

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

**Thursday, January 23, 2025**

**5:30 p.m.**

**City Council Chambers**

**4580 South 2300 East**

**Holladay, Utah**

---

***ATTENDANCE:***

Mayor Rob Dahle  
Paul Fotheringham  
Emily Gray  
Matt Durham  
Ty Brewer  
Drew Quinn

**City Staff:**  
Gina Chamness, City Manager  
Todd Godfrey, City Attorney  
Stephanie Carlson, City Recorder  
Jon Teerlink, CED Dir.

**I. *Welcome*** – Mayor Dahle.

Mayor Rob Dahle called the Work Meeting to order at approximately 5:30 p.m.

City Attorney, Todd Godfrey, reported that last year, the State Legislature adopted a new requirement for elected official disclosures. As a result, the disclosure form is slightly different than what was seen in the past. It is also different than what City Staff will sign this year. For instance, there is now a requirement to disclose the employment of a spouse. Mr. Godfrey noted that the disclosures will be published on the State website in addition to the City website for easier access. He asked Council Members to return the disclosure form within the next few days because the forms have to be published with the State before the end of the month. City Recorder, Stephanie Carlson, stated that Council Members with additional questions about the disclosure form can reach out to City Staff.

**II. *City Hall Design Update – Dwight Yee.***

*Dwight Yee from Process Studio* shared a City Hall design update with the City Council. Having worked through all of the desired seismic upgrades, the main corridors will most likely be fully demolished and need to be rebuilt. There have been discussions with the administrative team about the implications and how to reconstruct the hallway. There is an option to rebuild it as is. However, there was a review of the photographs and documentation from the original building. If the entire hallway has to be rebuilt, it is possible to bring back some of that original character, if desired by the Council.

Mr. Yee explained that Process Studio decided to look at similar buildings constructed around the same time. He shared different some options with the Council. In the first option, there is a minimalist scheme. Process Studio looked at buildings built around the 1920s and 1930s. Often, the floors had some type of monolithic terrazzo, which was more durable. The original drawings showed a marble. Based on that inspiration, the first option is a porcelain tile that looks like a terrazzo. It comes in 24x24 and could be set with a tight grout. This option is called the minimalist scheme because there

is a desire to keep the molding, as it is true to the character of the original building. With the minimalist scheme, the new lighting for the hall displays will attract the most attention in that area.

The scheme for the offices and the spaces outside of the corridor will likely receive new carpeting at minimum. What is proposed is a linear pattern that could be laid in a plank. It has hints of green throughout. While minimalism is one option for the City to consider, it is also possible to have a bordering effect where the outside perimeter has a darker color. In that option, the proposal is to have a border tile that would be dark with a marble-look tile in the middle. The intention is not to overwhelm with pattern, but what is proposed would add more character and a historic quality.

Mr. Yee noted that there is one slightly different option for carpet in the rooms. Instead of having something that is linear, which could feel too modern, there could be something with more of a pattern. There is no intention of having a high contrast pattern that could be distracting, but something that is a little more than the linear option. As for the basement work lounge for City Staff, that is where there would be a new kitchen area as well as some casual meeting places. It is proposed that the basement area have a resilient tile. The idea is to make it livelier with three colors. Those colors will subtly designate spaces within the larger space. Mr. Yee asked the City Council to share preliminary feedback on the different options that have been proposed. The Council likes the idea of the subtle inclusion of the green in the carpet.

Mayor Dahle asked if there are specific decisions the City Council is being asked to make during the Work Meeting. City Manager, Gina Chamness, explained that the desired feedback largely has to do with the ceilings. Mr. Yee wanted to hear comments from the Council about potential architecture changes. Mr. Yee reported that rebuilding the half-dome ceiling will likely be more costly. Discussions were had about the flooring options. Mayor Dahle pointed out that one of the options presented seems very plain. It was noted that the darker bordering is tile. The Council reviewed some of the different tile options. Council Member Paul Fotheringham suggested that the border be more of a Holladay brand green color. Mr. Yee clarified that green is not a readily available floor color at this time, so there are some limitations there.

