

7a

**MINUTES
TO BE
APPROVED**

**MINUTES OF THE CITY OF WEST JORDAN
CITY COUNCIL MEETING**

Wednesday, April 23, 2014

6:00 p.m.

Council Chambers

8000 South Redwood Road

West Jordan, Utah 84088

COUNCIL: Mayor Kim V. Rolfe and Council Members Jeff Haaga, Judy Hansen, Chad Nichols, and Justin D. Stoker. Council Members Chris M. McConnehey and Ben Southworth were excused.

STAFF: Richard L. Davis, City Manager; Jeffrey Robinson, City Attorney; Bryce Haderlie, Assistant City Manager; Melanie Briggs, City Clerk; Doug Diamond, Police Chief; Marc McElreath, Fire Chief; Tom Burdett, Development Director; Ryan Bradshaw, Finance Manager/Controller; Wendell Rigby, Public Works Director; Greg Mikolash, City Planner; Ray McCandless, Senior Planner; Dave Zobell, City Treasurer; Jim Riding, Capital Facilities Manager; Eric Okerlund, Budget Officer; Larry Montgomery, Finance Analyst, and Robert Thorup, Deputy City Attorney

I. CALL TO ORDER

Mayor Rolfe called the meeting to order at 5:00 p.m.

II. CLOSED SESSION

**DISCUSS THE SALE, LEASE OR DISPOSAL OF REAL PROPERTY;
DISCUSS PERSONNEL ISSUES**

COUNCIL: Mayor Kim V. Rolfe and Council Members Jeff Haaga, Judy Hansen, Chad Nichols, and Justin D. Stoker. Council Members Chris M. McConnehey and Ben Southworth were excused.

MOTION: Councilmember Haaga moved to go into a closed session to discuss the sale, lease, or disposal of real property and to discuss personnel issues. The motion was seconded by Councilmember Nichols.

A roll call vote was taken

Councilmember Haaga	Yes
Councilmember Hansen	Yes
Councilmember McConnehey	Absent
Councilmember Nichols	Yes
Councilmember Southworth	Absent
Councilmember Stoker	Yes
Mayor Rolfe	Yes

The motion passed 5-0 in favor.

The Council went into a Closed Session to discuss the sale, lease, or disposal of real property and to discuss personnel issues at 5:01 p.m. and recessed at 6:05 p.m. The meeting reconvened at 6:15 p.m.

III. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The pledge of allegiance was led by Bryce Haderlie, Assistant City Manager.

IV. PRESENTATION

Mayor Rolfe introduced Mark Klotovich, Teri Timpson, Jordan School District Administrator for West Jordan Schools, and Lowell Hicks, and his family.

Mark Klotovich provided a brief history of the life saving efforts made by Lowell Hicks as a music teacher at West Jordan Middle School during the 1947. He presented Mr. Hicks with an engraved plaque of his accomplishments.

The Mayor and Council presented a Proclamation to Lowell Hicks as West Jordan's Centurion, and for his life saving efforts. They expressed their appreciation for his efforts on behalf of the City.

Teri Timpson presented Mr. Hicks with a proclamation recognizing his efforts as an honored teacher for the Jordan School District for 39 years.

Mr. Hicks gave a very detailed history of that day in 1947 when he pulled the fire alarm to save over 400 children at the West Jordan Middle School.

V. COMMUNICATIONS

CITY MANAGER COMMENTS/REPORTS

Richard L. Davis-

- Kennecott representative provided an update on the Barneys Canyon Gold Mine, Clay Hollow Clean Up. He reviewed the history, reclamation, closure, offsite release, general clean up, and the cleanup options of the Barneys Canyon Gold Mine.

STAFF COMMENTS/REPORTS

Bryce Haderlie-

- Asked if the City Council were favorable to proceed with the construction of a Parade Float, and using the theme 'Imagine.' The cost would be \$15,000 - \$17,000. The Council agreed.

Tom Burdett –

- Updated the Council on the Stone Creek Clay Hollow open space elimination and reconsideration of the Peterson Development request. The item would be sent back to the Planning Commission for reconsideration and new recommendations.

Ryan Bradshaw-

- Asked if the Council had any preference of the examples from other cities of financial quarterly reports.

Chief McElreath-

- Reminded the Council of the groundbreaking for the new Station 54, on Tuesday, April 29, 11:00 a.m.
- The first CPR class would take place on May 3.

Wendell Rigby-

- Lane traffic closure on 7800 South 6000 West would begin May 5 through 8.

Chief Diamond-

- Updated the Council on the recent Police Officers that had finished POST, with a badge pinning Thursday, May 1, recognition of additional officers, and a special recognition to a civilian employee.
- Expressed appreciation for the City and community for support of the 'COPS for Kids' at the Sizzler held Tuesday, April 22.

CITY COUNCIL COMMENTS/REPORTS

Councilmember Nichols-

- Reminded the Council and staff of the deadlines for compiling of the Council Agenda packets. He clarified that the items must be submitted to the City Clerk's Office by 5:00 p.m. the week prior.

Councilmember Hansen-

- Updated the Council of the recent Sustainability Committee that was held. They requested that Roger Payne attend the next meeting to inform the members of the Stormwater

Mayor Rolfe-

- Informed those in attendance of the Comcast Cares Day on Saturday, April 26, 8:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.m.
- Branding Initiative process coming together. He asked if the Council were in favor of continuing the West Jordan Magazine that would be provided to the residents and new businesses. The Council was in favor of proceeding with the magazine.

VI. CITIZEN COMMENTS

Alexandra Eframo, West Jordan resident, stated she was against the logo that was recently approved. She requested information on the actual cost of changing the logo. She clarified that cats were allowed outside, as long as they are on a leash.

There was no one else present who desired to speak.

