

**MINUTES OF THE CITY OF HOLLADAY
CITY COUNCIL MEETING**

Thursday, November 20, 2025

6:00 p.m.

City Council Chambers

4580 South 2300 East

Holladay, Utah

Briefing Session 5:30 pm

ATTENDANCE:

Rob Dahle, Mayor

Emily Gray

Paul Fotheringham

Drew Quinn

Ty Brewer - *excused*

Matt Durham - *excused*

City Staff:

Gina Chamness, City Manager

Todd Godfrey, City Attorney

Stephanie Carlson, City Recorder

**MINUTES OF THE CITY OF HOLLADAY
CITY COUNCIL MEETING**

Thursday, November 20, 2025

6:00 p.m.

City Council Chambers

4580 South 2300 East

Holladay, Utah

Briefing Session 5:30 pm

ATTENDANCE:

Rob Dahle, Mayor

Emily Gray

Paul Fotheringham

Drew Quinn

Ty Brewer

Matt Durham - *excused*

City Staff:

Gina Chamness, City Manager

Todd Godfrey, City Attorney

Stephanie Carlson, City Recorder

I. *Welcome* – Mayor Dahle.

Mayor Rob Dahle called the City Council Meeting to order at approximately 6:00 p.m.

II. *Pledge of Allegiance.*

Mayor Dahle led the Pledge of Allegiance.

The Mayor congratulated Natalie Bradley, who will be the new representative for District 3. She will replace Council Member Paul Fotheringham. David Sundwall will be the new representative for District 1 and will replace Council Member Ty Brewer. Mayor Dahle congratulated Council Member Fotheringham who will take over as Mayor starting in January 2026. There was a civil and respectful election process, and he was confident that the City of Holladay will be in good hands.

III. *Public Comments.*

Rich Greenberg - 2646 East Glenna Drive. He is a Pediatrician and worked as a Pediatric ER Physician at Primary Children's Medical Center for a decade and has also worked at other Pediatric ERs. He would like to speak to the City Council about the epidemic of motorized vehicles, golf carts, electric scooters, and electric bicycles being driven in neighborhoods by young children who are not wearing helmets. He has witnessed children driving golf carts as well as police who have driven by without taking action. It is illegal to drive a golf cart on City streets. In addition, people under 21 riding a Class 3 electric bicycle or motorized scooter are required to have a helmet.

An individual under the age of 16 may not operate a Class 3 electric bicycle. An individual under the age of 14 may not operate an electric bicycle unless under the direct supervision of parents. Individuals under the age of eight may not operate an electric bicycle. As far as scooters, persons under 15 may not operate a motorized scooter unless under the direct supervision of a parent. Persons under eight may not operate an electric scooter. Electric scooters, according to the DMV, are not allowed to go more than 15 MPH and cannot carry more than one person at a time.

Mr. Greenberg was not certain that any of these rules are followed. Children do not know how to properly maneuver electric bicycles and scooters and he did not understand why Police Officers are not enforcing the laws that exist. Mr. Greenberg did not believe this should come down to parental choices, as there are laws in place for a reason. He felt strongly that the existing laws should be enforced. He reported that laws are in place to protect children and keep them safe.

Mayor Dahle explained that this is an issue the City Council has discussed in the past. There have also been conversations with the Police Department in order to determine how aggressive to be with enforcement. The City Council shares many of the concerns that have been expressed.

Alan Eastman - 5698 South Park Place East. He recently co-taught a class on Wildland Urban Interface at the University of Utah Extension. He was in favor of what the City is doing and what the State Legislature has done with respect to the Wildland Urban Interface. He noted that the Utah Division of Forestry, Fire, and State Lands (“FFSL”) will impose a fee on property owners in the most endangered parts of the City. Mr. Eastman suggested that the City consider rebating that fee to homeowners after the modifications have been made. This would be an incentive for people in those areas. It is possible to address issues beforehand. Mr. Eastman offered his assistance to the City and explained that he can provide additional information.

Mayor Dahle assumed that most of those in attendance were present to share comments about Item 5 on the meeting agenda. As a result, the agenda was to be reordered to hear those comments first.

Council Member Fotheringham moved to REORDER the City Council Meeting Agenda. Council Member Brewer seconded the motion. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Council.