Ms. Chamness pointed out that there will continue to be design ideas brought to the City Council for feedback. Council Member Ty Brewer asked about the wood finish, as it might not be as timeless as other elements. Mr. Yee explained that there is a desire to keep the wood and then use other elements to bring in a more modern look. The palette pulls grayer and more neutral, so the proposal is that the walls become a crisper white. This will tone down the wood stain so it is possible for it to remain in a lot of different locations. Lighting, color, and patterning are different ways to update the overall look of the City Hall building.

### **III. *Review of City Survey – Kyrene Gibb, Y2 Analytics.***

*Kyrene Gibb from Y2 Analytics* shared the Holladay City Citizens Survey – Draft Questionnaire with the City Council and reviewed the various sections. There is a question about how Holladay today compares to Holladay five years ago. She explained that a question was added to better understand what residents point to that makes Holladay unique or distinct from other communities along the Wasatch Front. There is also a question about the next three to five years in Holladay and the overall likelihood of recommending the City of Holladay to friends and family as a good place to live.

The next section of survey questions relates to Holladay services. Survey respondents will be asked to rate the service received for the Holladay tax dollars and will also be asked general sentiments about Holladay. There is a sliding scale option for items such as sidewalk maintenance, street lighting, Code enforcement, parks and open spaces, community events, planning, zoning and building services, emergency preparedness, and water conservation efforts. The intention is to see if resident attitudes have changed since the City undertook some of the more recent capital projects.

As for the news and communication section of the survey, it has to do with how residents currently receive information from the City and how those residents would prefer to receive information from the City. There are also questions to determine how often residents would like to receive information from the City in the future. A question has been added to gauge interest in a separate City newsletter outside of the Holladay Journal. If there is interest in a separate City newsletter, there is a question that asks how often it should be received. There are also survey questions related to contacting the City and the overall level of satisfaction.

Ms. Gibb reviewed the housing questions on the survey. There is a question about the type of housing that is most needed in Holladay. This list includes some statements related to accessory dwelling units (“ADUs”), potential development solutions, mixed-use developments, and moderate-income housing developments. There are survey questions related to public health as well. When it comes to public health, it is important to provide residents with some sense of anonymity. Providing that social cover tends to result in more honest answers.

Mayor Dahle commented that it is important to consider how much of this information is useful to the City. He does not want residents to be discouraged from taking the survey due to the length. Council Member Fotheringham suggested that the survey be segmented, so if someone stops answering questions after a certain point, it is still possible to collect the data from the answered questions. Ms. Gibb confirmed that partial responses are always included in the survey data.

Mayor Dahle pointed out that the current draft of the survey is quite long. Ms. Gibb reported that the current version of the survey would take respondents approximately 18 minutes to complete. To reduce the survey to 15 minutes, five or six questions need to be cut. Council Member Emily Gray noted that the clubs and groups section of the survey could be removed. There was Council consensus that the clubs and groups-related questions could be reduced or eliminated. Council Member Brewer suggested viewing the questions through the lens of interesting data versus useable data.

Council Member Gray suggested that instead of multiple questions about the same topic, some questions be combined. Council Member Fotheringham mentioned the accent lighting question. He pointed out that the question is whether or not citizens would be tolerant of the City engaging in that sort of regulation. Ms. Gibb is not sure that there is a way to succinctly condense those questions while still obtaining high-quality data.

Mayor Dahle is interested in knowing the trends. He would like there to be comparison information based on survey results from previous years. This information would be useful ahead of the budget season discussions. It is possible to highlight whether the responses have changed since 2017. Mayor Dahle also asked to hear how the trends compare to other municipalities that have been surveyed.