VII. CONSENT ITEMS

- 7.a Approve the minutes of March 26, 2014, and April 2, 2104, as approved.
- 7.b Approve Resolution 14-65, authorizing the Mayor to execute the Federal Aid Agreement Supplement for Local Agency Project between the UDOT and West Jordan City for additional funding for the Redwood Road & 8200 South Project intersection, in an amount not to exceed \$315,054.00.
- 7.c Approve Resolution 14-69, confirming the City Council appointments of members to serve on various Committees.
- 7.d Approve Ordinance 14-12, amending Ordinance 01-28, zoning condition #1, requiring 10% public open space and replacing it with a condition that requires the construction of a minimum 1.2 acre park, located at approximately 5800 West and 7100 South within the Siena Vista Development, Peterson Development/Vic Barnes.
- 7.e Approve Resolution 14-70, authorizing the Mayor to execute an Interlocal Agreement with Salt Lake County for the purchase LiDar Data in an amount not to exceed \$6,985.60.
- 7.f Approve the Health and Dental Insurance Renewal Rates for FY 2014-2015.
- 7.g Approve Ordinance 14-13, amending the 2009 West Jordan Municipal Code Title 3, Chapter 8, Section 3-8-1.B11 regarding 'Preparation of Tentative Budget'.
- 7.h Approve Resolution 14-71, authorizing the Mayor to execute an Amended Agreement with Valley Services Inc., for City Wide Parkstrip Landscape Maintenance, in an amount not-to-exceed \$91,725.00

- 7.i Approve Resolution 14-72, authorizing the Mayor to execute an Agreement with Construction Material Recycling, Inc. for Milling and Sweeper services in an amount not-to-exceed \$68,550.00**
- 7.j Approve Resolution 14-71, authorizing the Mayor to execute a contract with Hansen Allen and Luce, Inc., for the Water Master Plan Update in an amount not-to-exceed \$57,273.50**
- 7.k Approve Resolution 14-72, authorizing the Mayor to execute a contract with COP Construction, LLC for construction of the Well #3 Pump House, in an amount not to exceed \$68,550.00**
- 7.l Approve Resolution 14-75, authorizing the Mayor to execute an Agreement with Wasatch West Contracting LLC for elastomeric roof coating at the Public Works Operations building in an amount not-to-exceed \$1,025,000.00**
- 7.m Approve Resolution 14-76, authorizing the Mayor to execute a Purchase Order with CH Spencer and Company for the purchase of a Deep Well Vertical Turbine Pump Assembly and Column Assembly in an amount not-to-exceed \$58,500.00**
- 7.n Approve Resolution 14-77, approving the application for and participation in the Federal Surplus Property Program**
- 7.o Approve Resolution 14-78, authorizing the Mayor to execute an Agreement with the Princess Festival approving a value for value exchange in the amount of \$2,300.00**
- 7.p Approve Resolution 14-80, authorizing the Mayor to seek Legal Counsel for the City Council concerning Closed Door Sessions using Council Contingency Budget in an amount not-to-exceed \$30,000.00**
- 7.q Approve the purchase of a license for Adobe Acrobat for us by Council Member Haaga for his City computer not to exceed \$250**

Consent Items 7p and 7q were pulled to a date uncertain.

The Council pulled Consent Item 7f for further discussion.

MOTION: Councilmember Nichols moved to approve Consent Items 7a through 7e, and 7g through 7o; stating that Consent Item 7p and 7q were pulled to a date uncertain, and Consent Item 7f discussed later in the meeting. The motion was seconded by Councilmember Stoker.

A roll call vote was taken

Councilmember Haaga	Yes
Councilmember Hansen	Yes
Councilmember McConnehey	Absent
Councilmember Nichols	Yes
Councilmember Southworth	Absent
Councilmember Stoker	Yes
Mayor Rolfe	Yes

The motion passed 5-0

VIII. PUBLIC HEARING

RECEIVE PUBLIC INPUT AND CONSIDER FOR APPROVAL ORDINANCE 14-14, REGARDING A REZONE OF APPROXIMATELY 2.78 ACRES FROM R-1-8A (SINGLE-FAMILY RESIDENTIAL 8,000 SQUARE FOOT MINIMUM LOTS) TO PRD(H) (PLANNED RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT-HIGH DENSITY FOR AN ESTIMATED 21 UNITS) ZONE, FOR PROPERTY LOCATED AT 7292 SOUTH REDWOOD ROAD, AMARA COURT TOWNHOMES, FERRAN CONSTRUCTION/TROY FERRAN, APPLICANT

Ray McCandless stated the property is located at approximately 7292 South Redwood Road. It contains 2.74 acres and is zoned R-1-8A. The property has an existing single-family dwelling on it that fronts onto Redwood Road. The rest of the property is vacant. The property is designated as High Density Residential on the City's Future Land Use Map.

This application was initially submitted with the intent to rezone the westernmost 2.41 acres of the subject property from an R-1-8A zoning district to PRD(H) to accommodate a proposed 21-unit town home development and to rezone the easternmost .33 acres from R-1-8A to PO (Professional Office) to allow the conversion of the existing home into an office. Upon conducting a redline review of the rezoning request, several concerns were raised with regards to zoning the front portion of the property to PO. Given these concerns, the applicant has requested that the entire property be rezoned to PRD (H) as stated in Exhibit H. No change to the Future Land Use Map is needed, as the PRD (H) zoning is consistent with the High Density Residential land use designation on the map. The existing home can be converted to limited office or commercial use under the Redwood Road Overlay District. This Staff Report is written with the understanding that the entire property is proposed to be rezoned to PRD (H) and that no changes will be needed to the Future Land Use Map.

The applicant was also requesting approval of the Concept Development Plan that was required by the PRD zoning district. The concept plan shows 21 town homes with a gross density of 8.57 dwelling units per acre. The town homes are accessed by a private street

that connects to Redwood Road. A community garden area and guest parking are also proposed. The layout and number of units of the development may change depending on the road configuration approved by the Engineering and Fire departments as part of the preliminary and final site plan and subdivision plan review. The Preliminary Development Plan will need to be reviewed by the Planning Commission and City Council in the future.

On March 18, 2014, the Planning Commission reviewed this request and unanimously (7-0 vote) recommended that the rezoning request and Concept Development Plan be approved by the City Council (Exhibit J).

The property's surrounding zoning and land uses are as follows:

	Future Land Use	Zoning	Existing Land Use
North	High Density Residential	R-1-8A	Residential
South	Very High Density Residential / High Density Residential	R-3-20/R-1-8A	Residential
East	Low Density Residential	R-1-8C	Residential
West	Medium Density Residential / High Density Residential	R-1-8C and R-1-8A	Residential

FINDINGS OF FACT

According to City Code, Section 13-7D-7(A), the following shall be met in approving any amendments to the Zoning Map:

Criteria 1: *The proposed amendment is consistent with the purposes, goals, objectives, and policies of the adopted general plan.*

Discussion: The property is designated as *High Density Residential* on the City's Future Land Use Map with a density range of 5.1 to 10.0 dwelling units per acre. The proposed PRD (H) zone allows a density of between 5.6 and 10.0 dwelling units per acre which is consistent with the density range shown on the Future Land Use Map. No changes to the Future Land Use Map are required to rezone the property to PRD (H). The applicant may or may not achieve the proposed density of 8.57 dwelling units per acre as shown in the Concept Development Plan depending on the buy-up density approved by the City Council.