IV. *Public Hearing on Proposed Text Amendment to the Regional Mixed-Use (R/M-U) Zone Site Development Master Plan (SDMP 2007) for Royal Holladay Hills (Text Amendment to Cottonwood Mall within the Regional Mixed-Use (R/M-U) Zone to Provide New Signage Criteria for the Development Area as an Appendix to the SDMP).*

Community and Economic Development Director, Jonathan Teerlink, explained that this is a legislative request to amend the text within the Site Development Master Plan (“SDMP”) for Royal Holladay Hills. At the time that the City Council and owners were developing the SDMP for this project, signage was not something that was finalized. With the project underway, signage is something the Community and Economic Development Department is reviewing for permitting. The standards need to be in place, as directed in the section on Page 17.

Mr. Teerlink reported that the appendix to the SDMP allows for a number of development signs around the perimeter of the project. These signs would be designed in a way that is unique to Royal Holladay Hills. The development standards proposed within the Royal Holladay Hills site are a bit different from the rest of the commercial districts within the City of Holladay. Monument signs within the City are not usually much higher than 10 feet, depending on the commercial district. However, the project on Wasatch Boulevard and 3000 East has allowances for a sign up to 20 feet, which is the same height that is proposed at this location.

The Planning Commission provided a recommendation to the City Council based on the fact that the majority of the tenant placards will be placed on the individual signs. Including them on taller monument signs at specific locations with clear view and setback requirements was something the

Planning Commission found acceptable. Council Member Gray asked if this will be discussed during the Work Meeting, which was confirmed. It was noted that questions can be asked at that time.

Mayor Dahle opened the public hearing. There were no comments. The public hearing was CLOSED.

V. *Public Hearing on a Proposed Text Amendment to Add Title 13.70 Wildland Urban Interface Overlay Zone and Building Code (Regulations as they Relate to Statute Obligations, as Set Forth by State of Utah Legislation, HB 48, Creating a Wildland Urban Interface (WUI) Boundary Zone and Adopting the 2006 Utah WUI Building Code.)*

Mr. Teerlink explained that the Planning Commission forwarded a recommendation on a Wildland Urban Interface Overlay boundary. The boundary is part of a mandate associated with House Bill (“H.B.”) 48. There was a discussion with the City Council in mid-October. At that time, the Community and Economic Development and GIS Departments prepared overlay boundaries that align with Unified Fire Authority (“UFA”) requirements and recommendations as well as the Structure Exposure Score Map from the State. The City of Holladay Wildland Urban Interface Overlay and the Structure Exposure Score Map should be considered separately, but there are some associations.

HB-48 requires insurance companies to look at a high-risk map assessment to determine the coverage for property owners. That area was graded on a scale of 1 to 10 for risk. The properties in the high-risk range are intended to have an associated fee that is assessed through property tax. That fee would be used to implement fire prevention from the FFSL program. Mr. Teerlink clarified that the City of Holladay will not assess a fee. If a wildland fire took place, in order for a municipality to receive compensation funds, the municipality would need to have adopted an overlay zone that establishes properties within a structure score of five and above. The Structure Exposure Score Map that has been proposed was recommended by the Planning Commission as an overlay boundary.

Mr. Teerlink explained that overlay zones are different than normal land use zones. Land use zones are requirements for construction, where overlay zones add an additional set of construction standards. The overlay zone is where the implementation of the State of Utah’s Wildland Urban Interface Code comes into play. Whenever redevelopment occurs within this boundary, the code would be required.

Mr. Teerlink reported that the Planning Commission has recommended the boundary shown. The boundary represents a Structure Exposure Score of five and above. This is where the 2006 Utah Wildland Urban Interface Code would be implemented, once this has been adopted. The State has given a mandate of January 1, 2026, to have a boundary and the code adopted. The Planning Commission has provided their recommendation to the City Council.

Council Member Gray mentioned the State map and the recommended Holladay map. She asked if there must be automatic compliance with the defensible space requirements. Mr. Teerlink reported that the language states the code is implemented when there is new construction or redevelopment of the property. The only time property owners would need to change their

landscaping is if there is new construction or redevelopment that occurs. Mr. Teerlink explained that in those instances, the City would be involved to make sure the property was code compliant.

