

WOODLAND HILLS CITY COUNCIL
Work Session
Woodland Hills City Center, 690 South Woodland Hills Dr.
Tuesday, November 18th, 2025

CONDUCTING	Mayor Brent Winder
ELECTED OFFICIALS	Council Member Brian Hutchings Council Member Janet Lunt Council Member Kari Malkovich Council Member Dorel Kynaston
STAFF PRESENT	Ted Mickelsen, Public Works Dir./Fire Chief Jody Stones, City Recorder Wayne Frandsen, Code Enforcement and Planning Commission Chris Helvey, Finance Director - electronically

Mayor Winder opened the work session of the Woodland Hills City Council at 6:00 p.m.

Work Session

1. Discussion of a Change in Zoning from R-1 to R1-19 for property owned by Earl Underwood at 350 South Woodland Hills Drive, Serial #55:052:0044, consisting of 5.7861 acres- Nate Carson

Caden Cole stated that he represented the developer for the Havenwood project and that the Underwood family had agreed and expressed a desire to have their property included. He explained that the applicants had met with the Underwoods multiple times on site and, as part of those efforts, were requesting a zone change from R-1 to R-1-19 in order to integrate the Underwood property into the Havenwood project (the former Garrick house property). He noted that the revised layout would allow the road to extend through both properties rather than looping tightly within the original Havenwood parcel, resulting in approximately 14 lots, each generally between three-quarters of an acre and one acre. He stated that lot sizes on the Havenwood side had not been reduced and, in some cases, had increased because the internal loop road had been eliminated.

Council Member Malkovich clarified that the proposal effectively combined the newer Havenwood approval with the Underwood property that had been discussed in prior years, and that the earlier Council action had only been a zone change. She confirmed that the current plan joined the two areas into a single layout.

Council Member Lunt corrected that the more recent Havenwood approval had occurred only a few weeks earlier rather than years ago and observed that the proposed lots appeared larger, noting that the smallest lot was approximately 0.77 acres.

Council Member Hillyard noted that the developer had spoken with the City Recorder earlier in the day regarding an existing water line running through the already approved section of the development. He explained that the City was in the process of verifying the exact location of this line and that it might necessitate minor adjustments to lot lines or road alignment. He asked whether the developer would be amenable to working with the City to slightly tweak the layout to accommodate the water line.

Mr. Cole responded that the development team had only recently learned of the line's location and had not yet seen its exact alignment but was willing to discuss adjustments as needed.

Council Member Hillyard emphasized the importance of the line, stating that, according to Public Works Director Ted Mickelsen, it was a pressure-regulating line used to maintain system pressures and ensure adequate fire flows throughout the City. Mr. Mickelsen confirmed that the line looped the system and predated his tenure.

Council Member Malkovich then raised the issue of a planned trail along Woodland Hills Drive. She reported that the City was updating its general plan and had been studying a trail connection up Woodland Hills Drive, which was shown on both the MAG map and the Governor's Trail Network map. She noted that when Woodland Hills Drive was originally constructed, it was not perfectly centered within the easement, leaving at least one segment without sufficient width for a future trail easement. She asked whether the developer would be willing to work with staff, particularly Ted Mickelsen, to adjust the layout and dedicate any necessary additional width along the frontage so the trail could be accommodated, while keeping lots at or above the previously approved minimum lot sizes.

Mr. Cole replied that Ted had already mentioned potential property dedication to the City and that, so long as any adjustment did not significantly impact lot sizes or take them below the minimums represented during the zoning approval, the applicants were willing to work with the City.

Wayne Frandsen, Planning Commission Chair, commented that one reason the subdivision application had been put on hold until Mr. Underwood approached the City was the belief that a combined layout was better for the City than having four separate road connections onto Woodland Hills Drive. He stated that integrating the properties allowed a more efficient and safer roadway configuration.

Council Member Hutchings expressed appreciation for that approach and stated that the revised configuration was an improvement.

