Minutes of the City of West Jordan
Committee of the Whole
Tuesday, June 30, 2026 – 6:00 PM
Approved July 14, 2026
8000 S Redwood Road, 3rd Floor
West Jordan, UT 84088

1. Call to Order

Council: Council Member Chad Lamb, Council Member Kayleen Whitelock, Chair Bob Bedore, Council Member Zach Jacob, Council Member Kent Shelton, Council Member Annette Harris, Vice Chair Jessica Wignall

Staff: Senior Assistant City Attorney Patrick Boice, Mayor Dirk Burton, City Attorney Josh Chandler, Public Works Director Brian Clegg, Assistant Planner Mark Forsythe, Assistant City Administrator Paul Jerome, Community Development Director Scott Langford, City Administrator Korban Lee, Senior Planner Ray McCandless, City Engineer Nathan Nelson, Council Office Clerk Cindy Quick, Policy Analyst Walter Schmidt, Attendee Ashley Dupler, Attendee Nestor Gallo

Chair Bedore called the meeting to order at 6:00 pm

2. Discussion Topics

a. **Presentation of the 9000 South Corridor Study (Bangerter Highway to 4800 West)**
Mayor Dirk Burton introduced the item, explaining that projected growth and increased traffic along the 9000 South corridor require long-term planning. He said staff wanted Council feedback before moving forward with additional coordination with UDOT.

Public Works Director Brian Clegg introduced Transportation Engineer Jeremy Searle, who presented the results of a corridor study for 9000 South and 4000 West. Mr. Searle explained the study evaluated existing and future traffic conditions, identified operational challenges, and developed potential intersection and corridor improvements to accommodate projected traffic volumes through 2050.

Mr. Searle reviewed several improvement options for key intersections, including the realignment of Old Bingham Highway at 4000 West, modifications at 9000 South and Old Bingham Highway, improvements at 4000 West and 9000 South, and concepts to address traffic issues in the Valley View neighborhood. He also discussed a rail crossing analysis that identified 9000 South as one of the highest-priority rail crossings for future grade separation due to the frequency of train crossings and resulting traffic delays.

Council Members asked questions regarding roundabouts, traffic signals, railroad coordination, future roadway connections, crash data, neighborhood impacts, property acquisition, and construction timelines. Council Member Whitelock expressed concern that the Valley View neighborhood options did not provide a practical solution for residents and requested additional discussion of potential alternatives.

Following discussion, Council Members provided feedback on the proposed corridor improvements. A majority supported advancing the realignment of Old Bingham Highway at 4000 West and the recommended improvements at 4000 West and 9000 South. For the 9000 South and Old Bingham Highway intersection, Council Members were divided between the two preferred grade separation concepts (Options B5 and B6), with several members favoring each alternative. Council Member Jacob requested a separate future discussion regarding potential improvements for the Valley View neighborhood, and staff agreed to return with additional information.

A majority of the Council supported advancing the recommended improvements for the Old Bingham Highway realignment at 4000 West and the 4000 West/9000 South intersection. The Council was split between the two preferred grade separation concepts at 9000 South and Old Bingham Highway and requested additional discussion regarding potential solutions for the Valley View neighborhood.

b. Discussion of Dimonds Development – 3009 West 7800 South

Applicant Adam Nash presented a revised mixed-use concept plan consisting of townhomes and commercial development along 7800 South. He explained that previous efforts to develop the property for commercial uses alone had not been financially feasible and stated the proposal was intended to provide a viable mix of residential and commercial uses while maintaining compatibility with surrounding neighborhoods.

Council Members discussed several aspects of the proposal, including residential density, parking, alley-loaded garages, driveway lengths, available utility capacity, water allocation, affordability, commercial viability, and neighborhood compatibility. Several members expressed support for retaining commercial frontage along 7800 South, while others suggested reducing the number of residential units, adding additional open space or a playground, and providing more parking or driveways where feasible.