Council Member Gray asked for additional information about defensible space. She believes trees need to be 10 feet away from the structure. Mr. Teerlink reported that the tree branches and tree canopy must be 10 feet away from the structure and chimney. There is also language related to underlying growth, such as dead trees, branches, dry grasses, and anything that is six feet or lower.

Council Member Gray mentioned the State map and the City map included in the Meeting Materials Packet. There are some properties on Wallace Lane to the north with a risk assessment score of four, which would not be included, but those appear to be on the City map. She asked for clarification about the rationale. Mr. Teerlink reported that this is a land use hazard planning practice. The recommendation from the Community and Economic Development Department is to include similar situations within that boundary. There are similar characteristics there to properties scored as five.

Council Member Gray believed the only property owners in the City of Holladay that would be affected by a fee are on the far eastern side of the Heughs Canyon neighborhood. She noted there is something in the statute that if there are adjustments made to the defensible space, it is possible to receive a discount or waiver on that fee. Mr. Teerlink confirmed that there is a process outlined in the bill language.

There was discussions about the Structure Exposure Score Map included in the Meeting Materials Packet. Mayor Dahle reiterated that the City will not assess fees, but certain properties might be assessed a fee from the State through the County. Mr. Teerlink added that the City will not receive money from the fees. Council Member Gray does not believe the impact of the City map is extensive.

Mayor Dahle asked if there was discussion during the Planning Commission level about making I-215 the break. There is only a small strip of homes on the west side that are included. Mr. Teerlink confirmed that this was discussed by the Commission. The concern was that if the homes around Wallace Lane are not included, there could be future issues, especially if the risk for the homes was determined by the State but not the City. That was the reason for the alignment shown. Council Member Gray does not believe the insurance companies can use the City map. Mr. Teerlink confirmed that the State map should be used. Council Member Gray asked if the Utah Department of Transportation (“UDOT”) would be required to cut the grass in the area if I-215 was included. Mr. Teerlink reported that there could be some communication about the Wildland Urban Interface.

Council Member Brewer asked for examples of redevelopment that would trigger compliance with the code. He wanted to know what would happen if someone wanted to add a pergola onto their home. Mr. Teerlink shared his interpretation of the Code. In that scenario, the pergola itself, not the rest of the house, would need to be built to the fire standard. The new construction element would need to be updated rather than the rest of the home. He reported that there are specific requirements for reroofing, because wood shakes are not allowed to be replaced on a home. There is a specific paragraph related to that material. Council Member Brewer asked for some commonly permitted examples that could trigger compliance with the code. Mr. Teerlink asked for clarification from the Fire Marshal about what to do if there is new construction for a garage or

shed that is fairly minimal in impact. From the way that he reads the 2006 Utah Wildland Urban Interface Code, the shed itself would need to be built with fire-resistant materials. It would not impact the main home.

Council Member Brewer wanted City Staff to summarize how this Code will impact a remodel. Mr. Teerlink explained that there is clarity in the ordinance about what triggers this section of Code. Council Member Brewer was more concerned with remodel scenarios than new construction. Mr. Teerlink mentioned additions and carport conversions to a garage. Those would be new construction scenarios that would trigger a review from the Community and Economic Development Department. Council Member Brewer did not believe the City boundary would have an impact on insurance premiums. Mr. Teerlink stated that it should not have an impact, as it is all directed to the State maps rather than to the Holladay map. Council Member Brewer stated that the Legislation is requiring insurance companies that want to sell insurance in Utah to offer it in high-risk areas, but this is subject to the State map. Mr. Teerlink reported that the insurance company will look at the risk rating for each individual property. The overlay in Holladay does not have an impact on that process. Additional discussions were had about insurance companies and the code language.

Council Member Gray stated that I-215 seems to be an obvious fire break. She wants to better understand how the risk on the west side of I-215 is the same as the risk on the east side of I-215. Mr. Teerlink recognized that this pertains to embers that are thrown. It was noted that it will be possible to speak to UFA representatives during the Work Meeting discussion on the hearing item.

Mayor Dahle opened the public hearing. He reported that a written public comment was submitted by Anna Policelli at 4891 South Wallace Lane as well as Gary Freedman at 4893 South Wallace Lane and Craig Caldwell at 4901 South Wallace Lane. That written comment was reviewed by the Council.