Council Member Lunt asked who would be building the homes and whether the lots would be subdivided and sold individually.

Mr. Cole responded that the applicants did not yet have a designated builder and that the lots could either be sold to individual custom-home builders or developed by a higher-end homebuilder.

Council Member Lunt reported that a resident had approached her expressing concern that Arrive Homes might be the builder.

Mr. Cole confirmed that Arrive Homes had made an offer but stated that the applicants had not committed to any builder.

Mayor Winder thanked Mr. Cole for his presentation and asked if there were any additional questions or information to be provided.

Mr. Cole added that, while not directly related to the zone change request, the developer's intent was to construct its portion of the subdivision and the full roadway, after which Mr. Underwood would develop his side when ready. He explained that Earl Underwood's son, Christian, intended to build his personal residence on the Underwood property and might combine three lots for that purpose, depending on how he chose to design his home site.

Council Member Hutchings asked whether there would be a single performance bond covering the full length of the road. Mr. Cole stated that they had discussed this with the Underwoods and that the developer intended to bond for the entire roadway.

Council Member Lunt reiterated that she preferred the new layout, noting that the prior “U”-shaped road configuration had made the existing home feel like an island in the middle of the roadway, which she had not liked.

2. Discussion of Outdoor Lighting Ordinance- Chairman Frandsen

Planning Commission Chair Wayne Frandsen reported had prepared a draft update to the City’s outdoor lighting ordinance. He explained that the proposal primarily tweaked the existing ordinance, which had not been updated since the widespread adoption of LED lighting. He noted that wattage comparisons between incandescent and LED fixtures were different and that the ordinance needed to be modernized, potentially using lumens instead of watts. He acknowledged an email with a proposed lighting ordinance the council and he had received from PTR Chair Sherry Burger and questioned whether the draft was intended as a first step toward a full “dark sky” ordinance, observing that such ordinances could be lengthy and complex. He felt it was important for the Council to discuss whether the City wished to pursue a formal dark sky designation or instead focus on modest updates to preserve night skies. He expressed personal reservations about the need for a formal dark sky ordinance, suggesting that cooperation and reasonable limits on lighting might be sufficient without a heavy regulatory approach. He also pointed out legal constraints, including state restrictions on regulating exterior non-structural architectural ornamentation and rear yard landscaping, which could limit the City’s ability to dictate certain types of lighting, particularly in backyards. He emphasized that much of the City’s success would depend on voluntary cooperation rather than strict enforcement. Later in the discussion, he reiterated concerns about over-regulation, state preemption in building-permit requirements, and practical enforcement issues if residents were told they must change out fixtures within a fixed time frame. He cited the General Plan survey results which showed interest in dark skies (approximately 213 respondents in favor), but that this represented only about 14% of the City’s population, and he urged that residents be given the full picture, including potential retrofit costs, before the City committed to strict requirements. He indicated he was willing to draft ordinance amendments but reiterated his view that lights could be considered architectural ornamentation under state law and that he would be cautious about specifying exact fixture types.

Council Member Lunt spoke to a personal example where a neighbor’s bright spotlight shone directly into her window, which interfered with viewing the northern lights. She stated that, although she and her neighbor were on friendly terms and the neighbor would temporarily switch off the light upon request, the situation illustrated the need for clearer standards so residents could politely refer to an ordinance when asking that lights be re-aimed or shielded. She expressed support for updating the current ordinance and stated she preferred a “night sky” approach that preserved views of the night sky without necessarily seeking a formal dark sky designation. She said a compromise approach that balanced preservation of the night sky with flexibility for residents made the most sense.