#### **IV. *Lighting Discussion – Jonathan Teerlink.***

Community and Economic Development Director, Jonathan Teerlink reviewed the focus of the lighting study was addressing the misdirection of light and glare, excessive brightness, and the indiscriminate all-night usage of light in residential areas. Mr. Teerlink explained that there have historically been commercial lighting standards that protect residential properties. The Planning Commission currently reviews all Site Plans for lighting standards. One is a draft ordinance that could be inserted into residential zones. There is a table in the staff report that shows the zoned commercial properties and what the lighting standards are there. Something similar could be done for the residential zones. The second draft ordinance is more of a holistic review. It would remove the lighting standards from all of the zones and create one location with its own title and chapter.

Council Member Fotheringham asked about implementation. For instance, it would focus the review process on remodels and Building Permits or if it would apply to existing lighting as well. Mr. Teerlink stated that the recommendation would be nuisance enforcement based upon the standards. For new construction, there needs to be a Lighting Plan submitted to show what is being proposed. Council Member Fotheringham noted that it is easier to enforce based on new construction and remodels rather than enforcing new standards on existing development. Council Member Brewer stated that enforcement could be conducted based on reported nuisances. Mayor Dahle assumed there would need to be compliance for anything after the adoption of the standards. Mr. Godfrey clarified that there would not be enforcement unless there was a public nuisance created. As opposed to the City telling neighbors that the dispute is a private issue for them to resolve, the City would be able to enforce the nuisance standard.

Mr. Godfrey explained that his concern is that a citizen could approach the city and state that there needs to be enforcement because there is an ordinance, so it is important to think about the impacts. Mr. Godfrey explained that the City does not necessarily have a right to get involved unless it creates some sort of public safety hazard that is broader and is beyond neighbor to neighbor. That is an extreme situation and is not something that happens often in the community.

Mayor Dahle thought the second standard would create more work for staff. However, based on the comments shared by Mr. Teerlink, it sounds like there is a desire to have more control at the outset to look at what the Lighting Plan would be. Mr. Teerlink stated that the Lighting Plan review would add at least an additional half hour to the process.

Council Member Gray believes Level 1 would essentially create a straightforward standard. She asked whether it is possible to have a straightforward approach but still create City-wide lighting standards. Mr. Teerlink further discussed the Level 2 example and pointed out that there is a residential-only section. That section mirrors what the Level 1 standard is proposed to be. Council Member Matt Durham asked what a Lighting Plan would look like on a practical level. He wanted to know if a general contractor would have a lighting professional handle that or if a resident would need to seek out a lighting professional. Mr. Teerlink reported that the architect who is creating the plans will likely have a connection to a lighting professional. Council Member Quinn expressed concerns that another person would need to be hired, which could be burdensome for residents. Discussions were had about the Staff review process and problematic lighting fixtures in the City.

Council Member Brewer asked how common lighting issues are. The only lighting comments he has received from residents have to do with a desire to see additional streetlights. Mr. Teerlink reported that there are no more than a dozen complaints per year related to lighting. Mr. Godfrey

acknowledged that the lighting discussion is important. He does not know how this kind of regulation would be received by builders. As for the general development community, this would be seen as a step backward as opposed to a step forwards. There could be a strong reaction to this proposal. Mr. Godfrey does not have a lot of hesitancy about regulating the lighting on structures, but something he hears often is that additional money needs to be spent in order to comply with the application process. Adding another design professional to the process means there will be additional costs.

Council Member Gray pointed out that there are only a dozen or so complaints per year. This indicates that it is not a widespread problem, so she would rather not require everyone to hire another professional and the Council agreed. Council Member Fotheringham wanted to address the concerns about light trespass. Once installed, if the lighting design creates a light trespass problem, then the City could be supportive of a complaint from a neighbor. He stressed the importance of encouraging contentions. Mayor Dahle noted that there have been specific instances where lighting has been a problem. However, there does not necessarily need to be an ordinance that requires a design professional. Council Member Brewer suggested that there be additional education.

