Minutes of the City of West Jordan
Committee of the Whole
Tuesday, October 13, 2026 – 4:00 pm
Approved October 27, 2026
8000 S Redwood Road, 3rd Floor
West Jordan, UT 84088

1. Call to Order

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

Staff: Council Office Director Alan Anderson, Senior Assistant City Attorney Patrick Boice, Mayor Dirk Burton, City Attorney Josh Chandler, Utilities Manager Greg Davenport, Assistant Planner Mark Forsythe, City Planner/Zoning Administrator Larry Gardner, Senior Planner Tayler Jensen, Assistant City Administrator Paul Jerome, Community Development Director Scott Langford, City Administrator Korban Lee, Public Information Manager Marie Magers, Senior Assistant City Attorney Duncan Murray, Policy Analyst Walter Schmidt, Council Office Clerk Cindy Quick, Administrative Services Director Danyce Steck

Chair Wignall called the meeting to order at 4:02 pm and noted that Vice Chair Shelton would arrive shortly.

2. Discussion Topics

a. Discussion of Lewiston Place Future Land Use Map Amendment, Rezone to Add the Interchange Overlay Zone, a Preliminary Development Plan/Master Development Agreement, and an Amendment to The Highlands Master Development Plan

City Planner Larry Gardner oriented the Council with the 425-acre Highlands Master Development Plan area and noted two pieces currently undeveloped in the area (Lewiston Place and Coldstream Commons). He shared that Lewiston Place was in the HFR Zone, which would allow a minimum of 9 units per acre and maximum of 18 units per acre with added amenities. Mr. Gardner expressed the opinion the standards that were put in place had resulted in a very nice master-planned community.

Barrett Peterson with Peterson Development shared that Peterson Development had master-planned Stone Creek and The Highlands. He explained the request to apply the Interchange Overlay Zone (IOZ) to Lewiston Place near Home Depot and existing apartment buildings to develop for-sale homes at closer to 21 units per acre. Mr. Peterson emphasized that Lewiston Place would remain in the Highlands Special Assessment Area and shared the opinion that the development would not be short on open space amenities.

Jeff Seaman with Peterson Development mentioned that Peterson wanted a for-sale product noting that they would partner with Oakwood Homes, a national builder, for Lewiston Place.

Vice Chair Shelton arrived at 4:14 pm.

Brian Fronk with Oakwood Homes showed a concept site plan for Lewiston Place reporting that units would be townhomes with two-car garages. Responding to a question from Council Member Whitelock, Mr. Fronk pointed out sidewalks and pickleball/playground/ picnic area amenities on the concept plan. He showed exterior elevations, color selections, and photographs of similar existing product. Mr. Fronk asked for feedback from the Council.

Responding to a question from Council Member Whitelock, Mr. Fronk said the City's 22-foot driveway standard was unusual, but they would comply with City Code requirements. She asked how Oakwood would prevent the units from being purchased by a corporation and used as rentals, and Mr. Fronk expressed being open to suggestions. He said Oakwood did not want Lewiston Place to be a rental community.

Council Member Lamb said the concept plan looked like an alley-loaded community without driveways. Council Member Whitelock expressed concern about parking, and with 196 units in an area currently assigned 80 ERCs (equivalent residential connections). She did not know where the water would come from, and was of the opinion that the concept plan did not include enough amenities for the proposed number of residents. Vice Chair Shelton expressed that parking was one of his biggest concerns.

Council Member Harris believed the property was already zoned for high density, and she preferred to keep the current zone, which would provide more room for parking. Mr. Fronk said the total number of units would be 50-60 less with the current zone requirements rather than with the IOZ, which would make paying for the required amenities and infrastructure difficult.

Council Member Jacob believed the proposed density was probably appropriate for the site with the location between high-density apartments and a busy commercial corner. Mr. Gardner pointed out that the IOZ zone had design standards and required amenities. He expressed the opinion that design would make all the difference in a development on the subject site. Council Member Bedore felt the proposed placement of amenities on only one side of the development would make access more difficult for families living on the other side of the development. Additionally, he believed residents might find it difficult to live in a unit next to the proposed pickleball courts. Council Member Bedore suggested moving the amenities toward the center of the development or adding something on the other side. He also agreed with Council Member Jacob that the subject location was a good spot for high density, which was why the area was already zoned for high density, and shared that parking was a big concern of his as well.

