



**MINUTES OF THE CITY OF WEST JORDAN**  
**COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE**  
**Tuesday, June 24, 2025 – 4:00 pm**  
**Approved July 8, 2025**  
8000 S Redwood Road, 3rd Floor  
West Jordan, UT 84088

---

## **1. CALL TO ORDER**

**COUNCIL:** Chair Chad Lamb, Vice Chair Kayleen Whitelock, Bob Bedore, Pamela Bloom (remote), Kelvin Green, Kent Shelton

**STAFF:** Council Office Director Alan Anderson, Mayor Dirk Burton, City Attorney Josh Chandler, Budget & Management Analyst Rebecca Condie, Utilities Manager Greg Davenport, Economic Development Director David Dobbins, City Planner/Zoning Administrator Larry Gardner, Policy Analyst & Public Liaison Warren Hallmark, Senior Planner Tayler Jensen, Assistant City Administrator Paul Jerome, Community Development Director Scott Langford, City Administrator Korban Lee, Fire Chief Derek Maxfield, Senior Planner Ray McCandless, Assistant City Attorney Duncan Murray, Council Office Clerk Cindy Quick, Deputy Police Chief Jeremy Robertson, Public Works Director Brian Clegg, Public Information Manager Marie Magers

Chair Lamb called the meeting to order at 4:05 pm (due to technical difficulties) and noted that Council Member Bloom was participating remotely.

## **2. DISCUSSION TOPICS**

### **a. Discussion of Proposed South Valley Water Reclamation Facility**

Senior Planner Ray McCandless showed the subject property was currently designated on the Future Land Use Map (FLUM) as Business and Research Park (BR-P). The property was surrounded on three sides by residential subdivisions, and adjacent to the South Valley Water Reclamation Plant, zoned Public Facility (PF). Mr. McCandless explained that setbacks required in the BR-P Zone were much larger than in the PF Zone. He said the requested change of the FLUM designation and the zoning from BR-P to PF would allow the proposed administrative office building to be closer to the northwest corner. He showed a conceptual building rendering for a new administrative office building.

Taigon Worthen, Facility Engineer with South Valley Water Reclamation, said open space between Gardner Village and the South Valley Water Reclamation Facility was owned either by Rocky Mountain Power or South Valley Water Reclamation, reserved for future process development. Mr. Worthen said South Valley Water Reclamation had worked on plans for the proposed building for several years, and explained the goal to move some of the facility traffic away from the existing plant. He explained that Major Public Facility was a conditional use in the PF Zone, providing an amount of control to the City. Mr. Worthen emphasized that the intent was to keep the property for use by South Valley Water Reclamation.

Mr. Worthen discussed slope and elevations on the property, and said it made the most economical sense to put the new administration building next to 13000 West. He said the rooftop of the proposed single-story building would probably not exceed 15 feet. Mr. Worthen spoke of the possibility of adding an open slab/basin dump station close to the canal on the property. Council Member Bedore said he thought it was smart to separate public interactions from the main plant facility.

Community Development Director Scott Langford said the property was initially zoned BR-P as a buffer to adjacent residential. He commented that a dump station and some of the other operations would be allowed in the PF Zone, but not in a Professional Office (PO) Zone. Responding to a question from Vice Chair Whitelock, Mr. Worthen said a portion of the possible dump site would be like RV dump sites at gas stations, and a portion would be a recessed pit wide enough for trucks to back in. Mr. Worthen stated the Board would not build a clarifier on the subject parcel. Council Member Green said the current Board may not have intentions to put a clarifier on the subject parcel, but with the PF Zone, it was something a future Board could decide to do, which he found worrisome for the future of the neighborhood.

*Council Member Bloom disconnected at 4:29 pm.*

Vice Chair Whitelock asked if the Council wanted to hold a Town Hall meeting to discuss the issue with neighboring residents. Council Member Green expressed support. Council Member Jacob pointed out it was not the current residents who would likely be impacted 10-30 years down the road. He said the immediate impact was the office building. Mr. Worthen said the only improvement planned for and budgeted for at that time was the administration building. He said the plant treated 23 million gallons of sewage water every day. Growth was trending upward, and South Valley Water Reclamation partnered with Jordan Basin Improvement District. Decisions regarding growth at the south end of the valley and possible expansion of Jordan Basin Improvement District, would impact future decisions of South Valley Water Reclamation.

Mr. Worthen explained that sewer interceptors that flowed into South Valley Water Reclamation Facility paralleled the Jordan River, and said moving clarifying operations to the subject property would not make sense pragmatically. He said the higher they had to pump and lift the water, the more the process would cost in electricity.