City Code states that the purpose of the planned residential development (PRD) zone is to "encourage imaginative, creative and efficient utilization of land by establishing development standards that provide design flexibility, allow integration of mutually compatible residential uses, and encourage consolidation of open spaces, clustering of dwelling units, and optimum land planning with greater efficiency, convenience and amenity than may be possible under the procedures and regulations of conventional

zoning classifications. A planned residential development should also incorporate a common architectural design theme throughout the project that provides variety and architectural compatibility, as opposed to a development of individual, unrelated buildings located on separate, unrelated lots.”

The General Plan supports efficient residential development patterns that enhance established neighborhoods and creates new infill neighborhoods (Page 29). It also encourages infill development to be similar to existing adjacent residential development (Page 31). The General Plan also supports a diversity of dwelling unit types and densities in residential areas (Page 30).

Citywide, the General Plan recommends the ratio of single-family residential development to multi-family of 83/17. The General Plan states, “In order to meet an 83/17 single family/multi-family housing ratio established by the General Plan, the city would need a total of 32,636 single-family units and 6,685 multi-family units, which will require construction of an additional 7,754 single-family units and 535 multi-family units by 2020...”

The General Plan states that ‘the percentage of multi-family housing has increased slowly since 2000, climbing from 14% to 20% in 2010. The percentage of existing multiple-family housing as compared to the total housing stock is illustrated by the chart and graph below (Figure 4.3).’

Figure 4.3 Housing Type

Year	Single-family	Multi-family	Total	% Single-family	% Multi-family
2000 (Census)	19,531	2,789	22,230	87.5%	12.5%
2000	19,852	3,187	23,030	86.2%	13.8%
2001	20,238	3,380	23,609	85.7%	14.3%
2002	20,904	3,819	24,714	84.6%	15.4%
2003	22,125	4,474	26,590	83.2%	16.8%
2004	22,951	4,726	27,668	83.0%	17.0%
2005	23,811	4,878	28,680	83.0%	17.0%
2006	24,343	4,992	29,326	83.0%	17.0%
2007	24,505	5,295	29,800	82.2%	17.8%
2008	24,591	5,418	30,009	82.0%	18.0%
2009	24,732	5,832	30,562	80.9%	19.1%
2010	24,882	6,150	31,032	80.2%	19.8%

Source: W.J. Building Permits; U.S. Census Bureau, 2000 Census

Although the overall number of multi-family dwellings in the City was a consideration, the more important issue was whether this was an appropriate location for townhomes given the adjoining land uses proximity to Redwood Road and impacts to those uses.

Townhomes are a hybrid between single-family attached and multi-family housing. Townhomes are individually owned and generally owner occupied whereas apartments are for rent units.

Best planning practices would support locating higher density housing near where public transit facilities are available not only to provide housing options for those wanting to use the system, but to reduce the number of vehicle trips on public streets. There is bus service on Redwood Road and staff is of the opinion that higher density development can work, provided that any foreseeable impacts from differing land use densities can be adequately mitigated.

The density would be established as part of the Preliminary Development Plan review which will follow the rezoning process. Per City Code, section 13-5C-8, the density of the development will be determined based on the amenities provided such as detached garages, enhanced architectural features, and recreational facilities.

Given that the proposed density is within the density range of the PRD (H) zoning district and within the density range of the Future Land Use Map and because the townhomes add to a more diverse housing mix, the proposed rezoning to PRD (H) is consistent with the purposes, goals, objectives, and policies of the City's General Plan.

Finding: The proposed request to change the zoning map to PRD (H) as proposed is consistent with the purposes, goals, objectives and policies of the City's General Plan provided that the number of dwelling units is within the density range as set by the General Plan.

Criteria 2: *The proposed amendment will result in compatible land use relationships and does not adversely affect adjacent properties.*

Discussion: Looking at the broader picture, the Future Land Use Map shows the adjoining property to the north and south as High Density Residential meaning that the proposed PRD (H) zoning is consistent with adjoining land uses to the north and south. The proposed zoning also provides buffering between the single-family dwellings to the east and impacts from Redwood Road. The proposed rezone will not adversely affect the storage units which are further to the north or the Aspen Pines apartments to the south which are designated as Very High Density Residential and are zoned R-3-20.

The concept plan shows 21 townhomes. Although this was not a subdivision approval request, the concept plan demonstrates that adequate buffering between uses can be provided to mitigate compatibility between this development and the adjoining property. If the property were developed as single-family residential in an R-1-8 zone, roughly 10-12 units could be built on the site.

Finding: The proposed zoning amendment will result in compatible land use relationships and does not adversely affect adjacent properties.

Criteria 3: *The proposed amendment furthers the public health, safety, and general welfare of the citizens of the City.*

Discussion: Staff did not foresee any adverse impacts to public health, safety, or general welfare of the citizens of the city resulting from the proposed PRD (H) zone.

Finding: The proposed zoning amendment will not be a detriment to the public health, safety, and general welfare of the citizens of the city.

Criteria 4: *The proposed amendment will not unduly impact the adequacy of public services and facilities intended to serve the subject zoning area and property than would otherwise be needed without the proposed change, such as, but not limited to, police and fire protection, water, sewer and roadways.*

Discussion: The Engineering Division has determined there are adequate public facilities in the area. The applicant will need to provide for storm drainage, utilities and public streets during the subdivision review process and as required per City Code. The City will not require a traffic study; however, UDOT will require one since Redwood Road is a State road.

The Fire Department would inspect the subdivision plat once an application was made to determine serviceability based on specific design.

Finding: The proposed amendment will not unduly impact the adequacy of public services and facilities intended to serve the subject zoning area and property than would otherwise be needed without the proposed change, such as, but not limited to, police and fire protection, water, sewer and roadways.

Criteria 5: *The proposed amendment is consistent with the provisions of any applicable overlay zoning districts which may impose additional standards.*

Discussion: The property is in the Redwood Road Overlay District which will allow the applicant to convert the front building into a limited office or commercial use if all zoning requirements can be met. Rezoning the property to PRD (H) will not impact what can be developed in the Redwood Road Overlay District.

Finding: The proposed amendment is consistent with the provisions of any applicable overlay zoning districts which may impose additional standards.

Per City Code, section 13-5C-1C, the intent of planned developments (PC or PRD) was to:

Criteria 1: *Create more attractive and more desirable environments in the city.*

Discussion: The proposed development will provide a more desirable environment in the City by providing a variety of housing options for people interested in living in the area. Another benefit will be that a long underutilized parcel of vacant in-fill land will be developed in a central portion of the City.

Finding: The proposed rezoning will create more attractive and more desirable environments in the City.

