

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

**Thursday, July 16, 2026
6:00 p.m.
Temporary City Council Chambers
3330 South 1300 East
Millcreek, Utah**

ATTENDANCE:

Paul Fotheringham, Mayor
Emily Gray
Drew Quinn
Matt Durham
Dave Sundwall
Natalie Bradley

City Staff:
Gina Chamness, City Manager
Jonathan Teerlink, Community and Economic
Development Director
Todd Godfrey, City Attorney
Holly Smith, Assistant City Manager

I. *Welcome – Mayor Fotheringham.*

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

II. *Pledge of Allegiance*

Mayor Fotheringham led the Pledge of Allegiance.

III. *Public Comments.*

Trudy Jorgensen-Price shared updates about the library. She reported that Summer Reading runs until the end of the month. There are a lot of events scheduled throughout July and August. There will be changes made to Storytime at the end of August, as it will be held on Monday and Thursday instead of Monday and Tuesday. On August 4, 2026, there will be a program called “Staying Connected With Your Teen,” which will run in partnership with Salt Lake County Youth Services.

Ms. Jorgensen-Price reviewed some statistics with the City Council. Every year, the Institute of Museum and Library Services conducts a survey to compare the 9,000 public libraries in North America. The Holladay Library is part of the Salt Lake County Library Services, and in total circulation of items, they are the tenth-ranked library in North America. When it comes to physical circulation, the library is the eighth highest, and as far as physical items for children, the library is the fourth highest. The library ranks number 26 on the list when looking at total visits to the library.

IV. *Introduction of New Chief of Police for the Holladay Precinct.*

Chief Jason Mazuran explained that the Unified Police Department (“UPD”) has grown. Justin Hoyal was asked to serve as Assistant Chief, which meant a new Chief was needed for the Holladay Precinct. There were interviews conducted with qualified applicants and Tyler Ackerman was selected. Chief Ackerman expressed his appreciation and stated that he is excited to serve the community. He shared information about his professional background and reiterated his appreciation for this opportunity. Mayor Fotheringham has a lot of confidence in Chief Ackerman. His interview was impressive and he has served Holladay for many years. He welcomed Chief Ackerman to his new position.

V. *Consideration of the Appeal of Ron Hilton from the Denial of a Conditional Use Permit for Property Located at 2394 East Murray Holladay Road. (No Public Comment).*

Mayor Fotheringham explained that the above item relates to an appeal of a Conditional Use Permit (“CUP”) denial for property located at 2394 East Murray Holladay Road. Most of the time, the City Council acts as a legislative body, but in this case, the Council will act as a quasi-judicial body. The City Council will hear an appeal of a decision that was made at the Planning Commission level.

City Attorney, Todd Godfrey, explained that during the appeal process, Ron Hilton will have the opportunity to present. He bears the burden of showing that the Planning Commission denial of the CUP request was done in error. After his presentation, there will be a presentation made by Staff. Mr. Hilton will then be given one last opportunity to address the City Council. The City Council will then consider the information that was presented. Mr. Godfrey is present to answer legal questions. Council Members are also able to ask Mr. Hilton and Staff questions during their presentations.

Mayor Fotheringham reviewed the Meeting Minutes and the meeting recording. It appears that the denial was not based on the merits, but on the adequacy of the application. He believed the appeal process will focus on whether there was enough information submitted to make a decision. Mr. Godfrey confirmed that this is a fair reading of the record and the appeal request. Mayor Fotheringham pointed out that a lack of completeness in an application cannot be remedied at this level, because the City Council is not the body that would receive that additional information. Mr. Godfrey reported that Mr. Hilton will need to show that there was enough information provided.

Council Member Matt Durham asked if there is a standard of review. Mr. Godfrey reported that a CUP application is an administrative land use approval. The Planning Commission decision needs to be supported by substantial evidence in the record. He explained that the Planning Commission decided that the application was not sufficient for them to decide. Mayor Fotheringham pointed out that the motion to deny stated that it was not based on the merits, but had to do with the completeness of the application. The Meeting Minutes noted that the applicant was given an opportunity to withdraw and correct or enhance the application, but chose not to do so.

Ron and Melissa Hilton gave their address as 2397 East Murray Holladay Road. Mr. Hilton reported that he drafted an appeal narrative, which has been provided to the City Council. He clarified that part of the application was eventually withdrawn. The original application included two conditional land uses: an antique shop as a commercial use and an additional dwelling unit behind the historic building. There was also a Historic Site Modification. At this time, the only land use item being appealed is the additional unit. Mr. Hilton explained that at one point, there was a rezone request for the property. The request was to shift from R-1-10 to R-2-10, which would essentially double the density. That request was not approved. There has since been work done to find an appropriate use. What has been proposed most recently is approximately half the density of the previous request.

