

**TREMONTON CITY CORPORATION  
DEVELOPMENT REVIEW COMMITTEE  
APRIL 10, 2024**

Members Present:

Jeff Seedall, Chairman & City Planner  
Marc Christensen, City Manager  
Chris Breinholt, City Engineer  
Paul Fulgham, Public Works Director  
Zach LeFevre, Parks and Recreation Director—excused  
Sam Taylor, Landmark Design Planner  
Tyler Seaman, Building Inspector  
Cynthia Nelson, Deputy Recorder

Chairman Seedall called the Development Review Committee Meeting to order at 9:38 a.m. The meeting was held April 10, 2024 in the City Council Meeting Room at 102 South Tremont Street, Tremonton, Utah. Chairman Seedall, Engineer Breinholt, Manager Christensen, Director Fulgham, Planner Taylor (via Zoom), Inspector Seaman, and Deputy Recorder Nelson were in attendance. Director LeFevre was excused.

1. Approval of agenda:

**Motion by Director Fulgham to approve the April 10, 2024 agenda.** Motion seconded by Manager Christensen. Vote: Chairman Seedall – aye, Engineer Breinholt – aye, Manager Christensen – aye, Director Fulgham – aye, Director LeFevre – absent, Design Planner Taylor – aye, Inspector Seaman – aye. Motion approved.

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

3. New Business:

a. Review of Site Plan, Preliminary Plat, Final Plat, ADU and Annexation Checklists

Chairman Seedall said the purpose of these checklists are so the DRC can better communicate with developers about what should be included in submittal packages to follow State guidelines and City ordinance. We want the submittals to be a bit more formal so they know what is expected and we can deliver comments.

The Committee reviewed ADUs and context plans. Design Planner Taylor said this really just identifies where the ADU is in relation to the other. The ADU ordinance used the words context plan. This is not really a concept—it is more about establishing the context. Then there is a site plan requirement that gets into more of the details of what is being proposed. Planner Seedall said this is more to highlight what the existing conditions are around the site or property. The Committee further discussed ADUs, as well as low to moderate income housing, and how they might track those accessory dwellings.

The Committee then reviewed the annexation policy and an agreement they have with the County and health department. Manager Christensen said this continues with the County's new zoning ordinance. Anybody wanting to do a land use application near our boundaries is forced to go through the annexation process with the City before the County will do anything. We charge them \$1,100 for the application fee (\$800 deposit and \$300 application fee). I would like to do a fee analysis with other cities. We might know upfront we do not want to annex them in, but they still have to pay that fee to go through the process. The County will not allow them to build if we do not go through that. Would we want to lessen that fee? Director Fulgham said I think you want to do the minimum because if it moves on to a full annexation, then you could apply the other fees. Manager Christensen said this does take time to do notifications. It could be a minimum fee up until the Council approves it. The County will not accept that until they file an annexation petition and get approved or denied by the Council. Chairman Seedall said I would propose breaking it up so it is \$300 to get through the petition since there is still work involved and then if it gets accepted, we do a \$800 filing petition. By the County telling developers to come to the City first, I would assume that they would rather see City islands than having development within County boundaries.

Engineer Breinholt said in most preliminary checklists, you see things like geotechnical report and stormwater report. It is good to have those before to identify potential problems. However, we are being told by State legislature that we have to have a checklist and process to follow. In the interest of trying to balance being easy to work with and having substantial documents, I am a little in the air on what to suggest. It would be nice to have the flexibility to leave it in the preliminary phase. The Committee agreed there needed to be changes to the language to allow them to waive items when needed or delay the need for certain documentations. Director Fulgham also suggested language that allows the City and developers to utilize previous Geotech steps. Chairman Seedall said we could always say unless otherwise agreed upon with City administration. Engineer Breinholt would like to come up with a list of general stuff that could make it clear what the City requires. They would work on a list for developers and engineers to go through. Chairman Seedall said I would like to have a checklist that says, this is what we need to see on your construction drawings. I think having a separate checklist would be easier. Everyone is welcome to review this and send me comments.

The Committee discussed the new law and what is required of them in tracking all meetings and approvals. Engineer Breinholt said it would be good to read through what they just passed outlining all these steps. Everyone has to adjust what they are doing to comply and that is the reason for the checklist. Chairman Seedall said if their plans are incomplete, we did not count it as one until they have sent a completed submittal package with what was outlined in the checklist. Engineer Breinholt said right. If they submit something that does not address everything, then instead of working back and forth like we have, we would say, this is incomplete and you have not addressed all our

comments. This would not be counted as a new submittal. We only get four per turn (four per preliminary and four per final). Generally it can work the way it always has.

b. Special conditions with the Envision Estates Development Agreement

The Committee then discussed general conditions that are typical to any development agreements. Something that could be added in regards to utility capacity, saying the developer shall upsize existing utilities as required. They would coordinate with the engineer, public works director, and developer. That would all be reflected in the construction documents. The other suggestion was reparations to existing features. That any damages incurred shall be repaired or restored to City standards in satisfaction of public works director and or adjacent property owners.

The Committee then moved into the special condition section and talked about park impact fees. They discussed ways they can negotiate added benefits to the community in exchange for things like higher density. They also discussed when special provisions like a construction fence would be appropriate to keep garbage from blowing into adjacent properties or canals. The Committee discussed a boilerplate template and then moved onto the development agreement with Envision Estates. The Committee also discussed field drains and maintaining their integrity.

Design Planner Taylor said for the special condition section, most of these are standard, but I highlighted the unique ones. We have discussed the developer providing a fee in lieu for parks and trails improvements. They also discussed requirements for landscaping and storm water.

c. Walk-ins: There were no walk-ins.

4. Comments/Reports:

Engineer Breinholt asked about the triggers for River's Edge. Chairman Seedall said most of it was at 30% to 50% completion. It is not specifically tied to lots or a phase. That is something we may need to look at and discuss with the developer. Engineer Breinholt said it was determined that when they did phase two they have to do secondary water and the stoplight, but phase two has changed. They totally changed the boundaries of all the phasing. Director Fulgham said but secondary water is still on the table. That was part of the annex in the second phase.

The Committee discussed another development and other things coming up. They also had questions about Mark Allred's development and suggested providing a list of things that are permitted. Inspector Seaman said it is already non-conforming, because it was not approved as a house. It was approved as a shop with an office.

5. Public comments: No public comments.

6. Adjournment:

**Motion by Director Fulgham to adjourn the meeting.** Motion seconded by consensus of the Committee. The meeting adjourned at 11:16 a.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 Development Review Committee Meeting held on the above referenced date. Minutes prepared by Jessica Tanner.

Dated this 21 day of May, 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.