Criteria 2: *Allow a variety of uses and structures and to encourage imaginative concepts in the design of neighborhood housing and mixed-use projects.*

Discussion: The proposed rezoning will allow for greater flexibility in land use and structure types than would generally be found in a typical single-family development. The concept plan shows town homes which are consistent with the adjoining property to the south. Although the properties to the north currently have single-family dwellings on them, it is likely that this area will develop as multi-family with offices along the frontage of Redwood Road in the future.

Finding: The proposed rezoning will allow a variety of uses and structures and to encourage imaginative concepts in the design of neighborhood housing and mixed-use projects.

Criteria 3: *Provide flexibility in the location of buildings on the land.*

Discussion: The PRD (H) zoning allows for greater flexibility in where buildings on the property can be located. Fifteen percent of the site must be maintained as open space. This flexibility should not impact existing residential developments in the area as buffering and open space requirements are more restrictive in this zone.

Finding: The proposed rezoning provides flexibility in the location of buildings on the land.

Criteria 4: *Facilitate and encourage social and community interaction and activity among those who live within a neighborhood.*

Discussion: The open spaces surrounding the building and proposed community garden will encourage interaction and activity among the residents within the development. PRD's are intended to be more communal in nature than standard single-family residential developments. The community garden should be relocated out of the detention basin due to the potential for soil contamination from streets and parking areas. All subdivision / site plan related issues will be dealt with in full at the time of review and examination of the site plan and subdivision applications.

Finding: The proposed rezone facilitates and encourages social and community interaction and activity among those who live within the neighborhood.

Criteria 5: *Encourage the creation of a distinctive visual character and identity for each planned development.*

Discussion: Building architecture and theme will be addressed through the subdivision and site plan review processes. The applicant has submitted colored architectural renderings illustrating the proposed townhomes which are located in the Concept Development Plan (Exhibit I). All PRD developments are required to be reviewed by the City's Design Review Committee prior to a Preliminary Site Plan & Development Plan being approved. The applicant will be given a copy of the City's Design Guidelines Manual to assist in the future design, character, and architecture of the project.

Finding: Building architecture and theme will be addressed through the subdivision and site plan review processes.

Criteria 6: *Produce a balanced and coordinated mixture of uses and related public and private facilities.*

Discussion: This criterion is oriented toward large planned communities, not one of this size.

Finding: This criterion does not apply.

Criteria 7: *Encourage a broad range of housing types, including owner and renter occupied units, single-family detached dwellings and multiple-family structures, as well as other structural types.*

Discussion: This project is not a large-scale development but does provide an alternative to detached single-family homes and apartments. If the City Council votes to approve the rezoning request, there are a number of ways to assure that the units remain owner occupied such as through a development agreement.

Finding: The proposed rezoning encourages a broad range of housing types, including owner and renter occupied units, single-family detached dwellings and multiple-family structures, as well as other structural types.

Criteria 8: *Preserve and take the greatest possible aesthetic advantage of existing trees and other natural site features and, in order to do so, minimize the amount of grading necessary for construction of a development.*

Discussion: There are some trees along the south property line that should be kept if possible as they can serve as an aesthetic amenity for the development. This will be evaluated as part of the subdivision and site plan review process. The site is otherwise on level ground.

Finding: The proposed rezone preserves and takes the greatest possible aesthetic advantage of existing trees and other natural site features and, in order to do so, minimizes the amount of grading necessary for construction of a development

Criteria 9: *Encourage and provide for open land for the general benefit of the community and public at large as places for recreation and social activity.*

Discussion: This is a relatively small development with 21 dwelling units. The open space surrounding the development will provide spaces for recreation and social activity. A community garden is also proposed within the development which will benefit the residents.

If the property were zoned R-3-8, which is considered High Density Residential, the number of units allowed would be similar to what is proposed, at around 21 or 22 dwelling units.

Finding: The proposed rezone encourages and provides for open land for the general benefit of the community and public at large as places for recreation and social activity.

Criteria 10: *Achieve physical and aesthetic integration of uses and activities within each development.*

Discussion: Physical and aesthetic integration of uses and activities within the development will be provided with the coordinated architectural design of the buildings.

Finding: The proposed rezone achieves physical and aesthetic integration of uses and activities within the development.

Criteria 11: *Encourage and provide for development of comprehensive pedestrian circulation networks, separated from vehicular roadways in order to create linkages between residential areas, open spaces, recreational areas, and public facilities, thereby minimizing reliance on the automobile as a means of transportation.*

Discussion: Sidewalks will be required throughout the development and will provide connections between the units and Redwood Road. Pedestrian separation and circulation will be adequate and in conformance with all code requirements.

Finding: The proposed rezone encourages and provides for development of comprehensive pedestrian circulation networks, separated from vehicular roadways in order to create linkages between residential areas, open spaces, recreational areas, and public facilities, thereby minimizing reliance on the automobile as a means of transportation.

Criteria 12: *Since many of the purposes for planned development zones can best be realized in large-scale developments, development on a large, planned scale is encouraged.*

Discussion: The size of this PRD is limited by the property available, Staff believes that the proposed scale of the development will not be a detriment to the area and will have minimal impact to existing neighborhoods in the immediate area.

Finding: The size of this PRD is limited by the property available and the fact that all other adjoining property is developed.

Criteria 13: *Achieve safety, convenience, and amenity for the residents of each planned residential development and the residents of neighboring areas.*

Discussion: Public health, safety, and general welfare are discussed in Criteria 3 in the preceding section.

Finding: The proposed rezone achieves safety, convenience, and amenity for the residents of the planned development and the residents of neighboring areas.

Criteria 14: *Assure compatibility and coordination of each development with existing and proposed surrounding land uses.*

Discussion: Neighborhood compatibility is discussed in Criteria 2 of the preceding section.

Finding: The proposed rezone assures compatibility and coordination of the development with existing and proposed surrounding land uses.

As the findings support the proposed rezoning request, Staff did not foresee any concerns with rezoning the property PRD (H) (Planned Residential Development – High Density). Many issues related to design and layout could be addressed at the time of Site Plan and Subdivision submittal and review.

Based on the analysis and findings contained in the Staff Report, Staff recommended that the City Council rezone the property located at approximately 7292 South Redwood Road from R-1-8A (Single-Family Residential) to PRD(H) (Planned Residential Development – High Density). Staff also recommended that the City Council approve the Concept Development Plan showing 21 town homes and an existing single-family dwelling.

Troy Ferran, Ferran Construction, applicant, provided the Council with a brief history of his company and the benefit they would bring to the City. He reviewed the proposed plans for the townhomes located in the development.

The Council, applicant, and staff discussed clarifying questions.

Mayor Rolfe opened the public hearing.

Daniel Griffee, Real Estate Broker for the Steadman family, indicated they had several offers for the property over the years; however, they were not as compatible for the infill property as the proposed development. He felt this was a good project for the City.