Council Member Shelton asked how moving the dump station to the subject property would affect the neighbors. Mr. Worthen said the facility received noise complaints from elevated neighboring multi-family residents when large construction dumps or activity late at night occurred. He showed on a map where the dump station would be moved, and said there was not significant noise or odor associated with the dump station. Trucks were the loudest element. Mr. Worthen said they took odor control very seriously. Chair Lamb said there would be odors when things were dumped, but the odor would probably not permeate the whole area.

Council Member Green said he was generally comfortable with the requested rezone, but still had some concerns about long-term possibilities, and wanted to understand any alternatives. Mr. Langford asked if the Council was supportive of moving the administration building to the proposed location. A majority of the Council appeared to

indicate support. Mr. Langford suggested moving forward with a rezone to PO, and directing staff to gather more information about potential impacts to other operations.

Council Member Bedore expressed interest in visiting the existing dump station to get a better idea of potential impacts to neighbors. Responding to a question from Council Member Shelton, Mr. Worthen said outhouse haulers were dumped and charged differently than municipalities.

Chair Lamb summarized that the Council consensus was to rezone to the PO Zone and have the applicant come back in the future for any other use.

***b. Presentation of the Economic Development Strategic Plan***

Economic Development Director David Dobbins introduced Fred Philpot with LRB Public Finance Advisors. Mr. Philpot said he had enjoyed working on the Economic Development Strategic Plan project. He said the goal of the project had been to bring all information relative to economic development and economic development strategies together in one document, with intention to amend and refresh the document over time as needed.

Mr. Philpot presented the following findings:

- West Jordan was home to a growing population, characterized by a young demographic and average to above-average income levels.
- West Jordan had a concentration of residential development, with 66% of the market value attributed to single-family residential property types.
- West Jordan captured 82% of retail and service sales relative to the State average (100%).
- West Jordan had 8 active Redevelopment Agency (RDA) project areas.

Mr. Philpot said his hope was that the current Council and future Councils would be able to open the document if they had specific questions relative to an economic node. He presented a high-level SWOT (strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, threats) Analysis.

Mr. Philpot presented the following perspective provided by the City Council:

- Focus on City Center
- Focus on branding (internal & external)
- Regional retail focus (dining, shopping, entertainment)
- Focus on industrial development should remain a priority
- Ensure a diverse economy
- Address transportation needs

Economic Development Strategies:

- Enhance the quality of life in West Jordan
- Promote a diverse economy
- Plan for commercial that serves residents
- Promote professional office and business environments

Mr. Dobbins said he and Mr. Philpot would be willing to sit down one-on-one with Council Members to go through the document and answer any questions. City Administrator Korban Lee suggested the intersection of 90000 South and U-111 should perhaps be

considered separate from the rest of the Southwest Quadrant because plans for commercial development at the intersection were different from the broader industrial development plans in the quadrant. Mr. Dobbins said he agreed with isolating the intersection to look at retail opportunities to provide services for the whole west side.

***c. Discussion of External ADU Setbacks and Applicability to Lots Over 10,000 Square Feet***

Council Office Director Alan Anderson said the Council discussed ADUs in March 2025 at the request of a couple residents who had third-acre lots, but were not able to build accessory dwelling units (ADUs) because of the zoning. Mr. Anderson said at the discussion in March a majority of the Council indicated support for allowing external ADUs on single-family residential lots of 10,000 square feet or larger regardless of the zone. Mr. Anderson showed current West Jordan setbacks compared to setback requirements in other area cities.

Mr. Anderson said staff recommended keeping the current six-foot setback from a primary dwelling for external ADUs. Chair Lamb said he suspected the current 15-foot setback from the rear property line was the biggest problem for residents wanting to build an external ADU. Senior Planner Tayler Jensen said staff probably received an equal number of calls from residents asking why the current setback was so big, and why a neighbor was allowed to build an ADU so close to a property line.

*Council Member Bloom reconnected remotely*

Council Member Jacob asked why the setbacks for external ADUs would be different from setbacks for an external garage. Staff responded that Code required an external ADU to be built as a dwelling and meet requirements for a dwelling, which was not required for an external garage. Council Member Jacob said he believed the impact on neighbors of an external garage and an external ADU would be similar. Staff commented that most external garages were not built with a second story with windows that could look onto neighboring properties. Staff said structures built less than five feet from a property line were required to meet restrictions for a fire wall, which could be challenging for homeowners adding an external ADU. Council Member Green said he would not want setbacks between buildings to be less than six feet. Council Member Jacob said he would be comfortable with a six-foot setback from property lines. Vice Chair Whitelock said she wanted to keep the restriction that a setback would increase with an increased building height.