Hulton Park South has three lots, Lot 1, Lot 2, and Lot 2A. He explained that Lot 2A has a restriction on it stating that it must be combined with an adjacent lot. The request is to have that restriction removed so a third separately owned home can be built there. Mr. Hilton explained that the ordinance they are relying on allows for that. The idea is to have six units per acre, which is consistent with Hulton Park North. He pointed out that this property is surrounded by higher density. There is double the density on the east and west, so Mr. Hilton feels there was a modest request made.

The reason the Planning Commission chose to deny the application had to do with the level of detail that was provided. There was also a lot of public comment during the meeting, as some neighbors were concerned about an antique shop. Mr. Hilton does not know how much the public feedback factored into the decision made. He reiterated that the antique shop request has been withdrawn.

It was not clear that a lot of detail needed to be provided to address the restriction that prevented the other unit from being built. It seemed like a straightforward request. Mr. Hilton reported that approximately a year and a half ago, there was a Building Permit filed with a fully engineered set of plans. The City already had that information. If the City Council approves the waiver of the restriction and allows the additional unit to be built, Staff already has the detailed plans on file.

Mr. Hilton acknowledged that there was insufficient detail provided for Casper Cottage. There was an artist rendering of the external appearance submitted as well as a rough footprint. He explained that there was a proposal that this could become a museum. Since there was uncertainty about whether or not the use would be approved, some of the plan details were still unknown.

Mr. Hilton reported that there has already been approval to list Casper Cottage as historic. The ordinance has a list of conditional uses so a historic property can be used in a way that is sustainable. Without additional unit approval, Lot 2 and 2A would be combined, Casper Cottage would most likely be demolished, and a much larger home would be built on the property. This would be out of character with the surrounding historic bungalow district that there is a desire to be compatible with. The proposal is intended to maintain the historic character of the area. Mr. Hilton reiterated that there is a request to waive the one restriction so it is possible to move forward with the Building Permit. There will be the same density as the rest of the Planned Unit Development ("PUD"), and there will be compatibility with the surrounding area. The goal is to preserve the existing historic home.

Community and Economic Development Director, Jonathan Teerlink, explained that the Staff presentation will focus on how the application was received, processed, and delivered to the Planning Commission. There will also be information shared about the Planning Commission deliberation.

The applicant presented an application to the Technical Review Committee ("TRC") for a CUP for Historic Site Modifications and Additional Uses allowed by the Historic Preservation Ordinance. The TRC assessment of what was proposed met the definition of Historic Site Modifications. Certain modifications are allowed with Planning Commission approval. Details about the application were provided to Staff, and then a Staff Report was created for the Planning Commission. At the time, there were some questions from Staff, which were included in the report. The Staff Report noted that there could be additional questions posed during the meeting regarding the materials, landscaping, and other architectural items. Staff recommended the Commission open the public hearing, find out additional information, and continue the application to a future Planning Commission Meeting.

Another component of the request had to do with the Additional Uses proposed, which included an additional dwelling unit. Mr. Teerlink explained that this is an allowed type of land use. It is intended to sustain a historic property. There was also a proposal to have an antique shop with a museum component. He reported that some criteria were provided to the Planning Commission, but Staff did not receive much detail about the antique shop's operations. The Staff recommendation was to open the public hearing, find out more information, and continue the item.

Mr. Teerlink next discussed the accessory dwelling unit. The application for that was at a standstill because of the CUP, which controls the PUD that the property is located within. The Staff Report addressed the additional dwelling unit as something that could be requested, but additional conversation with the application would need to occur during the Planning Commission Meeting.

The Staff Report was forwarded to the Planning Commission. Mr. Teerlink reported that the public hearing and the Planning Commission deliberations on the merits of the requests took place during the Planning Commission Meeting on April 21, 2026. The Planning Commission discussed the request in two parts: Historic Site Modifications and Additional Uses. The Planning Commission considered the requests and had a conversation about the images that were provided. The Planning Commission wanted additional detail about the materials, window sizes, and other elements.

The Planning Commission's review of the Additional Uses focused on how it would support and preserve the historic property. There were conversations about what a retail use on the site would look like, including parking, hours of operation, and the internal remodel of the space. There was a floor plan to review, but the Planning Commission anticipated there would be more detail provided. There were missing details about how the antique shop would be operated as a retail use within a residential neighborhood. There were discussions about a museum and an additional dwelling unit.

Mr. Teerlink noted that two Commissioners questioned whether an additional dwelling unit would violate the CUP for the PUD. He explained that there are specific limitations on subdivisions that do not meet the standard development practices for a normal subdivision. Those parameters are detailed in a CUP, and that CUP set forth a maximum number of units for this subdivision. There were Commissioner concerns that the proposal was in conflict with the CUP. It was explained by Legal Counsel and Staff that if there was conflict with an additional dwelling unit, then there would need to be an amendment to the PUD and CUP brought back to the Planning Commission.