Kelvin Greene, West Jordan resident, provided the Council with a ‘Statement of Opposition’ regarding the Amara Court Development. He felt the application was legally insufficient, because the ‘property owners’ did not sign the application. He had informed the Planning Commission and staff of this issue. He submitted a GRAMA request to review the application, which did not have the signature of the Trust, of which it was owned. There were several documents that had not been submitted with the application. He requested the Council to vote against the application because of the flawed process and the eight areas of violations.

Linda Sorich, West Jordan resident, stated that her and husband were neutral regarding to the development. They had two questions: 1)What type of fence would be installed to separate their home from the new development, and 2)What was the plan and who was responsible for the safety and maintenance of the irrigation ditch or canal in the new development. They own two shares in the canal and use the water.

Aileen Steadman Smith, Trustee property owner, said that she and her sister Colleen Graham were the Trustees of the Steadman Family Trust. She clarified that they had both signed the required affidavits for the project.

Alexandra Eframo, West Jordan resident, had questions regarding the PRD and the proposed unit per acre. She agreed with one of the previous citizens, who felt the development had not followed the process correctly. She was concerned where the parking was located.

There was no one else who desired to speak. Mayor Rolfe closed the public hearing.

The Council and staff discussed at length the density issues. The Council was concerned with the PRD Zone and high density, as well as the relocation of the ditch.

MOTION: Councilmember Nichols moved to suspend the rules to allow the applicant to readdress the Council. The motion was seconded by Councilmember Stoker and passed 5-0 in favor.

Troy Ferran said they would need to research what was required, and locate point 'A' and point 'B' and establish a connection with what was needed to allow use of the canal.

Linda Sorich clarified the location of ditch and indicated that it flows North to South. At the South end of the ditch there was a large pipe and they wanted to make sure the canal and the opening was safe (i.e., possibly a grate or some type of secure cover over the opening).

Wendell Rigby stated typically the canals are piped underground, with the maintenance the responsibility of the ditch owners.

MOTION: Councilmember Hansen moved that based on the information and findings set forth in this staff report and the design shown in the Amara Court Concept Development Plan, and upon the evidence and explanations received today, I move that the City Council approve the request to rezone 2.74 acres of land located at approximately 7292 South Redwood Road from R-1-8A (Single-Family Residential) to PRD(H) (Planned Residential Development – High Density). Also approve the Concept Development Plan as presented. The motion was seconded by Councilmember Nichols.

A roll call vote was taken

Councilmember Haaga	No
Councilmember Hansen	Yes
Councilmember McConnehey	Absent
Councilmember Nichols	Yes
Councilmember Southworth	Absent
Councilmember Stoker	Yes
Mayor Rolfe	No

The motion failed 3-2

MOTION: Councilmember Nichols moved to table the item to the next meeting. The motion was seconded by Councilmember Hansen.

A roll call vote was taken

Councilmember Haaga	No
Councilmember Hansen	Yes
Councilmember McConnehey	Absent
Councilmember Nichols	Yes
Councilmember Southworth	Absent
Councilmember Stoker	Yes
Mayor Rolfe	No

The motion passed 3-2 *see explanation on page 26

IX. BUSINESS ITEMS

CONSENT ITEM 7F

APPROVE THE HEALTH AND DENTAL INSURANCE RENEWAL RATES FOR FY 2014-2015

Councilmember Haaga stated he pulled the item because he felt there should have been three bids received for health and dental insurance renewal rates, which was not done.

Councilmember Stoker was concerned that there would be sufficient time to request three bids, and have an insurance program in place by the first of the Fiscal Year.

Bryce Haderlie stated it could be done. However, the challenge was that the process should have begun six to eight weeks earlier. This could have the potential of raising concerns with the employees. He referenced a letter from the Employee Association Board recommending the Council approve the proposed insurance rates.

MOTION: Councilmember Stoker moved to suspend the rules to allow GBS representative to answer questions from the Council. The motion was seconded by Councilmember Haaga and passed 5-0 in favor.

Councilmember Haaga reviewed the contract between the City and GBS Benefits Inc., regarding the responsibilities of the consultant in providing insurance benefits to the employees.

Rob Ferguson, GBS Benefits Inc. Consultant provided the Mayor and Council a detailed explanation of the process they had followed to provide insurance rates for the City employees. He addressed the loss ratio over the past three years. They were prepared to

bid this year when they met with the employee insurance committee; however, the Committee did **not** want to go to bid this year. He reviewed in depth the process they went through to provide insurance rates to the group. GBS Benefits Inc., had presented the PEHP program every year for the past three years. They would follow the direction from the City, and the Insurance Committee.

Councilmember Haaga left the meeting at 7:58 p.m.

Mayor Rolfe clarified that GBS was directed from the Insurance Committee, and did not make the decision to not go out to bid.

Rob Ferguson indicated that was correct. They **do not** make the decision. They provide consultation and advice.

Richard L. Davis said the purpose of the Committee was to compose a proposal for the Council to consider. The Committee did not have it within their power to make a decision. This was why staff brings the proposal to the Council so early for their consideration of a bid process or not. Staff was seeking direction.

Councilmember Haaga returned at 8:02 p.m.

The Council and Rob Ferguson discussed at great length the insurance process (i.e., claims, utilization, loss ratio, change to insurance plans, etc.)

Mayor Rolfe felt based on the profit scenario, the City could move to a self-funded plan with great success.

Rob Ferguson addressed the benefits and downfalls of being self-funded.

MOTION: Councilmember Stoker moved to approve the Health and Dental Insurance Renewal rates for FY 2014-2015. The motion was seconded by Councilmember Nichols.

Councilmember Nichols said this could be the Council's mistake because they had not been as involved as they should. He was in favor of the motion; however, to investigate the insurance issue looking for something better for the next budget cycle.

Councilmember Haaga spoke in favor of the motion because he valued the employees; however, he reminded the Council that GBS Benefits Inc. earns 1.5% commission on \$4 million premium payment from the City.

Mayor Rolfe spoke against the motion. He had researched the issue at great depth, and felt there were better options available. He felt it was irresponsible not to get a minimum of three bids from three separate companies.

A roll call vote was taken

Councilmember Haaga	Yes
Councilmember Hansen	Yes
Councilmember McConnehey	Absent
Councilmember Nichols	Yes
Councilmember Southworth	Absent
Councilmember Stoker	Yes
Mayor Rolfe	No

The motion passed 4-1

MOTION: Councilmember Haaga moved to reconsider this item.

The motion died for lack of a second.

Councilmember Haaga tabled Business Items 9e and 9f until May 14.

DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING CITY MANAGER'S FY 2014-2015 PROPOSED BUDGET

Richard L. Davis said that the budget would be on every Council meeting for discussion until the final approval.