Staff advised that the proposal would require amendments to the General Plan, zoning map, and Balanced Housing ordinance because attached housing is not currently permitted at the proposed location. A broader policy discussion followed regarding whether the City's zoning regulations should be amended to allow townhome developments in similar infill locations. Some Board Members expressed interest in exploring potential ordinance changes, while others preferred to maintain the existing standards.

The Council generally supported retaining commercial development along 7800 South and requested that the applicant return with a revised concept showing fewer residential units and additional open space or amenities. Members also requested a future policy discussion regarding the City's zoning regulations for attached housing before considering any ordinance amendments.

c. Discussion of the Sugar Factory on the Creek Townhomes Development

Brandon Wixam and Tyler McArthur, representing McArthur Homes, provided an overview of the revised Sugar Factory on the Creek Townhomes Development. They stated that they had worked with City staff and various departments to address previous concerns, including parking, density, and open space.

Mr. Wixam explained that parking concerns had been addressed through the development agreement and CC&Rs, which would limit guest parking areas to guests only and allow for monitoring of parking use. He noted the project would include 23 ERUs, below the maximum allowable 30 ERUs, and would be over-parked due to its proximity to the TRAX station. The development would include alley-loaded units with 22-foot driveways, with approximately half of the lots including driveways and the remaining units utilizing guest parking areas. The developers stated there would be no street parking.

Mr. McArthur explained that the project was intended to provide a mix of residents, including families and individuals, and that the proximity to TRAX would provide an alternative transportation option. He noted that the homes would be for sale and that the developer typically required two to three years of owner occupancy through deed restrictions.

The developers discussed the community amenities, including access to trails, open space, and the creek area. They stated the revised proposal included reduced density, additional parking, more open space, and fewer ERUs than previously allowed. Mr. Wixam reported that he had met with nearby residents, including residents of adjacent townhomes, and stated that feedback had generally been supportive. He noted concerns raised regarding construction impacts, rodents, and fencing near the creek had been addressed.

Council discussed safety measures along the creek. Mr. Wixam explained that Salt Lake County had expressed concerns regarding fencing but that the developer had agreed to install fencing on both sides of the creek area and provide self-closing gates on the pedestrian bridge. Mr. McArthur suggested exploring a four-foot, see-through metal fence to maintain visibility of the creek while providing safety. Council Member Whitelock expressed concerns that excessive fencing could detract from the natural habitat and creek amenity.

Council Members noted concerns regarding potential parking impacts on Sugar Factory Road but appreciated that parking restrictions would be included in the CC&Rs. Mr. Wixam stated the parking plan had been carefully considered and that the project included additional parking compared to previous layouts.

Council Members discussed the potential for future expansion if additional properties became available. Chair Bedore preferred the revised layout and supported preserving the 11-unit configuration while considering a possible future phase if adjacent properties were acquired. He also expressed support for the proposed creek and trail amenities.

Mr. Wixam noted that a future trail connection along the strip of property near the creek could reduce walking distance to the area and stated Salt Lake County was reviewing the possibility. Chair Bedore expressed support for the connection.

Council Members Harris, Shelton, Lamb, and Bedore indicated support for moving forward with the proposal.

Council Member Jacob expressed continued concerns that the project may be under-parked and noted potential impacts from parking on Sugar Factory Road. Mr. McArthur reiterated that the CC&Rs would restrict guest parking and provide enforcement measures.

Council Member Whitelock requested consideration of additional driveway opportunities but acknowledged the challenges due to stormwater, canal, and creek constraints.

The developers asked about the next step in the process. Staff indicated the item could return to the City Council on July 28. Council discussed whether additional public noticing or public comment would be needed. Council Members Harris and Whitelock did not feel another public notice was necessary, and Mr. Langford suggested bringing the item back as a business item.

d. Discussion on Proposed Amendments to Temporary Business Licenses – Title 4, Chapter 2, Article E

Senior Assistant City Attorney Patrick Boice presented proposed amendments to the temporary business license regulations. He explained that the changes were intended to simplify the licensing process, clarify the distinction between sales events and individual vendors, eliminate the requirement for both a business license and a temporary business license, establish an expiration date for temporary licenses, and make stylistic updates. He noted the proposal would also prohibit sales within the public right-of-way and create a more straightforward fee structure.