The Chair of the Planning Commission allowed the applicant to withdraw the application so it could come back at a different time with additional information. That opportunity was denied by the applicant, and the Planning Commission voted to deny all components of the request.

Council Member Durham asked if the applicant could reapply, which was confirmed. Mr. Teerlink explained that it is possible to reapply after one year. Council Member Durham noted that Mr. Hilton mentioned information that was submitted to the City previously. He asked if there is a mechanism for that information to be shared with the Planning Commission. Mr. Teerlink clarified that the Building Permit that was applied for was on Lot 2A. The restriction through the PUD for Lot 2A is for it to be used as common space or combined with an abutting property. When the applicant submitted a Building Permit for that lot, the land use provision was not in place for a home to be permitted on that property. Council Member Durham asked if the documentation for the permit was submitted or discussed during the Planning Commission Meeting. Mr. Teerlink did not recall.

Council Member Sundwall asked if the TRC or Staff has a responsibility to certify that an application is complete or adequate before it is shared with the Planning Commission. Mr. Teerlink reported that the TRC reviews the ordinance and considers what is required to be submitted for a CUP. The materials substantially met the requirements of a complete application that could be considered by the Planning Commission. CUPs are complicated enough that additional information is sometimes

warranted. Staff believed there was enough information available to start the conversation with the Commission.

Council Member Sundwall believed the property received a Historic Designation in February. He asked if these modifications could have been made prior to receiving that designation, which was confirmed. He shared example scenarios with the City Council. Council Member Durham asked if the same time restriction would have applied had the applicant withdrawn their application during the Planning Commission Meeting. Mr. Teerlink did not believe so. Mayor Fotheringham stated that there was an opportunity provided to continue, table, or withdraw. Each of those options was offered, but refused by the applicant. He listened to the Planning Commission Meeting recording and did not get the sense that the additional information being requested was onerous. Mr. Teerlink believed Staff and Legal Counsel suggested that the Planning Commission consider continuance.

Council Member Drew Quinn noted that there was a mention of additional information being needed for the antique shop portion of the proposal, which the applicant has since withdrawn. She asked whether the Planning Commission felt additional information was needed for the land use component as well. Mr. Teerlink did not believe there was information missing for that component. The discussion primarily focused on where the additional on-site parking would be located. Mayor Fotheringham pointed out that there were two motions made, one about the Historic Site Modifications and one about the Additional Uses. Both of those motions denied the requests due to a lack of application completeness. The Commission felt more information was needed overall.

Council Member Sundwall asked if the applicant can petition to have the Historic Designation rescinded. Mr. Teerlink confirmed that it is possible for a Historic Designation to be removed from a property upon request. Mayor Fotheringham believed that if a Historic Designation is obtained, there are some additional uses allowed. If the designation is removed from this property, those additional uses would no longer be allowed. There is a trade-off with having a Historic Designation.

Mayor Fotheringham believed there were Planning Commission questions about both the Historic Site Modifications and Additional Uses. Commissioners did not feel those questions were adequately answered in the application. Council Member Emily Gray asked what was incomplete on the Historic Site Modifications portion of the application. As for the additional building, it did not seem that there were plans submitted for that. Mr. Teerlink explained that for the Historic Site Modifications, the Planning Commission wanted to understand what there was a desire to mimic. However, there were no examples provided for clarification. For the additional dwelling unit, there was no Site Plan that showed how it would be laid out or interact with the antique shop. Council Member Gray noted that it sounds like the applicant has that information, but it was not formally submitted at that time.

Council Member Durham asked if the commercial use on the historic property was discussed during the Planning Commission Meeting. He also wanted to know if adding a commercial use is a recognized option for the preservation of a historic site. Mr. Teerlink does not believe this point was discussed during the meeting. As far as the ordinance is concerned, that is the intent. He shared an example scenario with the Council. Mayor Fotheringham believed the added use does not waive other requirements. Mr. Teerlink stated that if there was a retail use approved on the site, the floor plans would still need to comply with the Building Code and other requirements associated with the use.

Mr. Hilton shared information about Casper Cottage. He explained that there are unique architectural elements. This is also historically significant because of the Casper family. During the Staff presentation, it was stated that an amendment to the PUD would need to return to the Planning Commission. Mr. Hilton explained that the PUD originally proposed seven homes. The Planning Commission at that time was not sure that it was a decision they were able to make. On the advice of Legal Counsel, the Planning Commission approved six homes but encouraged an appeal to the City Council. This would allow the City Council to decide whether there could be seven homes. Unfortunately, the deadline for that appeal was missed while some other alternatives were explored.

If it is necessary to amend the PUD, that is something that can be pursued. Mr. Hilton is not certain if it is necessary since there have been similar changes made to Hulton Park North. There was a lot line adjustments, a fire hydrant was moved, and Rocky Mountain Power added a public utility easement.