Ryan Bradshaw reviewed the tracking sheet outlining the new initiatives, and proposed additions to the budget. He addressed items that would be considered or added to the FY 2014-2015 budget. One new addition was the \$1,000 discretionary fund for each Councilmember.

The Council and staff discussed the following items regarding the proposed budget:

- Clarification regarding the \$1,000 discretionary fund for each Councilmember to be used for City purposes.
- Video streaming for the Council Chambers
- Administration Financial Analyst – position that would support additional analysis, financial tracking, and provide redundancy for our payroll system
- Administration Professional & Technical for \$7,000 – for Community Affairs – additional contracting for services that would assist Kim Wells, to assist communications.
- Crack Seal and Slurry 'Green Sheet' at Ron Wood Park, and if would be beneficial to have a complete overlay, rather than the crack seal and slurry
- Pavement of a portion of the Public Works parking lot
- Make Part Time Assistant to a Full Time Assistant in the Code Enforcement Department.
- \$50,000 for reclassification and compensation program for the City employees

- Civil Litigator - \$112,000 – new position (combined with Part Time Real Property employee)

Mayor Rolfe said if the Council were in favor he wanted a formal bid completed for the resurfacing of the parking lots listed in the proposed budget to include crack seal, seal coat, and a two-inch overlay. He felt this would be a permanent solution, rather than a 'Band-Aid.' The Council was in agreement for staff to investigate, and provide a proposed amount to cover those costs.

DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION ON RECOMMENDATION TO REFUND BONDS FOR THE SOUTH VALLEY WATER RECLAMATION FACILITY BONDS

Ryan Bradshaw stated in 2005, the South Valley Water Reclamation Facility issued \$19,425,000 in sewer revenue bonds (the '2005 Bonds') to fund a portion of the expansion to the wastewater treatment facility (38 to 50 MGD). The City of West Jordan and Midvale City were obligated parties to the bonds. Sewer fees paid by the cities to the Facility were used to pay the debt service on the bonds. The Midvalley Improvement District, Sandy Suburban Improvement District, and the South Valley Sewer District made separate cash contributions to the project and were not party to the 2005 bonds. The 2005 Bonds could be refunded for interest rate savings, which would result in savings for the City of West Jordan and Midvale City.

The refunding of the 2005 Bonds was made possible by today's lower interest rates and the approaching optional redemption date.

Staff was seeking direction from the Council to proceed with the refunding process.

The Council was in agreement and directed staff to proceed with the process to refinance the bonds for the South Valley Water Reclamation District.

DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING RESOLUTION 14-79, AMENDING THE CITY'S FLEET REPLACEMENT POLICY

Bryce Haderlie said currently the Vehicle Replacement Policy for the City of West Jordan revolves around a 15-point vehicle replacement assessment that utilizes age, mileage, and maintenance costs as a measure in determining the need to replace a particular vehicle. Per the current policy, when a purchased vehicle reaches 15-points on this scale it was reviewed. If it was determined that replacement was warranted a new vehicle was purchased.

As the City fleet ages, vehicle-operating costs were rising due maintenance and repair expenses. Even with regular maintenance, as vehicles age their appearance deteriorates and at some point the deterioration of appearance reaches the threshold of being damaging to the City's image. Currently there were numerous vehicles at or above the 15-point replacement threshold that had been determined to be in need of replacement. In the Police Department alone there were 37 vehicles that were at or above this benchmark.

The City had struggled to replace the vehicles that had outlived their usefulness and each year the number of vehicles identified for replacement but not replaced increases.

The Fleet Committee had been examining various options for altering the way we purchase replacement vehicles for the fleet. There were certain vehicles in the fleet, such as the Police Motorcycles where a determination had been made that there were clear fiscal saving's and advantages to leasing as opposed to purchasing. Other potential short-term advantages of leasing also include the ability for the City to utilize available cash to maximize the number of vehicles replaced each year. In order to maximize the number of replacement options available and bring the current practice of leasing Police Motorcycles into compliance with City Policy the following changes were recommended to the Vehicle Replacement Policy:

- Incorporate language into the Vehicle Replacement Policy that would allow for the leasing of fleet vehicles when it was determined that this course of action would be the most advantageous to the City.
- Allow for the replacement of leased vehicles based on the date the lease terminates as opposed to the current 15-point replacement scale.
- Retain the current 15-point replacement scale for **purchased** vehicles
- Reduce the target age of purchased Police and Fire light trucks, and sedans from 6 years to 5 years. This would bring the target age more in line with the target miles for Police vehicles the most.

It was anticipated that these changes would provide for greater flexibility in managing vehicle replacement. Staff felt a policy that allowed for the weighing of the various components of a lease vs. purchase would result in a customized approach to fleet vehicle replacement. This method had the potential of being more efficient and would allow for the maximization of available resources as they pertain to vehicle replacement.

Staff proposed changing the existing Vehicle Replacement Policy to allow for the leasing of fleet vehicles, and modifying the retention schedule of certain vehicles. Standing along, this policy change bears no fiscal impact; however, the implementation of options such as leasing would have an impact that would be discussed during the annual budgeting process or at other times as needed.

Staff recommended approval of the revised Vehicle Replacement Policy for the City of West Jordan to allow leasing as an option for fleet vehicle replacement and to make other changes.

Jim Riding clarified one change to the Fleet Policy would be to lease more vehicles, specifically 1/3 of the Police vehicles and replace them now. He asked for direction to begin an RFP process to replace the additional Police vehicles.

Mayor Rolfe clarified that the larger vehicles would be a lease/purchase program.

MOTION: Councilmember Stoker moved to approve Resolution 14-79, amending the City's Fleet Replacement Policy. The motion was seconded by Councilmember Nichols and passed 5-0 in favor.

A roll call vote was taken

Councilmember Haaga	Yes
Councilmember Hansen	Yes
Councilmember McConnehey	Absent
Councilmember Nichols	Yes
Councilmember Southworth	Absent
Councilmember Stoker	Yes
Mayor Rolfe	Yes

The motion passed 5-0

DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING OPTIONS RELATING TO THE FLEET DEPARTMENT CHANGES AND PROPOSALS OUTLINED IN THE CITY COUNCIL STRATEGIC PLANNING MEETING

Bryce Haderlie said during the City Council Strategic Planning Meeting, staff was directed to initiate certain changes in the Fleet Department which were included hiring our own Fleet Manager and Administrative Assistant and purchasing our own fleet management software. Staff had investigated the options to accomplish this directive and desired an opportunity to share the information and receive further direction. The directions for staff were identified as Goal #4 of the 2014-2015 Business Plan as follows:

"Imagine a West Jordan where we achieve fleet cost reductions through asset management system implementation; determine the best funding mechanisms for vehicle and equipment acquisition; determine and identify a cost/benefit process to replace aging and more expensive fleet units with cost effective and reliable equipment and vehicles; examine and recommend benefits of acquiring high performing equipment over less reliable and less costly models; and evaluate equipment for use in capacity functions that provide the greatest versatility and adaptability."