Phillip Policelli - 4891 S Wallace Lane. He had questions for the City Council and asked if the high fire risk is being equated with the Holladay map overlay. Mr. Policelli mentioned the I-215 fire break proposition and noted that the written comment includes a map that shows I-215. He reviewed the map and explained that there is a 6-foot-tall noise barrier wall that goes all the way along the Holladay interface with I-215. This is a well-established break. Mr. Policelli expressed concerns about insurance and the potential outcomes of this process.

Patrick Boice - Canyon Cove Drive in the Heughs Canyon area and believes the map was drawn hastily and needs to be revisited. He asked the City Council to consider tabling the vote and reexamining this at a future meeting. Some of the areas shown have a Structure Exposure Score of four and below. There has been a tree-cutting permit in the City for years, and now there will need to be a lot of trees cut down to create defensible space. Mr. Boice did not agree with the interpretation of the language that this will only apply to remodels and new construction. For instance, section six specifically states that the defensible space provisions apply to existing properties. He encouraged the City of Holladay to adopt something similar to Salt Lake City, where parcels that interface with the wildland were selected, rather than broad neighborhoods. Mr. Boice expressed concerns that the proposal will have a negative impact on the affected areas.

Anna Policelli - 4891 S Wallace Lane. Her neighborhood on the east side of Wallace Lane is no more susceptible to fire than the homes on the west side of Wallace Lane. This designation by the

City of Holladay serves no purpose but may lead to unforeseen problems for homeowners in her neighborhood. This neighborhood clearly does not fit the criteria established by the State.

Lawrence Cannon -5561 Indian Rock Road and expressed concerns about the map. The homeowners in the neighborhood are powerless to protect that space. His property abuts the upper canal that is somewhat poorly maintained. The branches that are cut out of that canal are put onto the banks. Beyond the canal is UDOT property. Mr. Cannon does not have access to the canal easement or the UDOT property to make a defensible space. He asked that there be thought into how homeowners will be able to create defensible space because there are certain limitations in place. Mr. Cannon likes the idea of pushing the map to I-215 and then having the City, the canal company, and homeowners work together to create a solution for the upper canal area. He stated that I-215 is a substantial fire break. He asked the City Council to think about ways to empower property owners to create defensible space when there is not necessarily access to the surrounding land.

There were no further comments. **The public hearing remained open**

VI. *Public Hearing on Proposed Budget Amendments for Fiscal Year 2025-2026.*

Finance Director, Christian Larsen, reviewed the Proposed Budget Amendment. In the General Fund, there are five budgeted increases in the benefits sections for various departments. In previous years, the City created a policy for a Retirement Health Savings account for employees. This would allow employees to buy out a portion of their sick leave that is over a certain cap at 50%. The City would then contribute that to a Retirement Health Savings account on behalf of the employees. While the policy existed, the benefit was not actually available to employees until recently. The increases shown in the document are for those payments, assuming that every employee who is eligible participated to the maximum amount.

In the Arts Fund, there is the Transfer from the General Fund that was mentioned. This is \$3,000, and then there is also the \$3,000 grant amount that would be received. In the Grants Fund, there is the 6200 South Matching Fund Transfer from Capital Projects line item. Mr. Larsen explained that this is a transfer from the Capital Projects Fund for \$45,205 and is associated with a project that happened several years back, which was a grant-funded project from UDOT. There were several costs associated with the project that were not reimbursable on a Federal level. For various reasons, those funds were not eligible to be reimbursed, so according to the contract, the City is responsible.

The Grants Fund also shows the Highland Drive grant. Mr. Larsen explained that this is from HB-488 and is \$1.23 million. This is for improvements on Highland Drive between Van Winkle and Arbor Lane. There is a Highland Drive Transfer from Capital Projects line item for \$5,091, which is related to a Wasatch Front Regional Council (“WFRC”) grant. This is the City portion of a much larger project. There will be a partnership with other cities to do a safety audit for Highland Drive.

The Grants Fund has a line item for the Salt Lake County Housing Rehab Loan Program. \$220,000 is being received and then the City is matching \$10,160. The program would enable residents to apply for funds to rehabilitate their homes. The expenses in the Grants Fund cover a lot of the items that were previously mentioned. In the Capital Projects Fund, there is a transfer out of the \$45,205 that is associated with the UDOT project that was mentioned earlier. In addition, there is

a transfer to the Grants Fund that is associated with the safety audit. Council Member Brewer asked about the software for recreation. He asked if the intention was to use that across the board, which was confirmed.