Responding to a comment from Council Member Whitelock, Mr. Fronk acknowledged that the developer could cut back on the finishing materials used to save money but explained that Oakwood Homes wanted to build quality homes that people would be proud of. Council Member Whitelock expressed pride with the very basic home she purchased, and thought people would rather be in a home they could afford that had the space they preferred. She

suggested there would be ways for the project to pencil out at 18 units per acre. Responding to a question from Council Office Director Alan Anderson, Council Members Whitelock and Harris said they would not be supportive of adding the IOZ zone as proposed.

b. Discussion of Oneleven Phase 2 Rezone, Future Land Use Map Amendment, and Master Development Plan/Agreement

Senior Planner Tayler Jensen reported that DAI was looking for feedback from the Council concerning Oneleven Phase 2. Chase Andrizzi with DAI showed an updated concept plan with a proposed rezone from Medium Family Residential (MFR) to Integrated Housing Development Zone (IH-D) to match adjacent development. He described a single-family rear-load product that would face 7400 South, as well as front-load townhomes, and pointed out that the update provided more integration of different use types across the Phase 2 portion of the project.

Mr. Jensen said the IH-D Zone would allow more townhome and duplex-type units than would be found in the MFR Zone. He noted that Council had previously expressed interest in moving toward more integrated zoning. Mr. Andrizzi added that the concept plan included additional commercial, which was a component of the IH-D Zone. Responding to a question from Vice Chair Shelton, Mr. Jensen said he believed the IH-D Zone would be appropriate at the subject location and pointed out moderate-income housing units included in the concept plan.

A majority of the Council indicated support for the proposed Future Land Use Map amendment, the IH-D Zone, and the concept plan presented.

c. Discussion of Harper Master Planned Community, Rezone, Future Land Use Map Amendment, and Master Development Plan/Agreement

Senior Planner Tayler Jensen described the applicant's proposed Future Land Use Map (FLUM) amendment and rezone for the Harper community, similar to the request from DAI in the previous agenda item. The applicant proposed amending the FLUM for 70.12 acres from Low-Density, Very Low Density Resident, and Public Facilities to Medium Density Residential, and proposed a change in zone from MFR, Low Density Single-Family (LSFR), and Public Facilities (PF) to IH-D. The proposal included 405 dwelling units (5.95 units per acre) and 2.14 acres of commercial.

Sattar Tabriz with Ward Engineering said the applicant desired the IH-D Zone because they believed it fit the project better than the current zoning. He commented that the two neighboring projects (Harper and Oneleven) would flow better with the same zoning. Mr. Tabriz presented an updated concept plan and noted that all driveways met the 22-foot requirement, moderate income housing was included, and the number of stacked condos was reduced from 216 to 108. Responding to a question from Council Member Harris, Mr. Tabriz reported that the intent was for the units to be for sale. He mentioned that two carriage lots were added and that different product types had been integrated together throughout the project. Mr. Tabriz described proposed park and open space amenities, connectivity, and widened sidewalks.

Responding to a question from Vice Chair Shelton, Mr. Jensen said street parking would be permitted on the public roads if allowed by Fire Department engineering. Mr. Tabriz spoke of the slope of the property and planned retention space. Mr. Jensen said staff had worked through a lot with the Harper project, and felt the applicant had done a good job of incorporating feedback. The applicant had worked hard to make 50% of the project single family. He asked if Council would be comfortable if the project ended up being 49% single family. Council Member Whitelock said 49% would be okay and other Council Members indicated support. Mr. Tabriz described planned traffic calming measures. Vice Chair Shelton suggested raised crosswalks near the linear park.

Council Member Jacob felt the proposed concept plan was a good example of what integrated housing should look like. A majority of the Council indicated support for the proposed FLUM amendment, the IH-D Zone, the proposed layout, and cottage lots under 4,500 square feet.

d. Discussion of Transition Plan for New Solid Waste Service Contract

Public Works Director Brian Clegg reported that following an RFP for solid waste collection, it had been decided that Waste Management (WM) would be the new provider beginning July 1, 2027. Seasonal cans would restart on April 1, 2027, with weekly year-round pickup starting July 1. It was noted that residents could opt out of the seasonal can anytime. Staff emphasized that no household would pay more until October 2027, creating an opportunity for savings if households chose to reduce their number of cans. The current monthly fee with three cans was $24.72.

Mr. Clegg proposed that beginning December 1, 2026, the base rate for two cans would be $20.00, with an additional $4.72 for each existing seasonal can. The seasonal can could be turned in to reduce the bill to $20.00. A flat rate of $6.50 was proposed for any additional can.