Council Member Jacob suggested adopting the same setbacks for external ADUs as external garages. Council Member Shelton said he believed neighbors would be more uncomfortable knowing individuals were occupying an ADU and looking onto their property than they would with a garage. Council Member Shelton said he liked the idea of requiring frosted windows or no windows along property lines if an external ADU were a certain height.

Council Member Green commented that many residents used an external garage as a shop, which could be much noisier than a residence. He said he liked the idea of the same

setbacks for external ADUs and garages, but suggested requiring frosted windows on any side facing a neighbor if an external ADU was higher than 17 feet. Council Member Jacob expressed agreement. Staff asked, if the Council considered eliminating windows on a second floor adjacent to a property line, to keep in mind that ADUs involved bedrooms that were required to have external egress for safety.

Council Members Shelton, Whitelock, and Lamb said they were not comfortable with three-foot setbacks for external ADUs. A majority of the Council indicated support for six-foot setbacks from the rear property line and the internal side property line. The Council and staff discussed different corner side yard configurations. Vice Chair Whitelock said she did not believe a six-foot setback was enough for a corner side yard. A majority of the Council indicated support for having the same setback for external ADU corner side yards as external garages (20 feet).

Vice Chair Whitelock said she supported the requirement that the setback should increase as the height increased beyond 17 feet. Council Member Jacob said he would support requiring the setback to increase with increased height unless frosted glass was used on second stories along property lines. Vice Chair Whitelock pointed out that frosted glass would not contribute to privacy when the windows were open. Chair Lamb said he did not want to require frosted windows, but agreed that for a two-story external ADU, the setback should be different. Council Members Jacob and Green expressed support. A member of staff emphasized that an external ADU would not be considered a flag lot home.

***d. Discussion Regarding a Proposal to Exempt Townhomes from the Balanced Housing Ordinance***

Senior Planner Tayler Jensen said staff were directed a few months previous to look at the possibility of making exemptions to the Balanced Housing Ordinance for townhomes, and said Staff were seeking clarification from the Council on how to move forward. Mr. Jensen explained that per the State, the City could only regulate design standards for townhomes if there was a master development agreement (MDA), or in exchange for additional density. Mr. Jensen presented three options to the Council:

- Permit townhomes in select residential zones, but be unable to enforce design criteria;
- Create a new zone/overlay that may be applied to property to allow townhomes and regulate design; or
- Amend existing ordinances so an applicant could “choose” to enter into an MDA that would allow townhomes, and then enforce design criteria.

Council Member Green pointed out the PCH Zone and Integrate Housing Zone already allowed townhomes as an exception. Mr. Jensen said staff suggested starting the discussion with R2 and R3 Zones. He asked the following questions to frame the discussion:

- If an exception were to be granted, would the intent be to regulate design criteria? If so, to what extent?
- Should an overall increase in density for townhomes be allowed, or would gross densities match existing zoning designations?
- Would specific areas be targeted? If so, where?

Vice Chair Whitelock said she was not sure water was available for the currently entitled but undeveloped units, let alone adding more units. Vice Chair Whitelock said she did not want to open up the possibility for townhomes without design standards. Council Member Green suggested maintaining the density of the underlying zone, and said he would want the “missing middle” of residential housing addressed if an exception were approved. Mr. Langford commented that all utility models were based on the General Plan maps approved by the Council. It was suggested that a developer would need to maintain the ERUs anticipated in the General Plan or somehow bring more water to the table.

Council Member Jacob talked about small household water needs, and suggested a case could be made with the State to change current water law. City Attorney Josh Chandler responded that many discussions about water were happening at the State level. Mr. Langford repeated his suggestion to begin with R2 and R3 Zones to see if making changes made sense. Council Member Jacob said whatever changes were made would affect the west side of the City most.

Council Member Green said he did not want to have entire neighborhoods of townhomes because they did not work. He expressed the opinion that townhomes needed to be mixed with other housing types. Council Member Jacob suggested a PRD Zone with an overlay to allow more townhomes (50%), with minimum acreage requirements removed and open space requirements included. Council Member Green suggested the acreage requirement could be removed from the Integrated Housing Zone (IHZ), and six units per acre allowed with deed restrictions. He expressed support for modifying the IHZ and maintaining the equivalent residential connections (ERCs). Mr. Langford asked if a majority of the Council wanted staff to work on the suggestion and bring it back for review and discussion. A majority of the Council expressed support.

### **3. ADMINISTRATIVE ITEMS**

None

### **4. ADJOURN**

Chair Lamb adjourned the meeting at 6:03 pm.

*I certify that the foregoing minutes represent an accurate summary of what occurred at the meeting held on June 24, 2025. This document constitutes the official minutes for the West Jordan Committee of the Whole meeting.*

Cindy M. Quick, MMC  
Council Office Clerk

Approved this 8<sup>th</sup> day of July 2025