Explanation: *This goal speaks to the necessity of ensuring that we maximize the value of every fleet dollar in order to enhance the abilities of our staff to accomplish assigned tasks and provide a high level of service. In so doing, the goal states that we need to consider not only how we acquire fleet units; but equal consideration should be focused on the type, appropriateness, and versatility of each new unit.*

As staff worked with Salt Lake County Fleet Maintenance personnel, they shared the advantages of maintaining a relationship with the City in order to maximize the purchasing power and lower the operating cost to both entities.

The cost benefits and justification were as follows:

1. **Fuel Manager \$3,016** – The County was getting a better price per gallon of fuel than the State bid by monitoring the cost daily and purchasing in bulk from the lowest bidder. This was estimated to save the county approximately \$100,000 per year and the City would realize the proportional benefit,. In addition to this saving, the City would not pay the cost of the State fuel card system and higher dump charge (cost to fill the tanks).
2. **System Administrator, Fiscal Manager, Director (\$7,147 total)** – This fee allowed us access to these professionals for any of the questions that we had regarding fleet operations. Based on the wealth of knowledge that these individuals have collectively and with a larger fleet, staff felt that we could benefit in management decisions and fleet operation policies. They had agreed to make themselves and their data available as we continue to improve our fleet operation.
3. **Maintenance Software, FASTER Data VPN (\$3,167)** – This was the greatest potential savings (approximately \$134,000 for license and data conversion) if we continue to use the County software and IT administration. The County was considering a future conversion to a better software system and those data conversion costs, and administration could be shared proportionally between the two entities.
4. **NAPA Contract (\$73,004)** – This pays for a full time person at our parts counter in our City facility plus ½ of the parts runner shared by the City and County. Writing a separate contract with NAPA may result in a different cost allocation.
5. **Attorney/contract, Admin. (\$19,711)** – This is the overhead cost for the functions identified above as well as County staff that provides assistance with software operation, fuel system management, etc. We are unable to tell at this point how much it would cost the City to move these services in-house.

Staff proposed the following

1. Hire a Fleet Manager (with the \$101,923 savings from the current County contract) for an estimated \$78,893.00 to take over many of the fleet purchasing and management duties that Jim Riding was currently providing and to oversee the daily operations of the department.
2. Hold off hiring the Administrative Assistant to see if there was a need for the position (estimated \$50,862.00)

The fiscal impacts were identified in the previous discussion, but could not be fully itemized without further Council direction.

Jim Riding explained the specific savings if we were to stay with Salt Lake County Fleet for the following items:

- Eliminate the Salt Lake County Fleet Manager, and hire a City Fleet Manager, moving toward a City employee
- Continue with Salt Lake County Administrative services (i.e., fuel, parts purchase through NAPA, software, and any available personnel for direction or questions).
- He felt this was an economy of scale working with Salt Lake County

- Hire the Fleet Manager, but hold off hiring the Administrative Assistant until staff could see how things would work out. He was not convinced that the Administrative Assistant would be needed if the City continued with Salt Lake County
- Rather than a contract for \$208,000 it would be \$106,000 for next year

Mayor Rolfe stated he worked extensively with the Committee on this issue, and felt the blended proposal would work well for the City.

MOTION: Councilmember Nichols moved that we direct staff to continue preparing the changes with the Fleet Department, by hiring a City Fleet Manager, and preparing a contract with Salt Lake County for the services provided in the West Jordan City Cost Allocation. The motion was seconded by Councilmember Haaga.

A roll call vote was taken

Councilmember Haaga	Yes
Councilmember Hansen	Yes
Councilmember McConnehey	Absent
Councilmember Nichols	Yes
Councilmember Southworth	Absent
Councilmember Stoker	Yes
Mayor Rolfe	Yes

The motion passed 5-0

DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING THE STATUS OF CITY COUNCIL MEMBERS AS EMPLOYEES OF THE CITY WITH W-2 TAX REPORTING, OR CONTRACTORS OF THE CITY WITH A 1099 TAX REPORTING

This item was continued until May 14, 2014.

DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING COMMUNICATION TO THE CITY COUNCIL AS THE GOVERNING BODY AS A WHOLE, BE MADE BY THE CITY MANAGER, AND ALL POLICY COMMUNICATION REQUESTS FROM STAFF BE ACCEPTED PERTAINING TO POLICY, APPROVE BY HIS AUTHORITY AS CEO OF THE CITY AND RESPONSIBLE TO THE COUNCIL

This item was continued until May 14, 2014.

DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING UTILITY RATES

Richard L. Davis provided a brief update to the Council on a few changes from the last time the Council reviewed this issue. He stated this was not a proposal, but request for

direction relative to the rates, so staff could prepare the budget for adoption of the Tentative Budget on May 14.

Steve Glain reviewed the proposed rate structure and provision of direction to staff regarding proposed utility rates for FY 2014/2015.

The fiscal impact would be that Utility rate adjustments would increase revenues to the enterprise funds and corresponding expenditures for operations and capital projects.

Staff presented its annual Utility Rate Study to Council on February 26. This report shows the same proposed rates, but with two Storm Water fee options (A and B). The same percentage increase would apply to Residential and Commercial rates:

	Typical Residential bill Increase	% Increase	Revenue Needs
Water	0	0	No change needed
Solid Waste	0	0	No change needed
Wastewater	\$0.60	2.8%	Personnel, equipment
Street Lights	\$0.99	57.9%	Cap projects, equipment
Storm (option A)	\$3.32	82.6%	Cap projects (excluding 70 th South)
Storm (option B)	\$3.32 + \$2.70	149.8%	Option A expenses <u>plus</u> 70 th South project

	Current Typical Residential bill	Revenue Needs	Monthly increase on Typical Residential bill	New Typical Residential bill
Water	\$36.56	None	0	\$36.56
Solid Waste	\$12.23	None	0	\$12.23
Wastewater	\$21.44	2FTE, Xpress Bill Pay, compressor, shared trackhoe, Capital Projects	\$0.60	\$22.04
Street Lights	\$1.71	Cap.Projects, Cap.Replacement, Xpress Bill Pay, trailer	\$0.99	\$2.70
Storm (Option A)	\$4.02 (residential) \$4.02 per ¼ acre (commercial)	Cap.Projects except 70th South, Cap.Replacement, 2FTE, Xpress Bill Pay, TV van, shared trackhoe, irrigation repairs, Detention Basin maint.	\$3.32	\$7.34 (residential) \$7.34 per ¼ acre (commercial)
Storm (Option B)	\$4.02 (residential) \$4.02 per ¼ acre (commercial)	Option A (\$3.32) <u>plus</u> 70th South \$7M trunkline for Constitution area (\$2.70)	\$3.32 + \$2.70	\$10.04 (residential) \$10.04 per ¼ acre (commercial)