Council Members Whitelock and Jacob felt residents would find the proposed timeline confusing and suggested leaving the structure the way it was until the end of the current contract, when the City could inform the residents the good news that they could reduce their fee to $20 by turning in the seasonal can. City Administrator Korban Lee commented that if the structure changed in December, residents could turn in the seasonal can and reduce their monthly rate to $20 as soon as December 2026. Council Member Jacob believed residents would opt out and turn in their seasonal can in December to avoid the $4.72 monthly charge, and then opt back in beginning July 1, 2027 when yearly collection began, which would create a lot of pick-up and drop-off work for the City. Administrative Services Director Danyce Steck pointed out that residents would opt back in at a monthly rate of $6.50 per additional can beginning July 1, 2027. The $4.72 would be a discounted rate for those who wanted to keep their seasonal can.

Mr. Clegg displayed the following proposed rate chart:

Proposed Monthly Rates

Effective	Base rate (2 cans)	Seasonal can	Additional can	Three-can household
Today	$24.72 (3 cans)	Included	$15.19 garbage / $7.61 recycling	$24.72
Dec 1, 2026	$20.00	Ended	$6.50 any color	$24.72 (no change)
Oct 1, 2027	$20.00	Ended	$6.50	$26.50 (+7.2%)
Oct 1, 2028	$21.00	Ended	$7.50	$28.50 (+7.5%)
Oct 1, 2029	$22.00	Ended	$8.00	$30.00 (+5.2%)
The $20 base rate would not increase until October 1, 2028				

Council Member Jacob believed a standard household with three cans most likely had a black can that was picked up every week, a green can that did not get picked up at all, and a blue can. With the proposed structure, a resident could opt for the green can taken away by the City beginning December 2026 to save $4.72 per month. The resident could then request an additional can beginning April 1, 2027 for $6.50 per month. The proposed structure did not make sense to him. Ms. Steck clarified that staff were trying to incentivize slow pickup of the green cans. Council Member Whitelock believed it was possible everyone would want their green can picked up in December.

Mr. Clegg pointed out the rate structure proposed by staff included an annual increase to the additional can rate. Mr. Lee explained that staff was working to minimize the impact on residents while avoiding a large volume of can turn-ins to Public Works. He suggested consumers were a little more sensitive to rate increases than possible rate decreases and suggested fewer households would contact the City to pick up the green can if the rate remained the same for a while.

Mr. Clegg said the Council could adjust the proposed rates if desired and the base rate could be lowered with an increase in the seasonal can rate; or the base rate could be increased for a decrease in the seasonal can rate. He recommended staying within a base rate range of $19-$21, and a seasonal can range of $3.72-$5.72 (base rate $19 and seasonal can $5.72 or base rate $21 and seasonal can $3.72).

Vice Chair Shelton asked about increases beyond 2029. Ms. Steck said the contract with WM included a 5% CPI maximum. Mr. Lee added that transfer station tipping fees were another element of the total cost that could increase. The proposed 7.2% and 7.5% increase in 2027 and 2028 were intended to recoup increased costs the City had been deferring.

Mr. Lee commented that the City could hold the base rate steady for longer with a $21 two-can base rate. A $19 base rate would need to increase after one year. He said staff tried to strike a balance by recommending the $20 base rate. He asked if the Council preferred to adjust the base rate one way or the other. Council Member Whitelock said she preferred the recommended $20 base rate because it gave residents options. Council Member Harris pointed out a $21 base rate was less than the current $24.72 cost, and said she liked the idea of increasing the base rate less often. Council Member Jacob said he was comfortable with a base rate of $20. Council Members Bedore and Wignall agreed.

Mr. Lee referred to a comment from Council Member Jacob, and asked what would stop a resident from using a third can as a seasonal can by turning it in during winter months and asking for it back in the spring, creating a lot of work for staff. He asked if the Council would support a delivery fee of $10. Ms. Steck pointed out a resident would be required to keep any additional can for at least a year. Vice Chair Shelton expressed support for a one-year minimum and a delivery fee. Council Member Whitelock asked if a resident could pick up a can to avoid the delivery fee. Mr. Lee responded there were still administrative costs involved, and said staff would prefer to deliver the can to check on the situation. A majority of the Council indicated support for a small delivery fee.