Mr. Hilton explained that there is a desire to record a historic preservation easement to protect Casper Cottage. His suggestion is to record a single document that states the restriction will be waived and the easement will be added. Council Member Durham wanted to understand why the application was not withdrawn during the Planning Commission Meeting. Mr. Hilton explained that he was willing to withdraw the request for the antique shop because there was opposition expressed during the public hearing. However, it sounded like it was an all-or-nothing scenario. He added that there are some time constraints, because this project has already been delayed for quite some time. The builder is anxious to move forward. If these issues are not resolved, the most likely outcome is that the cottage will be torn down and a much larger house will be built. He is trying to prevent that from happening.

Mayor Fotheringham reminded those present that the City Council is being asked to review the decision made by the Planning Commission. Mr. Godfrey noted that a question was raised about an additional unit, the PUD, and the Planning Commission authority. He reported that a PUD overlay is a legislative approval. That is a separate overlay approval that acts more like a zoning ordinance than a particular land use approval. He shared additional information with the Council for clarity.

Council Member Gray believed that based on the Staff Report and some of the comments from Mr. Hilton, there were key informational items missing. The Planning Commission operated within the scope of its jurisdiction. Council Member Sundwall applauded the passion that Mr. Hilton has for preservation but does not understand why the application was not withdrawn when there was an opportunity presented at the Planning Commission level. Mayor Fotheringham shared information about the appeal process and explained that in this case, the City Council has been tasked with evaluating the decision made by the Planning Commission. The Commission felt that additional information was needed and that information was requested. An opportunity was given to the applicant to withdraw, but the applicant did not take that opportunity, and a vote was taken. The role of the City Council during the appeal process is not to take the place of the Planning Commission.

Mayor Fotheringham explained that after a review of the Meeting Minutes and the meeting recording, he did not get the sense that the Planning Commission wanted to avoid ruling on the merits of the application. There were outstanding questions and concerns that needed to be addressed. Without the needed information, the Planning Commission did not feel it was possible to approve the request. It would be difficult for the City Council to rule that there was enough information provided. Council Member Durham appreciates what Mr. Hilton wants to accomplish with the Casper Cottage.

Council Member Durham moved to DENY the Appeal of Ron Hilton and Affirm the Planning Commission Decision, Casper Cottage, CUP PZ #26-1-05. Council Member Quinn seconded the motion. Vote on Motion: Council Member Gray-Yes; Council Member Quinn-Yes; Council Member Bradley-Yes; Council Member Durham-Yes; Council Member Sundwall-Yes; Mayor Fotheringham-Yes. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Council.

VI. *Public Hearing on Proposed Rezone at 4901 South Memory Lane from Residential Single-Family (R-1-21) to Public (P). (Future Expansion of Abutting Cemetery).*

Mr. Teerlink explained that property was purchased on Memory Lane in an attempt to expand the Holladay Memorial Cemetery options. The zone of the acquired property is R-1-21, which has detached residential homes as the primary use. The rezone request is for the P Zone, which would accommodate the expansion of the cemetery operations. The Planning Commission reviewed the merits of the application, held a public hearing, and found the rezone request to be appropriate.

Council Member Gray noted that no one came to the neighborhood meeting. This likely indicates there is neighborhood support for the rezone. Mayor Fotheringham asked if there has been any public feedback received in opposition of the proposed rezone. Mr. Teerlink denied this.

Mayor Fotheringham opened the public hearing. There were no comments. The hearing was closed.

VII. *Public Hearing on Proposed Text Amendment to Amend the Permitted Land Use Table of the SDMP to Allow Professional Services.*

Mr. Teerlink reported there was a request for a Text Amendment in the SDMP. The SDMP controls development within the Royal Holladay Hills redevelopment site. The applicant's request is to add Personal Services to the Permitted Land Use Table.

Personal Services are distinct from retail uses and are allowed in more intense commercial areas. The Planning Commission reviewed an amendment that essentially stated that a retail building could include personal services. All of the allowed uses within Personal Services were reviewed for compatibility with the R-M/U Zone. The main Planning Commission concern was uses that may be incompatible with the retail spaces in the Royal Holladay Hills site. However, the applicant has control over the tenants that can be there and will determine the businesses placed in the buildings. The Planning Commission forwarded a recommendation of approval for the Text Amendment.

Mayor Fotheringham asked if there is a difference between Personal Services and Professional Services. Mr. Teerlink confirmed this and explained that Professional Services could include architectural offices and law offices. Personal Services involves a license to interact with an individual. Mayor Fotheringham pointed out that the agenda mentions Professional Services. He asked for clarification about what is before the Council. It was clarified that it is Personal Services.

