of development the Council wanted to see at that location.

Mr. Jensen asked if the Council was comfortable with the proposed density, and the proposed setbacks and driveway lengths. Council Member Jacob asked if a PRD Zone would be appropriate, and staff responded the PRD Zone was only applicable for 20-30 acres, but other zoning tools were available. Staff clarified the PC Zone encouraged commercial, but did not require commercial.

Scott Langford said staff would work on the details if the Council was amenable to the proposed project moving forward. Vice Chair Bloom expressed the opinion that the project should not be classified as high density, and suggested the wording should be changed.

Council Member Green said there were obvious infrastructure issues he was willing to look at to ensure they were done correctly. He said he was open to considering a public infrastructure district if it meant getting the infrastructure right. Council Member Whitelock expressed the opinion that 22-foot driveways were necessary for safety reasons, and said she would want to provide some way to access the cottage homes other than the shared driveway.

City Administrator Korban Lee said he felt confused, and commented that the proposed development was a far departure from what the Council had previously suggested for the subject area. He said master plans would need to be reconsidered because they were built on the broad assumption that density should decrease moving further away from the infrastructure core.

Barrett Peterson with Peterson Development introduced Jeff Seamon and Kaylen Nichols with Peterson Development and Thomas Romney with Focus Engineering. Mr. Peterson said he was proud of what Peterson Development had accomplished in West Jordan. He expressed a desire to bring forward a community that was creative and imaginative, and said commercial may not work at the subject location. Mr. Peterson said he believed the proposal was reasonable at 5.3 units per acre, and believed the subject location was a good place for the proposed residential development.

Thomas Romney with Focus Engineering said the property already had some infrastructure planned that the proposed development would add onto. He said he understood that infrastructure took time, and said they would make sure needed infrastructure was in place before building homes. Mr. Romney said they were working with geotechnical experts and City staff.

Chair McConnehey asked what the applicants wanted the Council specifically to weigh in on. Mr. Peterson referred to Vice Chair Bloom's comment about finding balance. He said Peterson Development was willing to wait on building until water and sewer were ready. Ms. Nichols said Peterson Development was wanting to know from the Council if they should generally move forward. She said they had taken note of the Council comments that evening. Council Member Worthen said she wanted to hear feedback from people who lived in that area.

Responding to Mr. Lee's comments, Chair McConnehey said he felt the proposed development location was different because of the existing gravel pit and associated challenges. He acknowledged that flexibility and creativity were needed in the area. Chair McConnehey said he would prefer less density, but felt there was a fair amount of open space in the proposed plan. He said six units sharing a drive access seemed a bit much, and said he believed the infrastructure issues could be worked out.

Vice Chair Bloom said she looked forward to hearing what the neighbors had to say. She said she appreciated Peterson Development's willingness to listen and work with the City to find a balance. Council Member Pack said the location was tough and he liked the general concept plan. He said Peterson Development had a great track record for involving the community. Council Member Jacob shared personal experience with shared driveways, and suggested a little more breathing space between the houses.

Mr. Peterson spoke in favor of having a blend of housing options available in a community. Ms. Nichols said Peterson Development would be creative in finding ways to include pedestrian walkways and guest parking.

Mr. Lee asked if the Council was comfortable with the proposed density level. Council Members Worthen and Whitelock said they wanted to hear from the neighborhood. Council Member Whitelock said she understood the property was unique, but said the proposal was a little too dense for her. She said she would like to see more useable greenspace and more places to park. Responding to a question from Council Member Whitelock, Mr. Peterson said the HOA would be responsible for parking enforcement through CC&Rs.

Council Member Green said the development to the south was 5.2 units per acre, and he did not feel the proposed 5.3 units per acre was out of line with surrounding development. He said he was comfortable with the proposed density. Vice Chair Bloom said she was fine with 5.3 units per acre. Council Member Pack said smaller lots seemed to be the trend rather than large lots on the hill. He said he had no problem with the proposed density, but would appreciate hearing neighbor feedback.