Council Member Malkovich added that state law limited how cities could regulate exterior non-structural architectural ornamentation and rear yard landscaping, which made some lighting restrictions challenging to enforce. She reported that the City’s Community Development Committee had considered dark sky issues and ultimately decided not to reference “Dark Sky International” directly, concluding that its standards would be too strict for Woodland Hills. Instead, the committee emphasized the City’s quality of life and rural mountain character, including language about limiting light pollution and preserving the night sky without rigid external requirements. She cited examples from other cities, including Moab, where updated lighting standards were adopted in 2019 but phased in over several years, requiring compliance by a later date and focusing on downward-facing, shielded fixtures, reducing glare, and minimizing light trespass and “sky glow.” She noted that such ordinances often included allowances for holiday lighting and attempted to balance safety, aesthetics, and environmental concerns.

Council Member Hutchings reported that he had conducted considerable research on dark sky policies, though he acknowledged that resident Sherry Berger had done even more. He stated that, in his view, there was a distinction between “dark skies” as a formal designation and the broader goal of preserving the City’s night skies. He said his current focus was on preserving night skies. He indicated that he had reviewed an informal opinion from the state ombudsman regarding architectural lighting and non-structural features but did not consider it a binding legal opinion. He recommended that the City seek a formal legal opinion from its attorneys on whether and how lighting could be regulated without violating state limitations on regulating architectural ornamentation. He stated his belief, based on his research, that the City did have legal authority to adopt a stronger lighting ordinance addressing issues such as backyard sports-court lighting and that lighting could be treated differently than landscaping. He expressed skepticism about broad grandfathering if the community chose to actively preserve night skies, but stated he would not support the Dark Sky International requirement that all existing properties come into full compliance within ten years. He emphasized that if the City pursued stronger night sky protections, any ordinance should be enforceable and clearly define expectations, while still following the City’s traditional practice of emphasizing education and voluntary compliance before any punitive measures. He noted that most of the City appeared to be informally in line with what residents desired for night skies, but that a clear “path” or standard would help keep the community moving in a consistent direction.

Council Member Hillyard framed the issue in terms of nuisance and property rights, comparing light impacts to noise nuisances such as roosters. He suggested that the City consider whether some aspects of lighting regulation could be addressed through nuisance provisions. He also stressed the importance of safety, particularly for public facilities such as the city building and mailbox areas. He expressed concerns about relying solely on motion-sensor lights in public spaces, suggesting that such lighting could allow individuals to hide or crouch undetected, whereas an appropriate level of constant lighting might better support safety and emergency response. He acknowledged the value of downward-directed, shielded lighting that did not spill into neighboring yards, and he asked how the City’s ordinance could support that balance between safety and minimizing light trespass.

Mayor Winder asked Chair Frandsen how the current ordinance functioned in terms of preserving the night sky. He suggested that some concerns might be more about enforcement of existing standards than the absence of regulatory authority, and he observed that the ordinance likely needed updates to address LED technology and lumens-based measures. He also expressed concern about “regulatory takings” if residents who had invested in architectural features with integrated lighting were suddenly required to shut off or remove those features. He summarized the policy choices before the Council as: (1) modest amendments to the current lighting ordinance; (2) a broader “night sky” ordinance that emphasized preserving the night sky but did not seek a formal dark sky designation; or (3) a full dark sky ordinance consistent with Dark Sky International standards. He asked for a general sense of the Council’s direction and, by show of hands, confirmed that the Council generally favored a night sky–focused approach over an immediate pursuit of formal dark sky designation.

Council Member Kynaston stated that she was strongly in favor of the City becoming a formal dark sky community. He had counted approximately 28 dark sky–designated places in Utah and believed that, given Woodland Hills’ setting, the City should be on that list. He expressed interest in following the example of communities such as Moab and suggested that if she and Sherry Berger were to gather signatures from residents in support of dark sky designation, such a petition should carry weight with the Council.

Council Member Malkovich responded that, in her view, much of the Council already supported a night sky approach and that the primary concern was the degree of control that an outside organization, such as Dark Sky International, would have over the City’s ordinances. She reiterated that the committee and staff had sought a balance between preserving the night sky and allowing reasonable lighting for safety and aesthetics. She also referenced Moab’s phased-in approach, including a five-year compliance period and standards for downward-facing, shielded lighting, light trespass limits, and allowances for holiday lighting.