Mr. Teerlink reported that Personal Services are allowed in some of the commercial areas of the City. It covers a wide range of services. He reiterated that the applicant is able to make decisions about the tenants on the site. Mr. Godfrey addressed the discrepancy between the public hearing notice that went out and the agenda. His recommendation is that the public hearing remain open until the next City Council Meeting. This will allow residents to see an agenda with Personal Services listed.

Steve Peterson - applicant, stated that in Section 13.04.040, Personal Services is defined as: “A use primarily engaged in providing services generally involving the care of a person or the person's apparel such as beauty and barber services, tanning, nails, massage therapy, aesthetician, permanent cosmetics, or day spa, but excluding a body art/tattoo or sexually oriented business.” He asked if there be clarification provided so Personal Services can be included in the SDMP.

Mayor Fotheringham opened the public hearing.

It was noted that on the Utah Public Notice website, under Agenda Item 5 it states “SDMP to Allow Professional Services.” There was a request made for clarification about the correct public notice.

There were no further comments. The hearing remained open.

VIII. *Consideration of Resolution 2026-21 - Adopting Policies Relating to the Maintenance and Repair of Public Sidewalks.*

City Manager, Gina Chamness, reviewed the reasons for the sidewalk management policy. Their insurer stated that it would be wise to outline priorities for sidewalk maintenance, which is what this policy will do. There are more frequent inspections in high-traffic areas as well as areas around schools, transit stops, and parks. In residential neighborhoods, there is a timeline for a review every two to three years. There will be a priority system used to determine where action needs to be taken more immediately.

Council Member Gray moved to APPROVE Resolution 2026-21 – Adopting Policies Relating to the Maintenance and Repair of Public Sidewalks. Council Member Bradley seconded the motion. Vote on Motion: Council Member Gray-Yes; Council Member Quinn-Yes; Council Member Bradley-Yes; Council Member Durham-Yes; Council Member Sundwall-Yes; Mayor Fotheringham-Yes. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Council.

IX. *Consideration of Resolution 2026-22 - Approving An Amendment to an Agreement with Salt Lake County Relating to Funding for the Development of Community-Centered Health Programming.*

Assistant City Manager, Holly Smith, explained that the third round of funding has been received for the public health program. This agreement will provide another year of funding, which is approximately \$105,000. The total for the three years will be just over \$300,000. She noted that the County has been a fantastic partner on this program and continues to assist the community.

Council Member Durham moved to APPROVE Resolution 2026-22 – Approving an Amendment to an Agreement with Salt Lake County Relating to Funding for the Development of Community-Centered Health Programming. Council Member Gray seconded the motion. Vote on Motion: Council Member Gray-Yes; Council Member Quinn-Yes; Council Member Bradley-Yes; Council Member Durham-Yes; Council Member Sundwall-Yes; Mayor Fotheringham-Yes. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Council.

X. *Consent Agenda*

a. *Approval of Minutes – May 7, 14, 21, June 4 and 11, 2026.*

Council Member Bradley moved to APPROVE the Consent Agenda. Council Member Quinn seconded the motion. Vote on Motion: Council Member Gray-Yes; Council Member Quinn-Yes;

Council Member Bradley-Yes; Council Member Durham-Yes; Council Member Sundwall-Yes; Mayor Fotheringham-Yes. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Council.

XI. *City Manager Report – Gina Chamness.*

Ms. Chamness reported that it has been five weeks since the last City Council Meeting, and Council Members have been busy working in their districts on behalf of their constituents. There has been a lot of arts programming at City Hall recently, and there was a wonderful 4th of July event.

Ms. Chamness noted that the City Council approved funding for a community survey for this fiscal year. After speaking to the consultant at Y2 Analytics, the survey will take place in September and October. There should be more interest after school starts and before the holiday season begins. There should be a survey for Council Members to review at the City Council Meeting on August 20, 2026. Based on conversations with the Mayor, there seems to be an interest in a question specific to fireworks. She asked if there are other topics the City Council is interested in adding to the survey.

Council Member Natalie Bradley wanted to know if there is a way to access previous surveys. Ms. Chamness reported that these are all available on the City website. However, it is also possible for her to send more detailed information to the City Council following the City Council Meeting.

Ms. Chamness shared grant updates with the City Council. The Transportation Commission at the State level approved funding for the first phase of the I-215 trail project in District 5. This is funded entirely by State dollars and no match is required. This will not be managed directly by the City, as the Utah Department of Transportation (“UDOT”) will manage that work. It is anticipated that this will move forward soon. There will be opportunities to provide input in the near future.

Ms. Chamness reported that the BUILD grant offers a large source of Federal funding for transportation projects. Holladay applied to help fill in the funding delta for Highland Drive but was unsuccessful in receiving the grant. It is a competitive grant program, and the City was aware there would likely need to be more than one application submitted. The intention is to reapply in the future.