Council discussed how the proposed changes would apply to temporary vendors, including pop-up shops, sales events, and individual participants. Questions were asked about the distinction between sales event organizers and participants, whether "participant" should be defined, and how the ordinance would apply to examples such as farmers markets, home-based vendors, and similar temporary sales activities. Mr. Boice explained that event organizers would be responsible for obtaining the sales event license, while individual participants generally would not need a separate temporary license.

Council expressed support for the moving forward the proposed amendments.

e. Discussion on Proposed City Code Amendments to Reorganize Fireworks Sales Licensing Requirements – Title 6 Chapter 2 and Title 4 Chapter 2 Article A

Senior Assistant City Attorney Patrick Boice explained that the proposal to amend this code would separate licensing requirements for professional fireworks displays from retail fireworks sales by retaining professional display licenses in Title 6, Chapter 2, and moving retail fireworks sales licenses to Title 4, Chapter 2, Article A with other special business licenses. Additional changes would streamline the application process, align revocation procedures with other business licenses, establish fees through the City's fee schedule, and clarify ordinance language.

Council discussed establishing a licensing fee for retail fireworks sales and whether a cleanup fee or security deposit would be appropriate. Staff explained that the City had historically not charged a fee for these licenses, although inspections and administrative work were required. Council Members questioned whether cleanup costs on private property should be recovered through licensing fees and discussed using code enforcement, rather than a cleanup fee, to address properties left in poor condition.

Council directed staff to move the proposed code amendments forward to the City Council while returning the proposed fireworks licensing fees to a future Committee of the Whole meeting for additional discussion. Staff was also asked to provide additional information on the City's administrative costs and how other municipalities structure similar fees.

Council also discussed the concept of disparate fees to recover the additional public safety costs associated with certain businesses. City Administrator Korban Lee explained how disparate fees had been studied previously to recover indirect police and fire service costs generated by specific business types. Council expressed mixed opinions, with some members supporting additional discussion and others opposing disparate fees unless applied consistently across all applicable business categories.

Council generally supported separating the code amendments from the fee discussion and continuing the fee discussion at a future Committee of the Whole meeting. Four Council Members indicated support for that approach.

f. Update on E-Bike Code Amendment

Senior Assistant City Attorney Patrick Boice presented proposed amendments to the City's electric bicycle (e-bike) regulations to incorporate changes adopted by the State Legislature in 2025 and 2026, including statutory changes that will take effect in 2027. He explained that the proposal would align the City's code with state law by updating definitions, classifications, age requirements, and safety regulations while allowing the City to regulate e-bike use on municipal sidewalks and trails.

Council discussed where e-bikes should be permitted within the City. Members considered allowing e-bikes on the Jordan River Parkway, Mountain View Corridor trail, and other paved city trails while limiting or prohibiting certain classes of e-bikes on natural surface trails. Mr. Boice noted that gas-powered vehicles would remain prohibited on city trails and explained that the proposal would distinguish between permitted e-bike classes based on state law. Council also discussed whether to reference state code directly or incorporate the applicable provisions into the City's ordinance.

Questions were asked about the treatment of mobility devices, scooters, and enforcement of the proposed regulations. Staff clarified that the ordinance applied only to electric bicycles and not to other motorized devices.

Council directed staff to revise the ordinance to include the Mountain View Corridor trail and other paved city trails as locations where permitted classes of e-bikes would be allowed, while maintaining restrictions on natural surface trails. Council supported returning the revised ordinance with the additional trail language for future consideration.

3. Administrative Items

None

4. Adjourn

Chair Bedore adjourned the meeting at 9:22 pm

I certify that the foregoing minutes represent an accurate summary of what occurred at the meeting held on June 30, 2026. This document constitutes the official minutes for the West Jordan Committee of the Whole meeting.

Cindy M. Quick, MMC
Council Office Clerk

Approved this____ day of_____2026