Council Member Lunt supported Council Member Hutchings' suggestion of a "two-step" approach, starting with a night sky-oriented ordinance and then gauging the community's interest in moving toward formal dark sky designation over time. She suggested that gradual implementation might make it easier for the community to adjust while still working toward stronger night sky protections.

Council Member Hutchings reiterated that, if the City decided to pursue a full dark sky designation, some level of mandatory compliance, including retrofit requirements for existing properties, was likely unavoidable under Dark Sky International criteria. He stated that he was not comfortable forcing long-time residents to retrofit their lights at their own expense but acknowledged that stricter requirements would be necessary if the City wanted formal designation. He indicated that this was part of why he sought clear, current information from Dark Sky International and PTR, to avoid misinforming residents about the actual obligations. He stated that while he personally supported a more restrictive lighting ordinance to preserve night skies, he wanted the City to present accurate information and avoid over-promising or under-stating the costs of compliance.

Resident Diana Sackett commented that "architectural lighting" was a term of art in the design profession and referred to lighting that was specifically integrated into a building's architecture to accent or highlight elements of the structure as part of the original design. She cautioned that general illumination and architectural lighting were not the same thing and that imprecise use of the term in questions to legal counsel might skew the resulting opinion. She encouraged the Council to ensure that their questions clearly distinguished between architectural lighting and other forms of illumination.

Council Member Hutchings responded that this was precisely why he wanted to send the draft ordinance to legal counsel for review.

Resident Sherry Berger addressed the Council and clarified that the City currently had two lighting ordinances: one for residential properties and one for City-owned properties. She stated that the ordinance for City-owned property required lights to be turned off by 11:00 p.m., unless an exception was approved by the Planning Commission. She reported that when she asked about the city center and mailbox lighting remaining on all night, Chair Frandsen had told her he had made that decision himself rather than the planning commission making a formal decision, which she believed was inconsistent with the ordinance. Regarding residential lighting, she described Dark Sky International's framework as a useful place to begin, particularly as an educational tool to help residents evaluate whether their lighting was appropriate in purpose, direction, and intensity. She stated that UVU was willing to conduct a free light survey of the City and noted that, if the City became dark sky-approved, it would need to submit an annual review. She emphasized that the PTR committee was not trying to force an ill-fit dark sky model on the City, but believed Woodland Hills was already close to compliance and mainly needed to enforce existing shielding requirements and address particularly bright, unshielded driveway lights that created safety concerns. She explained that PTR's proposed changes to the residential ordinance primarily included requiring lights to be off by 11:00 p.m. and limiting lumens per acre, aligning the residential standard more closely with the City-property standard. She stated that the ordinance otherwise remained largely the same and stressed that PTR's goal was not to take away residents' rights but to preserve the community's existing dark-sky character. When she suggested there was nothing in City code that prohibited street lights, Chair Frandsen clarified that the City's development and construction standards did require underground power and specified that no street lights were allowed.

At the conclusion of the discussion, Mayor Winder observed that the Council had provided general direction to proceed with a night sky oriented approach. He stated that staff and the Planning Commission should forward that draft to the City's attorneys for legal review, particularly on issues related to architectural ornamentation, nuisance considerations, and the scope of the City's regulatory authority under state law. He emphasized that a concrete draft would help obtain more precise legal guidance. Chair Frandsen acknowledged the direction and agreed to move forward consistent with the Council's guidance.