Further discussions were had about lighting issues in the community. Mr. Teerlink noted that it is possible to move the Level 1 standard forward to the Planning Commission. It could be inserted into the R-1 and R-2 Zones. Ms. Chamness asked if there is comfort with that type of review. She also wanted to know if staff have the qualifications to handle the lighting reviews. Mr. Teerlink reported that his employees are not trained in illumination review. That being said, if there is a standard that says it has to be 4,000 Kelvin and the information states the light meets that standard, it could be accepted. There would be verification once it has actually been installed. Mr. Teerlink explained that there would need to be some verification that has been completed. If it has not been completed, it could potentially fall back. The Council discussed areas in the City where there have been lighting issues.

Council Member Brewer asked if there is an opportunity to discuss lighting when it comes to new builds. Mr. Teerlink reported that there are project information guides available. These are not laws, but there is information about the fixtures that are generally accepted. It is normally given to a builder for consideration. Council Member Brewer was not certain a project information guide would be all that effective in terms of addressing lighting issues. Mr. Teerlink believes the ordinance for outdoor lighting should be all in one place rather than sporadic and inconsistent. Mayor Dahle does not believe there is currently support to require a homeowner or builder to hire a lighting professional, so there does not seem to be consensus on the proposal.

Mayor Dahle believes there is a desire to clean up the code, but he does not think what is proposed addresses the problem there was originally a desire to solve. At this time, the Council does not have an appetite to establish an overly burdensome code to handle isolated lighting issues. Whether a plan is approved or there is an adopted standard, there will likely still need to be a Hearing Officer to handle disputes. Mr. Godfrey explained that most property owners who change out the lighting in their backyard will not think about whether there is compliance with City standards.

Ms. Chamness asked if there is Council Member support to move forward with what has been proposed. Mayor Dahle wanted to better understand the next steps. Mr. Godfrey suggested that there be another discussion before something is brought to the Planning Commission for consideration.

Council Member Gray expressed interest in better understanding what is being done in Cottonwood Heights as far as enforcement of the ordinances.

**V. Code Update – Review of Titles 10 and 11 – Gina Chamness, Todd Godfrey.**

Mr. Godfrey shared code updates with the City Council for Title 10 and Title 11. The intention is to start with a review of Title 10 – Public Welfare. This has a significant number of changes proposed but they will be adopted by reference to several State Code provisions. Mr. Godfrey reviewed the changes.

Ms. Chamness suggested that there be a follow-up conversation related to weapons and hunting. She referenced House Bill (“H.B.”) 309. Additional discussions were had about the proposed language in Chapter 10. Mr. Godfrey reiterated that the State Code was considered, and some City language was retained. He noted that more often than not, rather than the actual citation number in the State Code changing, its substance changes slightly. That does not require a change to be made to the references that are listed in the City Code.

Mr. Godfrey next reviewed Title 11. Far less of this has been adopted from the State Code compared to Title 10. In the definition section, there are a few definitions that have changed, including the definitions for alley, low-profile motorized vehicle, and safety zone. The Council discussed low-profile motorized vehicles in the community.

Ms. Chamness asked if there is a desire to have a full discussion on motorized vehicles. This was confirmed. 11.12.020 – Low-Profile Motorized Vehicles; Public Property Prohibition was reviewed. It was noted that the definition there is stricken because it has moved elsewhere, but the prohibition is still listed there. Council Member Brewer was not supportive of the language. Council Member Fotheringham thought the proposed language was worthy of additional discussion. Chief Hoyal reported that different classifications for the types of electric vehicles exist. The Council discussed the different kinds of low-profile motorized vehicles out there. Council Member Gray is more concerned about the age of the rider on the vehicle as well as the associated safety issues.

Chief Hoyal reported that in the fall, the Police Department started to receive a lot of complaints about certain motorized vehicles. Council Member Durham asked about enforcement. Chief Hoyal explained that a lot of this will be handled through education, especially in the beginning, because not everyone will know about the language. Over time, education will shift to citations. Discretion will be a factor, especially when there is a 10-year-old riding a scooter down the street in a residential area. There is a difference between that kind of situation and someone who is moving faster than the speed limit. Council Member Brewer would like to see the behaviors addressed, such as speeding or erratic movements. He would prefer to focus on the actual unsafe conditions created.