There is an opportunity to apply for a grant that is funded by the State Historic Preservation Office. The Historical Commission has proposed that an application be submitted so that funding is available to conduct a reconnaissance-level survey between 800 and 1,000 sites within a defined area of the City. As many sites as possible would be surveyed. This grant requires a 50% match. The Historical Commission feels this work would make it possible to identify the historic and cultural resources. It would also provide a foundation for targeted outreach and education efforts. Ms. Chamness acknowledged that there is a large match and asked for Council Member feedback.

Council Member Durham asked about the dollar amount that would be requested. Ms. Chamness reported that it would be \$15,000. Council Member Quinn mentioned the Speaker Series that took place in May. It is important to recognize the fact that the City of Holladay has several historic homes and buildings. There is an opportunity to identify some of those. The survey work would identify areas of potential historical significance. Mayor Fotheringham clarified that these designations will not change property rights. It would be meaningful to have additional historical information. Council Members expressed support for submitting a grant for the survey work that has been outlined.

Ms. Chamness reported that the Federal Emergency Management Agency (“FEMA”) has not made a decision on whether their project is eligible or not. There were two meetings this week and there is another scheduled on Monday. She thanked Ms. Smith for her efforts throughout this process.

XII. Council Report and District Issues.

a. Calendar

Council Meetings – August 6 and 20, 2026.

Council Member Gray explained that she sits on the Short-Term Projects Committee for the Central Wasatch Commission (“CWC”). There was an opportunity to review project applications and award funds for short-term projects in the Central Wasatch study area. There were projects awarded for graffiti abatement, trail repair, and restroom maintenance. She pointed out that many City of Holladay residents recreate in the Wasatch Mountains. Council Member Gray also sits on the Transportation Committee for the CWC and the priority this year is to work with the State Legislature to procure funds and improve canyon transportation. There is a focus on expanding ski bus priority access.

Council Member Quinn reported that there was a house fire in District 4 recently. She thanked Unified Fire Authority (“UFA”) for their efforts. It happened at approximately 1:30 a.m., and the neighbors were appreciative of the professionalism. The homeowner and his dog both survived the fire. Council Member Quinn is pleased that several paving projects have recently been completed.

Council Member Bradley reported that it has been a busy summer for the Arts Council. There was a successful summer musical, which was “Fiddler on the Roof.” Ticket sales exceeded expectations, even with having to cancel the Friday production due to air quality concerns. The Summer Concert Series recently started, and there is a Simon & Garfunkel tribute band scheduled this week. Council Member Bradley noted that the Arts Council requested a Meet a Council Member booth at the Blue Moon Festival. It is scheduled to take place on September 19, 2026, from 5:00 p.m. to 9:00 p.m.

Council Member Durham expressed appreciation that Staff was able to assist with some constituent issues. He received positive feedback on the Fourth of July activities, with the exception of the drone show. There were negative comments about the drone show, but there was positive feedback overall.

Council Member Sundwall stated that he had a positive experience at the parade and breakfast. While he enjoyed the drone show, he did hear some negative comments. Council Member Sundwall thanked City Engineer, Jared Bunch, for his assistance addressing some recent constituent issues.

Mayor Fotheringham reported that he received several comments about the drone show. He tried to explain the reason for the shift, which was an adjacent construction project. One reason he wanted to include a question about fireworks in the survey was to ensure that public input was received.

Mayor Fotheringham explained that he and Ms. Chamness will meet with Heather Anderson about Salt Lake Valley Law Enforcement Service Area (“SLVLESA”). He clarified that Holladay is not a SLVLESA city, but UPD is the primary provider, along with the County Sheriff, for SLVLESA service area communities, such as Kearns and Magna. Salt Lake County has expressed a desire to remove itself from SLVLESA. This will impact the SLVLESA communities. There are still a lot of unanswered questions, but there will be an update shared by Ms. Anderson tomorrow.

At the UPD Board Meeting, former Holladay Mayor, Rob Dahle, accepted an appointment on the UPD Merit Commission. He will work with UPD moving forward on their merit-based decisions. Mayor Fotheringham reported that the UPD Board endorsed the selection of Chief Ackerman as the new Holladay Precinct Chief. During that meeting, there were some retirements, and Chief Mazuran stated that there is an intention to make the shared services element of the UPD model more visible.

XIII. Recess to Work Meeting.

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

a. Discussion on Previous Public Hearings.

Mayor Fotheringham asked the City Council to discuss the previous public hearing items. There were no concerns expressed about the rezone for the cemetery expansion. It was determined that there will be a vote on that item during the next City Council Meeting. Mayor Fotheringham mentioned the proposed Text Amendment to amend the Permitted Land Use Table for Personal Services. Mr. Teerlink clarified that the public notice page on the City website mentioned Personal Services rather than Professional Services. The notice sent to the Utah Public Notice website also references Personal Services. However, the meeting agenda mentions Professional Services. There was correct noticing, but there was an error on the agenda. Mayor Fotheringham noted that during the meeting, the applicant clarified that Personal Services excludes “a body art/tattoo or sexually oriented business.”

b. Spring Lane Final Bridging Document – MHTN.