3. Discussion of September 2025 Financials and Check Disbursements

Finance Director Chris Helvey reported that through September 30 the City had received approximately 8% of budgeted revenues and expended about 15% of budgeted expenses, with roughly 25% of the fiscal year elapsed. He noted that additional road expenditures would appear in the October financials to be provided within the next couple of weeks. He stated that the external auditors were in the final stages of completing the annual audit and that, consistent with state auditor guidance, the City's financial statements would be restated once audit adjustments (including depreciation and other routine entries) were finalized. He added that the City's public transparency reporting would also be updated within 15–30 days of receiving the final audit and adjustments. Mr. Helvey reported that he had received some financial questions from staff and would respond within the next few days and share any relevant information with the Council.

4. Discussion of Per Diem Policy for Wildland Seasonal Firefighters- Chief Mickelsen

Chief Mickelsen presented a proposed policy regarding per-diem reimbursements for seasonal wildland firefighters who deploy on national fire assignments. He explained that when firefighters travel, the reimbursing agency—typically the State of Utah—authorizes a daily per-diem amount intended to cover meals and incidental travel expenses. Historically, firefighters had the option to charge meals upfront and later receive reimbursement once the state issued payment to the City; however, state reimbursement can take several months, causing firefighters to carry credit card balances and accrue interest.

He stated that the intent of the new policy was two-fold:

1. to reimburse firefighters at the same per-diem rate approved by the state so the City does not incur additional cost, and
2. to provide firefighters access to a portion of their per diem sooner, rather than requiring them to wait months for reimbursement.

He recommended that the City reimburse firefighters up to 75% of their expected per diem on the first payroll cycle following their return, with the remaining balance paid once the final reimbursement amount was confirmed by the state. He explained that the 75% threshold ensured firefighters received sufficient funds to cover credit card charges while allowing the City to retain a small amount to reconcile any final state adjustments.

Council members discussed timing considerations, noting that reimbursement should occur promptly so that employees were not carrying balances longer than necessary. After discussion, the Council generally supported reimbursing employees up to 75% within the first applicable pay cycle, but no later than three weeks after their return. Chief Mickelsen emphasized that per diem is not receipt-based and that firefighters may keep unspent funds, which is industry standard.

5. Notice of Vacancy on City Council

Mayor Winder stated that a council vacancy will occur effective January 6, 2026, and that the City will accept applications to fill the position until December 8 at 1:00 p.m.

6. Discussion of Utah Retirement System Benefits- Chris Helvey

Finance Director Chris Helvey reported that the Utah Retirement Systems (URS) conducts a comprehensive audit of participating public agencies approximately every three to four years, and Woodland Hills was audited during the current cycle. He stated that the audit process was collaborative and professional. He reminded the Council that once a municipality participates in URS, state statute does not allow withdrawal; the City joined URS around 2007–2008.

Mr. Helvey explained that the audit identified a previously unknown requirement that employees who had prior URS service—whether through another public employer or through contract work for the City—must be reported to URS, and retirement contributions must be paid if applicable work-hour thresholds

are met. He noted that one current employee had prior URS service and that the City was therefore required to remit corresponding employer contributions retroactively. As a result, URS assessed several thousand dollars in past contributions, which were not included in the current budget. He stated that the budget will need to be amended to accommodate this cost.

Mayor Winder added that the affected employee was Lori. He stated that the employee had voluntarily offered to reduce her pay to offset the cost; however, he did not believe it appropriate to reduce her compensation based on retroactive requirements and recommended that the City absorb the cost. The matter was presented to the Council for transparency and to inform necessary future budget adjustments.

7. Department Reports

- a. **Public Works** -Public Works Director Ted Mickelsen reported that Phases 1 and 2 of the road pavement management project had been completed and that Phase 3 had been released for bid, with bids due December 10. He stated that once bid amounts were received, the City would be able to confirm projected costs and proceed with financing arrangements, with Phase 3 planned for construction next year. He explained that Phase 3 would address all remaining roads except those requiring water line replacement. He further reported that he was conducting a rate analysis to determine the funding needed to complete the remaining water line and road projects and anticipated presenting additional information within the next few months after further coordination with the state and potential funding sources.