Mayor Dahle opened the public hearing. There were no comments. The public hearing was **CLOSED**.

VII. *Consideration of Resolution 2025-27 - Adopting the 2025 General Plan.*

Council Member Gray thanked City Staff and contracted partners for their efforts on the General Plan. She noted that it is forward-thinking and more accessible. She added that the document captured what the citizens of Holladay want to see. Council Member Fotheringham thanked everyone who participated on the Committee, as there was a lot of meaningful participation. The goal was to make the General Plan more readable and easier to use, and to ensure that there was contextual background provided. Council Member Drew Quinn confirmed that the document is understandable and clear.

Council Member Gray moved to APPROVE Resolution 2025-27 – Adopting the 2025 General Plan. Council Member Quinn seconded the motion. Vote on Motion: Council Member Gray-Yes; Council Member Quinn-Yes; Council Member Fotheringham-Yes; Council Member Brewer-Yes; Mayor Dahle-Yes. The motion passed unanimously.

VIII. *Consideration of Resolution 2025-28 - Approving an Agreement with Salt Lake County for Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) Funds.*

Economic Development and Housing Manager, Ann Frances Garcia, reported that the City applied for Community Development Block Grant (“CDBG”) funds in December last year for the Home Repair Loan Program. NeighborWorks is a non-profit organization that has the capacity to handle administration. NeighborWorks will gather the paperwork and review the financials. The responsibility of the City is to market the program to residents. There are homes in Holladay that are from the 1950s and earlier, so there is a lot of need.

Ms. Garcia believes this will be a beneficial program for residents. It was supposed to start on July 1, 2025, but with the government situation and some projects on hold, the contracts were received in late September 2025. Mayor Dahle asked if the funds need to be spent by a certain date, which was confirmed. Ms. Garcia reported that it is a fiscal year program, so it starts on July 1 and ends on June 30. The City will have a late start, but there are still six months remaining in the fiscal year. It is understood that there is a late start, so there is also openness to a potential rollover if necessary.

Council Member Gray moved to APPROVE Resolution 2025-28 – Approving an Agreement with Salt Lake County for Community Development Block Grant (“CDBG”) Funds. Council Member Fotheringham seconded the motion. Vote on Motion: Council Member Gray-Yes; Council Member Quinn-Yes; Council Member Fotheringham-Yes; Council Member Brewer-Yes; Mayor Dahle-Yes. The motion passed unanimously.

IX. *Consideration of Resolution 2025-29 - Approving a Service Agreement with Neighborworks to Administer Housing Programs in the City of Holladay.*

Council Member Quinn moved to APPROVE Resolution 2025-29 – Approving a Service Agreement with Neighborworks to Administer Housing Programs in the City of Holladay.

Council Member Gray seconded the motion. Vote on Motion: Council Member Gray-Yes; Council Member Quinn-Yes; Council Member Fotheringham-Yes; Council Member Brewer-Yes; Mayor Dahle-Yes. The motion passed unanimously.

X. City Manager Report.

City Manager, Gina Chamness, did not have additional updates to share with the City Council.

XI. Council Reports and District Issues.

Council Member Brewer noted that during a City Council Meeting, there was a discussion about some massive steel power poles and lines that went in. That was an unfortunate situation, and he is glad to see where things are now, as it is significantly better. It was no small expense to change things and it speaks to the investment that is being made in the property. The area looks better than before.

Mayor Dahle reported that he attended a Unified Police Department (“UPD”) meeting earlier in the day. The basketball court will be renamed on December 11, 2025, for the Head Coach at Olympus High School, Matt Barnes. There will be a celebration event held and those interested can attend. Council Member Fotheringham informed those present that at the UPD meeting, Mayor Dahle and the Mayor of Millcreek, Jeff Silvestrini, were honored for their many years of service on the UPD Board.

Council Member Gray reminded those present of the Tree Lighting on December 1, 2025, from 5:30 p.m. to 7:00 p.m. Mayor Dahle stated that a special visitor will be there at 5:45 p.m. He expressed appreciation for the work that has been done for the lighting in the community.