Ms. Smith explained that this portion of the Work Meeting will focus on the Final Bridging Document for the Spring Lane site. There will be a budget amendment brought to the City Council in August. In addition, there will be a discussion about the method of delivery, which considers how the implementation of the project will be managed. There will then be a discussion about a Small Area Master Plan. This is a vision document that outlines how the property will be developed. There will still be flexibility in decision-making provided, but the plan will outline the overall vision.

Ryan Wallace from MHTN shared information about the Bridging Document. Council Members were reminded that the second phase of the work is now concluding. There were tours taken to various dog parks, and there was an open house held at the library. Throughout this process, there has been broad support and a lot of meaningful feedback received. During this presentation, there will be a schedule update provided and a review of the Bridging Document. Information will be shared about turf and irrigation, there will be a cost opinion from a professional estimator, and some of the next steps will be highlighted. Vince Olcott and Tate Barney were introduced to the City Council.

Mr. Olcott reported that the Bridging Document and cost estimate have been completed. Some of the upcoming steps are for the City to select a delivery method and move forward to the actual construction phase. Mr. Barney shared information about the Bridging Document. He explained that it tends to serve as a bridge between conceptual plans and construction documents. The document establishes owner intent, minimum program elements, and the minimum requirements for those program elements. He shared portions of the Bridging Document with the City Council.

Mr. Barney reviewed the Table of Contents and explained that it is robust. There was a lot of work done with the Steering Committee to ensure enough clarity was provided. In addition to the written portions, a Bridging Document typically includes supporting graphics as well. The Spring Lane document includes a rendering. He highlighted some of the changes that were made since the last meeting on June 11, 2026. The restroom abutting the pavilion was shifted down to the south side, but it was determined that this blocked the views. Previously, there was a restroom to the north side and a maintenance structure on the south side, but that has been flipped to address concerns. There was a discussion about moving the pavilion further to the west, but there were concerns about having the pavilion too close to the property limits. There was an adjustment made to some of the language in the document to allow the bid teams to propose a combination of the pavilion and structure.

Mr. Olcott provided information about different turf types and irrigation. He explained that there are three types of turf that are typically used in a multi-purpose or sports field: Kentucky bluegrass, tall turf fescue, and Bermuda grass. He highlighted some of the pros and cons associated with each type.

Mayor Fotheringham noted that the cost of Bermuda grass would be considered a con, because it is significantly more expensive than the other options. However, it has an impressive recovery rate. Mayor Fotheringham asked if it would be possible to find out what other parks in Salt Lake County have chosen for their multi-purpose or sports fields. Mr. Olcott offered to look into this but believed only one has Bermuda grass installed. The other options are more commonly seen. Council Member Gray asked what MHTN would recommend. Mr. Olcott explained that it depends on how often the fields will be used. Kentucky bluegrass might be best because it handles the cold better.

Mr. Olcott reported that there was a previous City Council question about whether to leave the existing irrigation system in place, replace part of the system, or replace all of the system. There is uncertainty about when the current irrigation system was installed or the current conditions. As drought-tolerant material is installed, the irrigation system will need to be cut and patched, which could lead to more inefficiencies in the irrigation system. The MHTN recommendation is to retain the irrigation mainline, install new valves, laterals, and heads, rebalance topsoil, and install new sod.

Council Member Durham asked if it is possible to have different turf types in different areas. Mr. Olcott confirmed that this can be done as long as there is physical separation. If there is no separation, one type will eventually take over. Additional discussions were had about the turf types. Council Member Quinn wanted to know if the tall turf fescue turns brown in the winter. Mr. Olcott confirmed this and explained that it is a warm season grass. Council Member Gray is interested in a turf that requires less water, but pointed out that it also needs to be usable for the primary purpose.

Mr. Olcott reported that on sports fields, there is bluegrass used, because it is better able to repair itself. That being said, he has seen fescue used in parks, and it tends to do well. It is dormant in the winter and turns green a little bit later in the summer. The tall turf fescue will stay greener in the summer and goes more dormant in the spring and fall. Bluegrass is greener in the spring and fall.

Mr. Olcott explained that there are newer varieties of Kentucky bluegrass that are coming onto the market that use less water than older varieties. Council Member Gray expressed interest in that. It was noted that whatever is in the Bridging Document can be updated and there can be continued research conducted. The new concept dramatically reduces the non-functional turf areas.

Cost opinion information was provided to the City Council. Mr. Olcott explained that this was broken out based on the park area. For example, the pavilion has a cost opinion of \$330,976. Once everything is added together, the total cost estimate is \$8,090,861 for the entire park. This includes the removal of the existing lawn and the installation of the irrigation system, as previously described. Moving forward, the City can select a delivery method, and then the construction phase can start.