Fire Department- Chief Ted Mickelsen reported that the department had been awarded a FEMA Assistance to Firefighters Grant in the amount of \$56,000, with a required City match of approximately \$2,800, to purchase six new SCBA units. He explained that the department had received a promotional quote of approximately \$50,800 for the equipment and initially faced uncertainty due to the temporary shutdown of FEMA's grant portal, which delayed access to reimbursement documentation. He stated that the supplier was willing to hold the pricing and delay invoicing, reducing financial risk to the City. As of the day of the meeting, the FEMA portal had reopened, and the regional FEMA administrator confirmed that funds would be released within approximately two weeks of submitting the finalized sales order. Chief Mickelsen noted that updated pricing was being reconfirmed due to the age of the original quote, but he anticipated the final amount would remain within the approved grant allocation. He added that FEMA encouraged agencies to fully expend awarded funds and that, if the SCBAs cost less than the grant amount, remaining funds could be applied toward eligible PPE purchases.

- b. **Code Enforcement**-Wayne Frandsen: Mr. Frandsen had nothing new to report.

8. Mayor and City Council Reports

- a. **Mayor Winder: SESD, MAG/COG:** Mayor Brent Winder reported that he attended the SESD meeting and there was nothing notable to report. He also noted that he was unable to attend the MAG/COG meeting.
- b. **Council Member Hillyard: Dry Creek Transfer Station:** Council Member Hillyard reported that the transfer-station board had not met, so there was nothing formal to report. He noted that a resident had recently asked whether recycling collected in Woodland Hills was actually recycled, given ongoing rumors that it was being sent to the landfill. He clarified that recycling is in fact separated, processed through its own compactor, and not mixed with regular waste. He further reported that the City's transfer station was recognized as having the lowest contamination rate of recycled material in Utah, which he attributed to continued efforts by the station and residents.
- c. **Council Member Hutchings:** Council Member Hutchings reported that he was unable to attend recent meetings but reviewed agendas and related updates. He stated that the South Utah Valley

Municipal Water Association is undergoing significant board turnover, including the departure of its long-time attorney and other board members, and that new representatives will need to be selected early next year.

He noted that the association presented information on block-water allocations and upcoming repayment requirements tied to the Central Utah Project. He explained that Woodland Hills has been assigned a small portion of that water block, and that future repayment obligations will result in additional water-related costs. The estimated repayment rates range from approximately \$180 per acre-foot over a 50-year term to approximately \$199 per acre-foot over a 40-year term.

Public Works Director Ted Mickelsen added clarification, stating that each city's allocation is based on population and that cities can either begin paying immediately when the water becomes available or defer payment for up to 10 years. He indicated that he would likely recommend deferral for Woodland Hills and noted that the City may also choose to transfer its allocation to another entity if it is not needed.

Council Member Hutchings reported on information he received from NEBO Water regarding recent developments related to the Strawberry Valley Project. He explained that the project was originally organized in 1905 to provide agricultural irrigation water, with Spanish Fork and Payson using approximately 2,000 acre-feet for more than a century. He noted that water use has since shifted toward municipal and industrial purposes.

He explained that the Bureau of Reclamation and Strawberry Water Users Association recently finalized a long-term agreement, referred to as the 1920 Act contract, which formally converts approximately 61,000 acre-feet of water from agricultural to municipal and industrial allocation. This action resolves longstanding conflicts regarding historical usage and rights.

Council Member Hutchings stated that this change is tied to new statewide water-tracking and reporting requirements. Monthly usage reports will be requested so that systems can track both surface and aquifer supplies. He noted that Woodland Hills relies solely on aquifer water, so the impact on the City is comparatively small, but the broader program will significantly affect neighboring communities.

He added that this model is being adopted statewide as part of modernized water-management practices and that the treatment and infrastructure projects occurring throughout the valley are now part of this coordinated framework.