Mr. Clegg presented the following implementation timeline:

October 27, 2026	Council review, public hearing, amend Fee Schedule
Late November 2026	Seasonal can service ends as scheduled
December 1, 2026	Revised rates; opt-out program opens
April 1, 2027	Seasonal cans become regular solid waste cans with weekly pickup
July 1, 2027	WM contract begins; all cans weekly, year-round pickup
October 1, 2027	Seasonal can billed as additional can

A majority of the Council indicated support.

e. Discussion of Proposed Amendments to Title 6, Chapter 3B, Section 5 – Revocation of Dog License

Senior Assistant City Attorney Patrick Boice said he and Animal Control Officer Dan Eatchel had been working through some issues with problem dogs. They found current Code to be cumbersome for some circumstances and did not fit some current processes. Mr. Boice listed situations encountered by Animal Control where City Code had been confusing and unwieldy: dogs running loose in a neighborhood chasing children; dogs biting and attacking other dogs; dogs left in unsanitary and unsafe environments. He said Animal Control had been involved in more than 14 separate instances at one particular residence.

Mr. Boice proposed amendments to Title 6, Chapter 3B, Section 5 concerning Dog License Revocation sought to clarify acts which may result in license revocation, clarify procedure with the ALJ to understand how a license was revoked, and clarify consequences for license revocation. Officer Eatchel said license revocation meant revocation of ownership. Responding to a question from Council Member Jacob, Officer Eatchel believed a low percentage of dogs in the City were licensed.

Officer Eatchel noted that there was a process in place for impounding. Council Member Jacob believed the proposed amendments were necessary for the rare situations that may occur and was in favor of setting clear standards. Officer Eatchel reported that the City required an unlicensed dog be licensed as part of enforcement with a first offense.

Council Member Whitelock suggested increased public education efforts on social media. Council Member Jacob suggested incentivizing and streamlining the process to license dogs.

He suggested providing free licensing online for animals that were spayed and neutered, with increased fines for enforcement situations. Officer Eatchel said the City offered free microchipping for all residents with a grant from the County. Council Member Whitelock would be supportive of the City providing free licensing and increased fines for those who required enforcement actions. Mr. Boice was happy to bring back recommendations. He encouraged members of the Council to take a tour of the Animal Control facility.

Responding to a question from Council Member Lamb, Officer Eatchel said an online licensing process had been available to residents for several years. Council Member Lamb did not think reducing the licensing cost from $8 to $0 would incentivize a lot of dog owners to license their pets.

City Attorney Josh Chandler pointed out that there were multiple open cases in the City with repeat offenders, and requested the ability to move forward with the proposed Code amendments and hold a separate discussion regarding fees at a future meeting. A majority of the Council indicated agreement with his request.

f. Discussion of Proposed Amendment to Title 4, Chapter 2, Articles N, P, and Q – Secondhand Stores, Numismatic Dealers, and Employment Agencies

Senior Assistant City Attorney Patrick Boice presented proposed amendments to Article N (secondhand, antique and junk dealers), Article P (numismatic and bullion dealers), and Article Q (employment agencies) of Title 4, Chapter 2 as part of an ongoing effort to update Title 4. He defined numismatic as relating to or consisting of coins, paper currency, and medals.

Mr. Boice said the State had adopted Code to address secondhand stores, numismatic and bullion dealers, and employment agencies, and said the City did not have a lot of issues with compliance in those areas. He recommended removing the three special business licensing provisions to reduce duplicative licensing requirements now covered by the State, and reserving the sections to deal with advanced licensing issues as they arose down the road.

Council Member Whitelock felt that language concerning garage sales needed to remain in City Code. Mr. Boice clarified that current language limited secondhand store dealers to two yard sales per year, but did not limit private citizen yard sales. Council Member Whitelock felt that frequency of garage sales needed to be addressed. She explained that residents frequently complained about neighboring garage sales. Council Member Harris expressed interest in learning about garage sale restrictions in other cities. Council Member Whitelock and Harris requested a discussion of potential restrictions for garage sales be placed on a future Committee of the Whole agenda. They both indicated support for removing Article N and creating something new concerning garage sales.

3. Administrative Items

None

4. Adjourn

Chair Wignall adjourned the meeting at 6:31 pm.

I certify that the foregoing minutes represent an accurate summary of what occurred at the meeting held on October 13, 2026. This document constitutes the official minutes for the West Jordan Committee of the Whole meeting.

/s/ Cindy M. Quick, MMC
Council Office Clerk

Approved this 27th day of October 2026