XII. Recess to RDA Meeting.

Council Member Gray moved to RECESS the City Council Meeting and RECONVENE in a Redevelopment Agency Meeting. Council Member Brewer seconded the motion. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Council.

XIII. Reconvene City Council in a Work Meeting.

Mayor Dahle reconvened the Council in a Work meeting at approximately 7:15 pm.

a. Discussion on Previous Public Hearings.

Mayor Dahle reported that the City Council will discuss the previous public hearing items. He asked to begin with the Wildland Urban Interface Overlay Zone and Building Code. It was noted that UFA Captain, Dan Brown, was present to answer questions.

Council Member Gray asked about the risk west of I-215. Captain Brown acknowledged that there have been comments about I-215 being a fire break. He shared information about where the Structure Exposure Score came from. There is a company that handles this work and develops the scores based on wildfire likelihood and how probable it is for fire to reach there based on probability modeling, expected fire intensity, and ember exposure. While I-215 is a fire break, the determination comes down to embers. The ember exposure is modeled using historic weather and topography information.

Council Member Brewer stated that one to three miles is how far the embers can travel and still cause a fire. He mentioned a comment made during the public hearing about the boundary. He understands that there needs to be a line determined, but is not certain about what has been proposed. Council Member Fotheringham pointed out that I-215 can still be a line that is determined for City purposes. He does not fault the Planning Commission for being overly conservative when it comes to the boundary, but he believes I-215 makes a lot of sense. This is a new concept, and it might make sense to be less aggressive at this time. If more information is presented to the City Council in the future, then it would be possible to expand the boundary accordingly. He is comfortable with making I-215 the initial boundary at this point, because the residents east of I-215 are in the wildland area, where the residents west of I-215 are not actually in it, but have an elevated risk due to the proximity.

Council Member Gray stated that she wants to better understand the impacts. She asked to confirm that the language applies to new construction and redevelopment. City Attorney, Todd Godfrey, explained that he would rather not advise the City Council on this issue due to the proximity of his property to the line. Jayme Blakesley has agreed to handle this matter. There will be an answer to that question provided before the next City Council Meeting. Council Member Gray asked if it would be possible to receive that clarification sooner, especially if the City Council is going to vote on this item. Mr. Godfrey anticipates that the answer will be communicated to the Council next week. Mr. Teerlink shared clarification about his interpretation of the language. It is clear to him after reading the administration section of the code that existing conditions and buildings are not required to be updated unless there is an extreme fire risk that is assessed by the Code Official. The roles and responsibilities of the Code Official are outlined in the 2006 Utah Wildland Urban Interface Code.

Council Member Brewer asked about the Salt Lake City approach that was mentioned during the hearing. Mr. Teerlink reported that Captain Brown spoke to the Fire Chief in Salt Lake City about their approach, but Salt Lake City has not officially adopted anything at this time. Captain Brown reported that Salt Lake City originally went off the Structure Exposure Score Map for structures five and above. This encompassed approximately 3,000 homes, but the list was whittled down to approximately 900 homes. UFA recommends that the State scores be taken into account. The City Council further reviewed the proposed boundary map and discussed the areas that were included.

Ms. Chamness believed the suggestion from Council Member Brewer is to include the area west of I-215, including the UDOT property. Council Member Brewer stated that if this boundary would make a difference as far as UDOT taking action, then he would support the inclusion, but if it would not, then he would suggest that the boundary be I-215. Mayor Dahle does not think UDOT will look at the map, see their property in the overlay, and decide to handle the maintenance there.

Mayor Dahle asked how the boundary would be determined. He wanted to know if changes to the map could be handled in a motion or if a new boundary map would need to be put into the future Meeting Materials Packet. Ms. Chamness would recommend that the map be updated based on City Council direction. Council Member Fotheringham wanted to know if this should return to the Planning Commission. Mr. Godfrey explained that if the City Council wants to include more area, then he would recommend that this return to the Planning Commission. However, if there is

less area included, he does not believe it would need to be discussed further by the Planning Commission.