- d. **Council Member Kynaston: Central Utah 911:** Council Member Kynaston reported the next meeting for the district is scheduled for November 11th.
- e. **Council Member Lunt:** Council Member Lunt asked whether the electrical service at the roundabout was functioning properly, noting that Christmas lighting would be installed soon and that previous issues had occurred with the power box. Staff confirmed that power was working and assistance would be available as needed. Council Member Lunt indicated she would be placing pre-lit trees rather than wrapping existing trees due to safety concerns experienced in prior years.

The Council then coordinated plans for the annual Santa event scheduled for Saturday, December 6, confirming a 10:00 a.m. start time with the typical route and stops. It was noted that attendance varies by neighborhood, reflecting changing demographics.

Council Member Lunt requested that signage or banners be posted to increase visibility of the event. The group discussed that existing banner posts were damaged and would be discarded, and alternatives for banner placement were considered. Staff indicated that a location near Summit Creek and the corner by the trail appeared feasible. The Council will review final placement and determine whether one or two banners will be needed.

- f. **Council Member Malkovich- South Utah Valley Animal Shelter:** Council Member Malkovich reported that she emailed the Council information from the South Valley Animal Shelter regarding how shelter data is being used. She noted that there is an Animal Control Officer Association conference in January but stated she was not requesting to attend.

She informed the Council that the state legislative session was approaching and that significant municipal-related legislation was anticipated again this year. She highlighted discussions regarding changes to property tax structures, possible caps or percentage limits, and the importance of ensuring cities retain local authority over land-use decisions.

She also noted potential state proposals affecting gas tax revenues; while refinery-related tax changes may benefit consumers, they may reduce the amount of gas tax distributed to cities for road funding. Updates were also underway in state housing policy, including development standards, infrastructure requirements, and provisions related to ADUs. She stated that these changes may require the City to update several ordinances by March.

Council Member Malkovich additionally explained that the state recently renumbered sections of Title 10 into Title 20, resulting in broken statutory references, and encouraged staff to document the time spent making necessary updates so the City can report unfunded impacts back to state officials.

She concluded by reminding the Council of the National League Summit taking place in Salt Lake City later in the week and encouraged members to RSVP for related events. She invited Council members to relay any additional legislative concerns they would like her to advocate for through the Utah League of Cities and Towns.

9. Items for Upcoming City Council Meetings

Mayor Winder reminded the Council and attendees that there would be only one City Council meeting in December, scheduled for December 9. He noted that the agenda was expected to be full and would include interviews with individuals who had applied to fill the upcoming vacant City Council seat.

The City Council work session adjourned at 7:39 p.m.

WOODLAND HILLS CITY COUNCIL
City Council Meeting
Woodland Hills City Center, 690 South Woodland Hills Dr.
Tuesday, November 18th, 2025

CONDUCTING	Brent T. Winder, Mayor
ELECTED OFFICIALS	Council Member Ben Hillyard Council Member Brian Hutchings Council Member Janet Lunt Council Member Kari Malkovich Council Member Dorel Kynaston
STAFF PRESENT	Ted Mickelsen, Public Works Dir./Fire Chief Chris Helvey, Finance Director - electronically Jody Stones, City Recorder Wayne Frandsen, Code Enforcement and Planning Commission

The Woodland Hills City Council meeting was called to order at 7:47 p.m. Council Member Lunt offered the invocation, and Council Member Kynaston led those in attendance in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Public Comment:

Resident Diana Sackett expressed concern about the City's recent practice of rezoning larger properties into smaller lots to facilitate development, noting that doing so conflicts with the current General Plan. She emphasized preserving the rural atmosphere, maintaining tree buffers between homes for aesthetics and wildfire safety, and following the General Plan as legally required until it is formally updated.

She also encouraged the City to consider long-term impacts of mixed zoning areas—such as properties with animal rights situated next to those without—and the potential community discord that could result.