City staff presented its annual Utility Rate Study to Council on February 26. The table below shows the same proposed rate changes, but with two Storm Water options (A and B). Option A would be a fee increase of \$3.32 (new total fee \$7.34), which would provide sufficient revenues for personnel, equipment, detention basin maintenance, and all capital projects except 70th South Storm trunkline for the Constitution area. Option B would be a fee increase of \$6.02 (new total fee \$10.04) and would provide funding for all Option A expenses including the 70th South trunkline project. Residential Storm fee is fixed rate per household. Commercial Storm fee is the same rate per quarter-acre of property.

The Council and staff discussed the following issues regarding Utility Rates:

- Were the Capital Projects on the 5-Year plan
- Street light fee was to create a Capital Replacement program and install street lights in dark neighborhoods, (was not attached to the LED changeover)
- Commercial properties assessed for the Stormwater, larger properties should pay a larger fee
- Concern with increased fees, and the potential for the Parks & Open Land Fee

MOTION: Councilmember Nichols moved to revise the Utility Rates for Waste Water, and Street Lights, as proposed in the agenda packet, and table the discussion on Stormwater until May 14. The was seconded by Councilmember Stoker.

A roll call vote was taken

Councilmember Haaga	No
Councilmember Hansen	Yes
Councilmember McConnehey	Absent
Councilmember Nichols	Yes
Councilmember Southworth	Absent
Councilmember Stoker	Yes
Mayor Rolfe	No

The motion failed 3-2

X. REMARKS

Jeff Robinson said that after the motion made during the Public Hearing to 'Table the item' he looked at Utah State Code 10-3-507(2)(b) to verify his interpretation. There must be four votes to pass an item; however, in this section it indicates that by a simple majority vote, an item could be continued to a specific time, tabled the item until the next meeting.

XI. ADJOURN

MOTION: Councilmember Haaga moved to adjourn. The motion was seconded by Councilmember Nichols and passed 5-0 in favor.

The meeting adjourned at 9:08 p.m.

The content of the minutes is not intended, nor are they submitted, as a verbatim transcription of the meeting. These minutes are a brief overview of what occurred at the meeting.

KIM V ROLFE
Mayor

ATTEST:

MELANIE S BRIGGS, MMC
City Clerk

Approved this 14th day of May 2014

DRAFT

**MINUTES OF THE CITY OF WEST JORDAN
CITY COUNCIL & PLANNING COMMISSION
WORKSHOP**

Wednesday, April 30, 2014

6:00 p.m.

Community Room

8000 South Redwood Road

West Jordan, Utah 84088

COUNCIL: Mayor Kim V. Rolfe and Council Members Jeff Haaga, Chris McConnehey, and Ben Southworth. Council Members Judy Hansen and Justin D. Stoker arrived at 6:05 p.m. Council Member Chad Nichols was excused.

PLANNING COMMISSION:

Chair Dan Lawes and Members Lesa Bridges, Bill Heiner, Zach Jacob, David Pack, Sophia Rice, and Ellen Smith.

STAFF:

Richard L. Davis, City Manager; Bryce Haderlie, Assistant City Manager; Jeff Robinson, City Attorney; Robert Thorup, Deputy City Attorney; Melanie Briggs, City Clerk; Tom Burdett, Development Director; Reed Scharman, Deputy Fire Chief; Paul Brockbank, Fire Marshall; Doug Diamond, Police Chief; Greg Mikolash, City Planner, and Ray McCandless, Senior Planner.

I. CALL TO ORDER

Mayor Rolfe called the workshop to order at 6:00 p.m.

Tom Burdett addressed the process for the meeting and possible future discussions.

Councilmember's Hansen and Stoker arrived at 6:05 p.m.

Councilmember Nichols arrived at 6:10 p.m.

II. BUSINESS ITEMS

**DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING DEVELOPMENT
QUALITY STANDARDS**

Ray McCandless reviewed the following information regarding development Quality Standards:

- Residential
 - Single Family
 - Multi Family

Does the City have sufficient tools needed to get the expected results?

Staff felt the Performance Based Zoning was a very important tool, as well as additional Architectural regulations for residential homes in the City.

Councilmember Hansen felt the standards should be changed to require more brick or stucco, along with double-car garages.

What would have the biggest impact on the quality of development in the City?

- Break up asphalt in shopping centers
- No more non-masonry siding
- Change perception of development quality in West Jordan (increase)
- Landscaping along major roads
- Higher price point on residential commercial lot and all four sides
- Increase Code Enforcement
- Maximize quality of life (more living area in backyard)
- 10,000 square foot minimum lot size
- Better quality signs, traffic lights, etc.
- 'Better' open space, not just detention
- Open space – where and who maintains
- Do away with 40 foot right-of-ways
- Sufficient garage setbacks (22 foot minimum)
- Build incentives for better quality development

DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING DENSITY IN THE CITY

Growth Management Tool: Cap & Grade – Transit Oriented Development, Senior Housing, Disabled, and Townhomes...

What to use as the Ratio for the 'Cap & Grade' system?

Calculation:

- 22.5% - consistency is key
- 29% - using single family as the baseline, could use 22.5% in the General Plan (in cap & grade)
- 29% - using a simpler method

What type of housing would be exempt from the calculation?

Exemption:

- Senior, disability & TOD with some Townhomes
- Everything exception Townhomes
- Same as others, with consideration of the Townhomes
- Leave Townhomes out of a potential moratorium

Should there be a 6-month Zoning Moratorium?

- Yes, however, what is the catch
- Yes, and find a way to incentivize mobile home parks
- Yes

The Mayor and Council were in agreement of proposing an ordinance to establish a six-month moratorium on multi-family applications, and have it presented at the meeting on May 14.

DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING SIGNS

This item was not discussed.

VIII. ADJOURN

The meeting adjourned at 8:10 p.m.

The content of the minutes is not intended, nor are they submitted, as a verbatim transcription of the meeting. These minutes are a brief overview of what occurred at the meeting.

KIM V. ROLFE
Mayor

ATTEST:

MELANIE S. BRIGGS, MMC
City Clerk

Approved this 14th day of 2014