Mayor Fotheringham asked for Staff feedback on the delivery method. Ms. Chamness reported that there will be a discussion about that at the City Council Meeting on either August 6, 2026, or August 20, 2026. Once there is a decision made about the delivery method, it will be possible to look into a refined timeline. Ms. Smith informed the City Council that there are two pending grant applications.

c. Happy Healthy Holladay Update – Megan Bartley.

Public Health Coordinator, Megan Bartley, shared information about Happy Healthy Holladay. She explained that Happy Healthy Holladay is a coalition of residents, schools, businesses, City leaders, healthcare partners, and volunteers working together for a healthier, safer, and more connected Holladay. It initially started as an event where the intention was to encourage members of the community to be more active because this was linked to improved physical and mental health. Over time, Happy Healthy Holladay turned into a City coalition. In 2022, the County started to work with communities without coalitions in place to assist with establishment. In 2023, she was hired to evaluate local data. In 2024, a grant was secured to formalize a coordinated public health effort. The grant renewal was contingent on progress in the implementation of an evidence-based process.

Ms. Bartley reported that the Communities That Care (“CTC”) process was selected. The framework that is used to implement that process is Asset-Based Community Development (“ABCD”). There have been two cycles of grant renewal. Ms. Bartley explained that when she first started, the data found there were two main focus areas: opioid-related harm and mental health and suicide prevention. These continue to be priorities for the community. She shared a chart that looks at the opioid related ER visits. The red trend line represents County data, and the blue trend line represents local data. Since 2023, local data indicates a decline while the County is experiencing an increase. Ms. Bartley next shared a chart that looks at mental health ER visits. There has been a sustained decline. Since 2023, there is a steeper rate of decline at a local level than at the County level.

Ms. Bartley reviewed some of the different events that have taken place since 2023:

- Dive into Family Fun pool event;
- Mental health awareness events;
- Blood drives;
- Naloxone trainings and distribution;
- QPR suicide prevention trainings; and
- City event support and volunteering.

Ms. Bartley stated that anecdotally, at least two lives have been saved from the efforts being made within the City for naloxone distribution. She added that City events create opportunities for Happy Healthy Holladay to interact with members of the community. Ms. Bartley reported that the capacity was doubled for the Page to Stage program two years in a row. To ensure this program aligns with social development strategies, there was a reinforcement and evaluation component added.

Over the last three or four months, there was a risk and protective factor assessment conducted. The Utah Student Health and Risk Prevention (“SHARP”) survey data from 2021 to 2025 was used, and based on the data, priority problem behaviors were identified: youth alcohol use, youth marijuana use, and academic failure. There were also priority risk factors identified: transitions and mobility, alcohol risk perception, home alcohol access, peer marijuana norms, and school commitment. The priority protective factors include: family ties, community ties, and prosocial opportunities.

Ms. Bartley shared information about underage drinking. Based on the SHARP survey data, two out of 20 students in 12th grade reported alcohol consumption in the last 30 days. For comparison, the Statewide average is one out of 20. She shared a graphic that looks at parental permission for drinking. Ms. Bartley reported that there was a resource assessment conducted. The findings show that there are some gaps in the local assets. For example, there are no specific programs that address periods of transition for youth. There is a desire to build a program that addresses youth between the ages of 12 and 16. There are strengths to leverage, such as community ties, family ties, and programs.

Information about the next steps was shared. Happy Healthy Holladay is a young program, but the funding renewal milestones have been met and there are encouraging trends seen in the data. In addition, there is a data driven plan for the future.

Mayor Fotheringham mentioned the fact that a lack of recognition appears to be an issue for high school students. He reported that there is a UPD art competition for elementary, junior high, and high school students. The winners receive pizza parties for their entire class, which can be encouraging. That normally happens in the spring, so it might be possible to reach out to Chief Ackerman for details. Council Member Bradley noted that the Holladay Youth Council will restart this year. Ms. Bartley stated that it would be meaningful to have a member of the Youth Council involved in Happy Healthy Holladay in the future. There are also a lot of grant opportunities that are youth-focused, and she is able to assist with the grant writing process. Council Members expressed appreciation for the update on Happy Healthy Holladay and for the work that has been done to benefit the community.

XIV. Closed Session for the Purposes Described in U.C.A. 52-4-204-and 205.

There was no Closed Session.

XV. Adjourn.

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

The City Council Meeting adjourned at approximately 8:49 p.m.

I hereby certify that the foregoing represents a true, accurate, and complete record of the Holladay City Council Meeting held Thursday, July 16, 2026.

Stephanie N. Carlson, MMC
Holladay City Recorder

Paul Fotheringham, Mayor

Minutes approved: **October 1, 2026**