

**TREMONTON CITY CORPORATION
PLANNING COMMISSION
MARCH 26, 2024**

Members Present:

Micah Capener, Chairman—excused
Penni Dennis, Commission Member—excused
Jeffrey Seedall, Commission Member
Raulon Van Tassell, Commission Member
Mark Thompson, Commission Member
Marc Christensen, City Manager
Cynthia Nelson, Deputy Recorder

Co-Chairman Seedall called the Planning Commission Meeting to order at 5:31 p.m. The meeting was held March 26, 2024 in the City Council Meeting Room at 102 South Tremont Street, Tremonton, Utah. Co-Chairman Seedall, Commission Members Van Tassell and Thompson, City Manager Christensen, and Deputy Recorder Nelson were in attendance. Chairman Capener and Commission Member Dennis were excused.

1. Approval of agenda:

Motion by Co-Chairman Seedall to approve the March 26, 2024 agenda. Motion seconded by Commission Member Van Tassell. Vote: Chairman Capener – absent, Co-Chairman Seedall – aye, Commission Member Dennis – absent, 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—February 27, 2024 and March 12, 2024

Motion by Co-Chairman Seedall to approve the minutes stated above. Motion seconded by Commission Member Van Tassell. Vote: Chairman Capener – absent, Co-Chairman Seedall – aye, Commission Member Dennis – absent, Commission Member Van Tassell – aye, Commission Member Thompson – aye. Motion approved.

Co-Chairman Seedall called a Public Hearing to order at 5:33 p.m. to discuss the zoning below. There were eight people in attendance.

5. Public Hearing:

- a. To receive public input on amending zoning district regulations relating to the creation of the Single-Family Residential Transition Overlay Zone (SFRTO). Also, the accompanying proposed Envision Estates development, which would

construct 202 single-family units at approximately 500 W 600 N (Parcel #05-043-0049) and rezone the existing R1-10 zoning for the property to include the SFRTO Overlay Zone.

There were no public comments. Co-Chairman Seedall closed the Public Hearing at 5:34 p.m.

6. New Business:

- a. Discussion and consideration of amending zoning district regulations relating to the creation of the Single Family Residential Transition Overlay Zone (SFRTO). Also, the accompanying proposed Envision Estates development, which would construct 202 single-family units at approximately 500 W 600 N (Parcel #05-043-0049) and rezone the existing R1-10 zoning for the property to include the SFRTO Overlay Zone. Developer Ben Steele from Visionary Homes.

Co-Chairman Seedall said the purpose of this is to provide a transition between single-family and multi-family neighborhoods primarily with lots 4,000 and 5,000 square feet in size. These will be cottage or patio style homes with variable setbacks to create mixed approaches. Here is an overview of the lot layouts. The main change we discussed previously was to reduce the amount of high-quality exterior materials from 60% to 40% and the allowed use of a single material to be used if a fence is provided. This is for the corner lots about wrapping the high-quality material around, which should go until it meets a fence line. The fence line would help break that up and anything behind it would not have the high-quality material to match the front. When asked about the timeframe for installing the fence, developer Ben Steele said they would have to contract that upfront. Some homeowners choose to do a fence when they are more established. This wrap around just adds extra cost. We do want to have affordability. We have to have a manageable lot size and price tag. In conversations with Mr. Taylor, we had discussed a wrap of two feet around the side. If we are going to ask them to wrap the side of the house all the way back to where a potential fence might be, I am concerned about that extra cost. I feel like wrapping it two feet is sufficient. Manager Christensen said this would have to be done in the design phase so you know if there is a fence and if it meets the sight lines. Mr. Steele said I would lean on the side of even more affordable and not making that a requirement. We do not want to force homeowners to add a fence right away. Co-Chairman Seedall said I think the City would prefer to have that finished even though we are trying to make these affordable. We still want them to have curb appeal. My preference would be seeing some of these houses from every angle look well finished. Commission Member Van Tassell said I can see the case for affordability, but the difference in our scenarios is that we have pushed so much toward affordability that we have a bunch of multi-family. We have a bunch of projects already established that are trying to meet that need. Mr. Steele said I like the idea of making it more aesthetically pleasing with some high-quality materials on the

corner. Mr. Taylor did a great job on the overlay. I think you are going to see a handful of developers want to take advantage of it. I do like how we are varying the product setbacks and heights. Having it very mixed adds a lot of value.

Commission Member Van Tassell said I am in favor of keeping a standard. That way it is set and then you can work through those in an agreement and discuss it with the City planners in the review process. Mr. Steele said maybe we need to work on the language a bit. This will be the guidepost. We are not going to be able to go outside of it, unless we add a language that gives discretion in the creation of the development agreement. At least leave the door open. As long as your code allows that discretion you can work within those bounds.

The Commission further discussed the fencing and sight distance requirements. They also discussed frontage and setbacks for corner lots. Mr. Steele said I do not want to get too far off the track of affordability. I appreciate the open conversation. I would ask that the requirement for the corner lot be reduced to a more manageable percentage. Councilmember Rohde said I wonder what we are really going for? We are trying to make small homes that people can afford. I wonder if this requirement is something we need to add to a larger subdivision with bigger homes. I like this, but can people really afford it? Commission Member Thompson said yes, but we still want to make it aesthetically appealing. Commission Member Van Tassell said I think what we find unaffordable today will be affordable 10 years from now. This is also about a standard of how do we want this community to sit in our plan. We are talking about details in a plan. Those will be hammered out with the review committee. There has to be some guidance and standards. We need to have something that says, we will approve it, but you have to work out the nitty-gritty with the committee. Would it be so set in stone that it cannot be customized in a Development Master Plan?

Co-Chairman Seedall said we want some of the nice architecture from the true front of the house to go around to see some continuity and have the corner streets look a bit nicer. We want some of these houses that you see from more angles to look good. I think I would be up for the 20% just to make sure it breaks it up enough. I would say do the 20% almost no matter what and get rid of the fence requirement since that is going to be a little bit more confusing. The 20% would make sure we are only seeing a little bit of the corner, but we are not upping the price by having almost half your two-story house in stone or brick. So, 40% on the front and 20% on the sides. I would forget about the fencing. As a Planning Commission we are doing what we can to help make the corner lots be a little bit more dressed up.

Motion by Co-Chairman Seedall to approve this item with the change of having the side façade be reduced to 20% and any notion of a fence be

removed from the overlay zone. Motion seconded by Commission Member Thompson. Vote: Chairman Capener – absent, Co-Chairman Seedall – aye, Commission Member Dennis – absent, Commission Member Van Tassell – aye, Commission Member Thompson – aye. Motion approved.

7. Planning commission comments/reports: None

8. Adjournment

Motion by Commission Member Van Tassell to adjourn the meeting. Motion seconded by consensus of the Board. The meeting adjourned at 6:29 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 23rd day of April, 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.