Mayor Dahle explained that the City Council will next discuss the Text Amendment to the SDMP. Council Member Fotheringham did not have an issue with the proposal, especially with the recommendation from the Planning Commission and the context that was provided during the meeting. Council Members Quinn and Gray expressed support for the signs. The applicant representative clarified that there is one change that is proposed. The Planning Commission suggested 20-foot setbacks. On Murray Holladay Road, there are transmission lines and distribution lines for the power company, so that is back 40 feet. The setback is mandated by those lines. The Commission wanted Highland Drive to be 20 feet back but it is not possible to do so because of the ditch canal, which is the raised area in the parking lot. It is not possible to build in or over that easement area. As a result, the setback there needs to be 15 feet rather than 20 feet.

The City Council discussed the sign placement proposal. It was noted that an email was sent to Mr. Teerlink that provides additional clarification about the placement. The applicant representative reviewed images with the Council. It was reiterated that the 20 feet will not work in this specific location, so there is a request that the setback there be 15 feet instead of what was previously proposed by the Planning Commission. Mr. Godfrey explained that when the City Council votes on the item at the next meeting, the Council can approve the sign package as shown, with the exception that this particular sign must have a setback of at least 15 feet. This is a minor change that does not need to return to the Planning Commission.

b. Discussion and Review of Title 3 Amendments – Gina Chamness.

Ms. Chamness reviewed the Title 3 amendments with the City Council. She reported that the redline version of the document is included in the packet. This is part of a multi-year effort to make the code more readable and consistent. Ms. Chamness pointed out 3.12.070 – Procedure for Erroneous Collections. There is a fair amount of language proposed to be eliminated there. Mr. Godfrey explained that the State Law has changed. That language appeared in an old section of the statute, but does not appear there anymore. The language that is proposed now is consistent with the State Code. Instead of restating the language, which was previously done in the code, the State Code section has been referenced. Ms. Chamness reviewed Section 3.16 – Community Development Fees. A lot of existing language is proposed to be eliminated, and there is direction to the Consolidated Fee Schedule. That fee schedule is adopted, but is not codified, so it is easier to make changes. She discussed Section 3.24 and explained that it is a reference to a program that she does not believe the City has ever used. Since it has not been used and there is a lack of clarity, those references have been eliminated from the Title 3 document.

Chapter 3.40 – Donations, Sponsorships, and Naming of City Assets is something that has been discussed previously by the City Council. This is a draft that most of the Council Members have seen before. There was some language added for in-kind donations. Council Member Brewer likes the language that has been proposed in this section and stressed the importance of community. He expressed a willingness to assist with fundraising efforts in the future. Mayor Dahle asked if there would be a public hearing on the amendments scheduled for the meeting on December 4, 2025, which was confirmed. He did not anticipate a lot of comment, so it could be voted on at that time as well.

c. Calendar.

- *Council Meetings –December 4, and 11.*
- *Tree Lighting – December 1 from 5:30-7:00 PM*

The calendar items were reviewed and discussed.

XIV. Closed Session for the Purposes Described in UCA 52-4-204 and 205 (if needed).

Council Member Brewer moved to go into CLOSED SESSION for the Purposes Described in UCA 52-4-204 and 205, for a discussion of the character, competence, or mental or physical health of an individual. Council Member Gray seconded the motion. Vote on Motion: Council Member Gray-Yes; Council Member Quinn-Yes; Council Member Fotheringham-Yes; Council Member Brewer-Yes; Mayor Dahle-Yes. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Council.

The City Council entered the Closed Session at approximately 7:50 p.m.

Those in attendance in the Closed Session included Council Members Durham, Fotheringham, Quinn, Gray, and Mayor Dahle. Others present included Gina Chamness, Todd Godfrey, Stephanie Carlson, and Holly Smith.

The minutes of the Closed Session were taken and are on file as a Protected Record

Council Member Gray moved to adjourn the Closed Session. Council Member Quinn seconded the motion. The Council roll call vote was as follows: Council Members Durham, Fotheringham, Quinn, Gray, and Mayor Dahle in favor. The motion to go out of closed session at 8:08 p.m. passed with a unanimous vote.

XV. Adjourn.

Council Member Gray moved to ADJOURN. Council Member Quinn seconded the motion. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Council.

The City Council Meeting adjourned at approximately 8:10 p.m.

I hereby certify that the foregoing represents a true, accurate, and complete record of the Holladay City Council Meeting held Thursday, November 20, 2025.

Stephanie N. Carlson, MMC
Holladay City Recorder

Robert Dahle, Mayor

Minutes approved: **January 8, 2026**