Lastly, she asked how street-side setbacks would be handled when parcels are rezoned from larger lots (e.g., R-1-2) to smaller ones (e.g., R-1-19), and urged consistency along street frontages to preserve uniformity throughout the City.

Resident Jody Stones commented on the recent survey related to lighting and noted that some of the survey questions, particularly those relating to dark-sky lighting, were worded in a way that appeared leading. She expressed concern that existing homeowners could be financially burdened if required to retrofit exterior fixtures, noting that some homes may have multiple lights and replacement costs could be significant.

She also stated that she does not support turning off lights at City-owned facilities such as the City Center or mailbox area. She referenced safety concerns, noting that fire, EMS, and snowplow personnel access the area at all hours and adequate lighting is needed. She mentioned a prior injury that occurred when an individual slipped on ice and urged the Council to keep those public-area lights illuminated to minimize risk and potential liability.

Consent Agenda

14. Approval of September 23rd, and October 14th, 2025, City Council Meeting Minutes

Motion: Council Member Hutchings moved to approve the minutes from the September 23 and October 14, 2025 City Council Meetings, with the noted correction that the newly constructed water tank will be owned by Woodland Hills and not by the City of Salem.

Second: Council Member Lunt seconded the motion.

Vote: The motion passed unanimously.

Business and Discussion

15. Decision on Forwarding Request for a Change in Zoning from R-1 to R1-19 for property owned by Earl Underwood at 350 South Woodland Hills Drive, Serial #55:052:0044, consisting of 5.7861 acres.

Motion: Council Member Hillyard moved to forward the item to the Planning Commission for review.

Second: Council Member Malkovich seconded the motion

Vote: The motion passed unanimously.

16. Resolution 2025-23 Canvas of the 2025 Municipal Election

City Recorder Jody Stones reported that several ballots were successfully cured after signatures were verified, resulting in a slight adjustment to the final vote counts; however, the election outcome remained unchanged. She clarified that some voters chose to cast ballots only for the mayoral race and not for council seats, often because they felt unfamiliar with the candidates.

She also explained that although voters had been informed about including the last four digits of their driver's license or voter ID, that requirement did not apply this year, and ballots without those numbers were still counted if the signature matched and eligibility was confirmed. She noted that the County made multiple attempts, up to six contacts by text, email, phone, and mail, to resolve ballot issues, resulting in most ballots being cured, with only a small number remaining unresolved.

Motion: Council Member Malkovich moved to adopt Resolution 2025-23, certifying the canvass of the 2025 municipal election results as presented

Second: Council Member Kynaston seconded the motion.

Vote: The motion passed unanimously.

17. Resolution 2025-24 Approving the September 2025 Check Disbursements

Motion: Council Member Hillyard moved to adopt Resolution 2025-24 Approving the September check disbursements.

Second: Council Member Hutchings seconded the motion.

Vote: The motion passed unanimously.

18. Policy and Procedures 2025-03 Per Diem Policy for Wildland Seasonal Firefighters

Motion: Council Member Kynaston moved to adopt Policy and Procedures 2025-03 Per Diem Policy for Wildland Seasonal Firefighters

Second: Council Member Lunt seconded the motion.

Vote: The motion passed unanimously.

Closed Session

Motion: Council Member Lunt made the motion for the council to enter into a closed session to discuss pending litigation at 8:06 p.m.

Second: Council Member Hutchings seconded the motion.

Roll Call Vote: The motion passed unanimously with a roll call vote.

Motion: Council Member Kynaston moved to close the closed session at 8:30 p.m. and moved back in to the open session of the city council meeting.

Second: Council Member Lunt seconded the motion.

Roll Call Vote: The motion passed unanimously with a roll call vote.

Adjournment

Motion: Council Member Malkovich moved to close the meeting at 8:31 p.m.

Second: Council Member Kynaston seconded the motion.

The meeting was adjourned at 8:31 p.m.