Council Member Fotheringham noted that there needs to be clarity about what kinds of vehicles need to be license plated and insured. Council Member Quinn reported that there are a lot of students who ride electric scooters to school, which prevents the parents from driving them. That removes vehicles from the road. Council Member Brewer commented that this can teach young people responsibility to some extent. There are some pros and cons to consider. He suggested that there be additional discussion about this issue. It is important to address the problematic behaviors before anything else is done.

Mayor Dahle believes it is necessary to think about when the use starts to impact public safety. There were issues with golf cart use in the past. Council Member Gray agreed with the earlier comment from Council Member Brewer about addressing the behaviors rather than specific vehicles. For example, if there are speed issues or there is erratic driving happening, that can be addressed instead.

Additional discussions were had about low-profile motorized vehicles. Council Member Fotheringham pointed out there is a gray area between a vehicle and a bicycle. In order to determine what should be a licensed and insured product, it might be possible to consider the weight. Council Member Brewer wants children to be outside, be able to play, and to learn responsibility. Council Members discussed various public safety issues.

Ms. Chamness asked if the Council would like the language refined further. It can then be brought back for future consideration. Council Member Brewer felt the focus should be on responsible behavior. Council Member Fotheringham pointed out that it is difficult to codify that. Mayor Dahle asked for additional information about low-profile motorized vehicles.

Mr. Godfrey reported that there are places in the traffic code where there is designation of authority to the City Engineer or the City Manager. Some conscious decisions have been made about when it is appropriate to select the City Engineer or the City Manager. The traffic issues will be addressed with the advice of the City Engineer. There is a desire to have an appropriate balance. Mr. Godfrey noted that there is a provision in the traffic code that allows the City to create truck routes, which is a way to channel heavy truck traffic in certain ways. That section is in the code, but it might need some further follow-up. Some supporting information will be gathered and presented to the Council.

There is some significant development occurring outside of the City boundaries, but that development will still impact Holladay. The intention is to keep those heavy trucks off of certain sections of Wasatch Boulevard where there could be damage caused or residents would be disrupted. Mr. Godfrey explained that there is an intention to support the existing truck routes more fully. In the speed limit section, there are some updated references to the State Code, but the substance has not changed. In Chapter 20, there are very few changes and those are not substantive in nature.

Mr. Godfrey next reviewed 11.20.145 - Prohibited Parking In Front Yards On Residential Property. Council Member Quinn believes there should be some portion of the front yard that is actual landscaping. Mr. Teerlink clarified that there still is a requirement about the landscaping percentage required.

Ms. Chamness reported that there will be a delayed effective date for Title 10 and Title 11 once it is adopted. There will be a public hearing held for this item.

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

Council Member Brewer moved to go into CLOSED SESSION Pursuant to Utah Code Section 52-4-204 & 205. Council Member Fotheringham seconded the motion. Vote on Motion: Council Member Brewer-Aye; Council Member Durham-Aye; Council Member Fotheringham-Aye; Council Member Quinn-Aye; Council Member Gray-Aye; Mayor Dahle-Aye. The motion passed unanimously.

The Council convened in a closed session at 8:30 p.m. Those in attendance in the Closed Session included Council Members Durham, Fotheringham, Quinn, Gibbons, Brewer, and Mayor Dahle. Others present included Gina Chamness, Todd Godfrey, Stephanie Carlson, and Jared Bunch.

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, Brewer and Mayor Dahle in favor. The motion to go out of closed session at 8:48 p.m. passed with a unanimous vote.

**VII. Adjourn.**

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

The City Council Meeting adjourned at approximately 8:50 p.m.

*I hereby certify that the foregoing represents a true, accurate, and complete record of the Holladay City Council Meeting held Thursday, January 23, 2025.*

\_\_\_\_\_  
Stephanie N. Carlson, MMC  
Holladay City Recorder

\_\_\_\_\_  
Robert Dahle, Mayor

Minutes approved: **March 6, 2025**