

**TREMONTON CITY CORPORATION
PLANNING COMMISSION
MARCH 12, 2024**

Members Present:

Micah Capener, Chairman—excused
Penni Dennis, Commission Member
Jeffrey Seedall, Commission Member
Raulon Van Tassell, Commission Member
Mark Thompson, Commission Member
Bret Rohde, City Councilmember
Marc Christensen, City Manager
Sam Taylor, Landmark Design
Cynthia Nelson, Deputy Recorder

Co-Chairman Seedall called the Planning Commission Meeting to order at 5:35 p.m. The meeting was held March 12, 2024 in the City Council Meeting Room at 102 South Tremont Street, Tremonton, Utah. Co-Chairman Seedall, Commission Members Dennis, Van Tassell, and Thompson, City Councilmember Rohde, City Manager Christensen, Mr. Taylor with Landmark Design (joined via Zoom), and Deputy Recorder Nelson were in attendance. Chairman Capener was excused.

1. Approval of agenda:

Motion by Commission Member Thompson to approve the March 12, 2024 agenda. Motion seconded by Commission Member Dennis. Vote: Chairman Capener – absent, Co-Chairman Seedall – aye, Commission Member Dennis – aye, Commission Member Commission Member Van Tassell – aye, Commission Member Thompson – aye. Motion approved.

2. Declaration of Conflict of Interest: None.

3. Public Comments: None.

4. Approval of minutes—No minutes to approve at this time.

5. New Business:

a. Discussion and consideration of advising the City Council regarding amendments to zoning district regulations relating to the creation of the Single Family Residential Transition Overlay Zone (SFRTTO) and the accompanying proposed Envision Estates development, which would construct 202 single-family units at approximately 500 W 600 N – Ben Steele, Visionary Homes

Mr. Taylor said this overlay zone builds off our discussion from last time. This is an

overlay zone which we are proposing being created to serve future developments. City staff feels this is important. The purpose is to provide a transition between single-family and multi-family neighborhoods and bring more affordable single-family housing products to Tremonton. This would create the opportunity for a 4,000 square foot lot. It is denser than most of our single-family neighborhoods, but not denser than the townhome development. This is a way to bridge the gap between those two neighborhood types and create more continuity from block to block. We hope this could lessen the impact of some of those higher density areas. One provision would be the requirement of a development master plan to guide proposed developments. They would still conform to architecture and design standards. It allows for a minimum lot size of 4,000 square feet, but also the inclusion of at least 25% of the development to have 5,000 square foot lots. This would create a slight mix of housing and lot sizes. We would provide some guidance on different layouts (examples were provided). They would be required to provide a variety of one- and two-story plans and the use of high-quality materials on the facade. As written, we have it that 60% of the front facade should use at least a combination of two high quality materials. There is a provision for landscaping. There are also parks and trails improvements, to be constructed as part of the development agreement. That is something to be negotiated through the process.

Mr. Taylor said this is currently written for single-family, but if we wanted to expand on it and make it more robust, we could work in duplexes and other things. That could also be its own overlay. Co-Chairman Seedall said this is an overlay that would allow for 4,000 and 5,000 square foot lots. They are trying to amend code and update the zoning map. Kind of as a hybrid of what was discussed last time to find a solution to help fill in the missing middle housing. This overlay zone allows us to write the flexibility into the code without having to reinvent the wheel. This would be done per request. Every subdivision that wants this would need to come in and be approved. This becomes our default overlay zone. We would be able to write what the minimum requirements are in order for this to be approved.

Mr. Taylor said this proposal is to construct 202 single-family units on this property. This would be a mix of both cottage homes and small single-family lots. The cottage homes would be 4,000 to 4,500 square foot lots. The 57 small single-family lots are closer to 5,500 square feet. The proposal is to do a fee-in-lieu for the general system parking trail purpose rather than the provision of construction facilities within this center. They reviewed some elevations of the proposed cottage plans. They are 32 feet wide and come in a variety of colors and materials to shake up the facade. These are the smaller single-family plans, which are 44 feet wide. The one-story plan would create some variation. These are some idealistic renderings of what this would look like. They would have 10 feet between the homes with setbacks from the other side. Everything that has been proposed as part of this development fits within the overlay as it is currently written. The R1-10 zoning would be the base underlay and then the overlay would allow for this off configuration.

Mr. Steele said there is not a plan to have an HOA as part of this project. We are planning to do a fee-in-lieu with park trail improvements. I think 95% of the overlay works really good for us. As I look through some of the elevations as we presented to the DRC and to you as currently written, two specific things make a challenge. Those are the requirement to use two high quality materials on the façade and the percentage required. We provide six of the elevations for the small single-family and cottage homes. It looks like we would have to eliminate four of those based off those two requirements. I wonder if there is some leeway. The only one that would not work would be these traditional plans that are stucco and are popular. Those would be eliminated the way the code is written today. It would be nice if there was a way to allow these particular facades. Otherwise, we would have to add additional siding to meet that two-material percentage. The idea here is to keep these homes affordable. I hate to add too much gingerbread to these homes in the name of trying to make things affordable. I understand there is a balance between affordability and the desire for this Commission to keep things looking nice and the longevity of the project. Stucco tends to be a little cheaper, but is very popular. I would propose reducing that 60% requirement to 40%. I think you are still going to get everything you want, but it gives more flexibility. I think everything else looks really good. The code is written to help with variation in color and architectural design that forces a variety of products and colors. There is also a variation in the front setback.

Co-Chairman Seedall said is the 10-foot separation enough? Mr. Steele said it is sufficient. People who do not want to share a wall do not mind being 10 feet from their neighbor. A lot of the details can be worked out when we put the development together. If there are any other concerns or comments shoot them our way and we would love to discuss it. Co-Chairman Seedall said I worry about putting an access into the road, between the old parts of Archibald Estate and the new one. I think there needs to be a four-way if you have 202 new houses. That road curves and there is a six-foot fence so you cannot see down that road going north. I worry about cars getting hit there. We would just need to add a couple stop signs. Commission Member Dennis said I like that we are bringing this option of a smaller lot size.

Commission Member Dennis said so we still need to decide on stucco and the percentage. Mr. Steele said if you accept stucco as a high-quality material that solves the problems. Stucco is a product I prefer, but it is a preference. It is a high-quality product. The color is built in so it does not fade like it used to. Mr. Taylor said this does not say stucco cannot be used on the front. It is just that it controls the amount it can be. If we keep it at the 60% high-quality interior of the other materials, then only 40% of it can be stucco. If we reduce it to 40% then 60% could be stucco. We probably do not want a situation where 100% is stucco. We need to be careful on how we write the language. I think bringing that down to 40% would be a really reasonable compromise. Mr. Steele said I think that would be the best of both worlds and a good balance. We hope to keep these homes in the \$350,000 to \$400,000 range.

The Commission tabled this item until they can hold a public hearing at their next meeting.

6. Planning commission comments/reports: None.
7. Adjournment

Motion by Co-Chairman Seedall to adjourn the meeting. Motion seconded by consensus of the Board. The meeting adjourned at 6:28 p.m.

The undersigned duly acting and appointed Recorder for Tremonton City Corporation hereby certifies that the foregoing is a true and correct copy of the minutes of the Planning Commission held on the above referenced date. Minutes were prepared by Jessica Tanner.

Dated this 26th day of March, 2024.

Linsey Nessen, CITY RECORDER

***Utah Code** 52-4-202, (6) allows for a topic to be raised by the public and discussed by the public body even though it was not included in the agenda or advance public notice given; however, no final action will be taken.