

**TREMONTON CITY CORPORATION
PLANNING COMMISSION
DECEMBER 10, 2024**

Members Present:

Micah Capener, Chairman
Kaden Grover, Commission Member—excused
Andrea Miller, Commission Member
Mark Thompson, Commission Member
Raulon Van Tassell, Commission Member—excused
Bret Rohde, City Councilmember—excused
Jeff Seedall, City Planner
Bill Cobabe, City Manager—excused
Tiffany Lannefeld, Deputy Recorder

Chairman Capener called the Planning Commission Meeting to order at 5:31 p.m. The meeting was held December 10, 2024 in the City Council Meeting Room at 102 South Tremont Street, Tremonton, Utah. Chairman Capener, Commission Members Miller and Thompson, City Planner Seedall, and Deputy Recorder Lannefeld were in attendance. Commission Members Grover, Van Tassell, City Councilmember Rohde, and Manager Cobabe were excused.

1. Approval of agenda:

Motion by Commission Member Miller to approve the December 10, 2024 agenda. Motion seconded by Commission Member Thompson. Vote: Chairman Capener – yes, Commission Member Grover – absent, Commission Member Miller – yes, Commission Member Thompson – yes, Commission Member Van Tassell – absent. Motion approved.

2. Declaration of Conflict of Interest: None.

3. Public Comments: None.

4. Approval of minutes—November 12, 2024

Motion by Commission Member Thompson to approve the November 12, 2024 minutes. Motion seconded by Commission Member Miller. Vote: Chairman Capener – yes, Commission Member Grover – absent, Commission Member Miller – yes, Commission Member Thompson – yes, Commission Member Van Tassell – absent. Motion approved.

Chairman Capener called a Public Hearing to order at 5:34 p.m. to receive public input on the sign permit chapter. There were 0 people in attendance.

5. Public Hearing:

a. To receive public input on amending Chapter 1.27 Sign Permit

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

6. New Business:

a. Discussion and consideration of updates to Chapter 1.27 Sign Permit

Planner Seedall said the change makes it so concept plans can be submitted to me or the DRC for general discussion. We will waive the fee, so people feel more welcome to discuss their plans and get feedback. This would not trigger the State code to do any vested interests.

Motion by Commission Member Miller to approve the proposed amendments to this concept plan. Motion seconded by Commission Member Miller. Vote: Chairman Capener – yes, Commission Member Grover – absent, Commission Member Miller – yes, Commission Member Thompson – yes, Commission Member Van Tassell – absent. Motion approved.

b. Discussion of updates to Chapter 1.33 Planned Unit Development (PUD)

Planner Seedall said we went through this a couple weeks ago and the parking is where we got hung up. We wanted to vet it out a bit more. I tried combining the approval process, whether it was internal or external and making the requirements similar. We tried rewriting it for clarity because we all had a different interpretation of what the parking was. Chairman Capener said this says only one accessory dwelling unit shall be allowed per single-family lot, but this one says each parcel will be permitted to have one internal and one detached, which then would change that definition. We need to fix that. Planner Seedall said I will update A to make sure it reflects the section above.

The Commission further discussed parking and where that would be located. Planner Seedall said this is going to come down to the property owner's management. Parking for the primary structure cannot be negatively impacted by parking needs for the ADU. They cannot block each other. They need to ensure those cars can be accessed on demand and that there is not an exceeding amount of stacking. It will be up to the property owner to show where those stalls are and that the parking area is reasonable. I think this reads a little clearer than it used to. They need to park on the lot and not on the street. This will all be part of the approval process. Parking maintenance should maintain the existing aesthetics in the neighborhood and parking stalls should be prioritized in the rear and side of the yards. I will update 21.035 and then add that they would prioritize the rear and side yard parking.

Motion by Commission Member Thompson to accept the amendments with

the modifications stated and send to the City Council. Motion seconded by Commission Member Miller. Vote: Chairman Capener – yes, Commission Member Grover – absent, Commission Member Miller – yes, Commission Member Thompson – yes, Commission Member Van Tassell – absent. Motion approved.

- c. Discussion and consideration of proposed amendments to Chapter 1.08 Commercial and Industrial Zone

Planner Seedall said the Inland Port Authority is a State level organization that is trying to help bring industrial growth statewide. Lakeshore is one of them. Chairman Capener said this is essentially a mechanism to allow them to receive incentives to bring their businesses to Utah. Planner Seedall said the other part, is there is an entire financial tool that goes with it. To bring in industrial, of any size, there is going to be an impact on the utility systems and roadways. They are looking at being able to market chunks of land to make a public infrastructure district (PID). They would then get a list of all of the capital improvements needed (roadways, sewer lift station, water line, etc.). Then they are able to bond to put in capital improvements. They would then use the increase in property tax. The city gets 25% of that increase and the other 75% goes to the PID to pay off debts. The State is trying to find chunks of land they can market to large industrial businesses to bring people in. Industrial spaces require a lot of land. They have been successful in finding landowners willing to see that growth happen. Chairman Capener said it also speeds up the process. Lakeshore would normally have taken three more years. They get incentives for a period of time, but then taxpayers get a huge shot in the arm when their incentives go off. If you can focus on distribution and big manufacturing companies to give them incentives then they will bring the tide up for all the service and trucking companies that support them. Planner Seedall said this brings careers and not just jobs. This would allow us to keep our workforce here. I am really excited about the Inland Port. We are trying to get this code together to help quantify what the City can handle.

Planner Seedall then reviewed proposed changes. There are three purposes: assembly manufacturing, light manufacturing and heavy manufacturing. We expanded the use table and did some other cleanup on this, including less footnotes. I can get you the edits. The big changes were the special regulations. A lot of the regulations are pretty much the same. This is where most of the changes started. We will have our engineer review the ranges. If they were to need more water then we need to have some plan in place for what those businesses would do. That could include wells, storage and wastewater reclamation. We would not want residential growth to be cut off because we allowed too much industrial water usage. We want to have these different talking points so when the Inland Port starts advertising new area, we can put quantities that say where they are limited and what they can do. Also, how they can help with water and air quality.

This will help quantify what the City's systems can handle.

Motion by Commission Member Miller to table this for a future meeting. Motion seconded by Commission Member Thompson. Vote: Chairman Capener – yes, Commission Member Grover – absent, Commission Member Miller – yes, Commission Member Thompson – yes, Commission Member Van Tassell – absent. Motion approved.

7. Planning commission comments/reports:

Planner Seedall said Tuesday, December 17, is our Planning Commission dinner at Maddox at 6 p.m.

8. Adjournment

Motion by Commission Member Thompson to adjourn the meeting. Motion seconded by consensus of the Board. The meeting adjourned at 6:26 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 ____ day of _____, 2025.

Cynthia Nelson, 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.