Council Member Green pointed out that a portion of the subject property would need to

be annexed. Responding to a question from Council Member Jacob, Mr. Peterson estimated it would be at least a couple years before the first home could go in. Mr. Romney said he believed it would be reasonable to have a home completed by spring of 2025.

Chair McConnehey thanked Peterson Development representatives for their time.

- c. Consider a potential Code Amendment to Title 13-5C; Planned Residential Development Zone, and potentially Title 13-5B-3; Residential Lot and Bulk Standards**
- Community Development Director Scott Langford said staff had delved into the possibility of amending the Planned Residential Development (PRD) Zone at the urging of Council Members Whitelock and Bloom following a Committee of the Whole discussion in March of 2023. He said staff had tried to remove road design and traffic calming issues from Title 13, said an ad hoc committee had researched and settled on 22 feet as a proposed standard driveway length, and said an effort had been made to make the PRD and PRC Zones more uniform.

Council Member Jacob asked if a developer would be able to propose three PRD phases of 20-30 acres each on a total of 75 acres of land. Mr. Langford said it would not be possible under current Code, but added that the Council was the land use authority and had the ability to govern a development with a master development agreement. Larry Gardner said the Council had full approval discretion under Utah State Law. Mr. Langford suggested reducing the 20 down to 10 acres. Council Member Green said he generally liked the direction the suggestions were headed, with the exception of the reduction to 10 acres. He argued that 10 acres was an infill project, not a large-scale project (as stated in the preamble), and said the preamble would need to be changed if the number reduced to 10. Council Member Whitelock said she agreed that the preamble would need to be modified, and said she thought more “shalls” and fewer “mays” were needed.

Council Member Jacob said he favored form-based code over arbitrary numbers, and suggested getting rid of the PRD Zone. Council Member Green said he would not be opposed. Mr. Langford said in making the proposed changes he was hoping to present more predictability for a developer while maintaining flexibility for the Council. Council Member Green suggested looking at the flex residential and flex commercial zones in Taylorsville.

Vice Chair Bloom asked the benefits of moving in the proposed direction. Mr. Langford responded that the Council and Code were always adapting to new ideas. He said he liked the clarity and predictability the proposed changes would provide.

A majority of the Council indicated support for:

- a minimum front yard 22-foot setback in the PRD and Residential zoning districts;
- a Code amendment that would bring the PRD into greater uniformity with standards currently found in the PC Zone;
- changing PRD language regarding minimum development acreage, with an immediate change to the preamble; and
- retaining discretion to approve PRD developments less than 10 acres in size.

d. Discussion to permit daycare as a conditional use in an M-1 Zone

Vice Chair Bloom and Council Member Worthen brought this agenda item forward. Vice Chair Bloom said she was approached by a community with a need for a daycare onsite in an M1 Zone, and expressed the opinion that it made sense to her to be able to expand the use not just to the M1 Zone, but generally where needed. Council Members Whitelock, Green, and Jacob expressed support. A majority of the Council indicated support for directing staff to look into other possible zones where childcare might be appropriate.

e. Discussion of 2023 Property Tax Scenarios

Budget & Management Analyst Rebecca Condie gave a brief summary of changes made to the Consolidated Fee Schedule based on Council feedback and direction. The Certified Tax Rate provided by the County was .00143. Ms. Condie presented a tax rate history for tax years 2012 through 2023 and average West Jordan home values for the same period, with the tax rate to average home value reducing over time. Ms. Condie showed scenarios involving different home values and different tax rate increases up to 5%. A majority of the Council indicated support for continuing forward with consideration of a property tax increase not to exceed 5%.

3. ADJOURN

Vice Chair Bloom moved to adjourn the meeting. Council Member Worthen seconded the motion. All voted in favor and the motion passed unanimously.

The meeting adjourned at 8:25 pm

I hereby certify that the foregoing minutes represent an accurate summary of what occurred at the meeting held on June 21, 2023. This document constitutes the official minutes for the West Jordan City Committee of the Whole.

Cindy M. Quick, MMC
Council Office Clerk

Approved this ____ day of ____ 2023