

**TREMONTON CITY CORPORATION
PLANNING COMMISSION
MAY 27, 2025**

Members Present:

Micah Capener, Chairman
Karen Ellsworth, Commission Member
Andrea Miller, Commission Member
Mark Thompson, Commission Member
Ashley Phillips, Commission Member (alternate)
Jack Stickney, Commission Member
Raulon Van Tassell, Commission Member
Bret Rohde, City Councilmember
Jeff Seedall, City Planner
Bill Cobabe, City Manager—excused
Tiffany Lannefeld, Deputy Recorder

Chairman Capener called the Planning Commission Meeting to order at 5:30 p.m. The meeting was held May 27, 2025 in the City Council Meeting Room at 102 South Tremont Street, Tremonton, Utah. Chairman Capener, Commission Members Ellsworth, Miller, Phillips (alternate), Stickney, Thompson (arrived at 6:33 p.m.), Van Tassell, City Councilmember Rohde, Planner Seedall, and Deputy Recorder Lannefeld were in attendance. Manager Cobabe was excused.

1. Approval of agenda:

Motion by Commission Member Van Tassell to approve the May 27, 2025 agenda. Motion seconded by Commission Member Ellsworth. Vote: Chairman Capener – yes, Commission Member Ellsworth – yes, Commission Member Miller – yes, Commission Member Stickney – yes, Commission Member Thompson – absent, Commission Member Van Tassell – yes. Motion approved.

2. Declaration of Conflict of Interest:

Chairman Capener declared a conflict with items 4. a. and 5. a. During these discussions he sat in the audience, while Co-Chairman Van Tassell led the discussion.

3. Public Comments:

Spencer Smith said I am in one of the houses that were annexed along Iowa String. Preserving the country feel of that area is important. I also understand that growth needs to happen. My main takeaway from the last meeting was it is a win there is no multi-housing, like in the proposed plan we saw last time. I much rather prefer moving forward with the residential development than fight against commercial or other things trying to come in. If I were to tweak anything, I would like to see the R1-8 be R1-10 or R1-20

instead. Overall, I think the plan seems reasonable.

4. Public Hearing:

Co-Chairman Van Tassell called a Public Hearing to order at 5:36 p.m. to receive input on the rezoning listed below. There were 16 people in attendance.

- a. To receive public input on the zoning of the property referred to as the Riverfront Annexation (Tax ID Nos 05-200-0016).

Resident Jason Ellsworth said I have a comment about the floodplain. The zoning needs to be considered with the flood level, the road level and the amount of square footage that is around those.

Planner Seedall said the proposed zoning is RM-16. The parcels across the street and adjacent to 100 are all zoned RM-16. This matches the zoning in the area. We will be extremely sensitive to the floodplain. Through the process of development, we will identify and figured out where that 100-year floodplain is. The landowner is waiting to get the zoning in place before they start designing. Councilmember Rohde said the annexation is the first step. The engineering will address the other issues.

Co-Chairman Van Tassell closed the Public Hearing at 5:43 p.m. Chairman Capener rejoined the Commission and called a Public Hearing to order at 5:43 p.m. to receive input on the rezoning listed below. There were 16 people in attendance.

- b. To receive public input on the rezoning of parcels 05-175-0030 and 06-059-0082 from R1-12 to R1-8.

A resident asked about capital expenses, saying I have family who lives up there and they still do not have secondary water. How do we make sure it benefits the existing citizens without taxing infrastructure when what we are already supposed to put in still has not been added. Citizens need to know how much we are planning to invest or what the impact will be. Do we have a net benefit? Does it lower or increase our taxes? What does it do? Can that be provided before it is approved by the Commission. I think it would be beneficial for everyone to know the impacts on the rest of us and what the City is paying.

Aaron Tesch said I live there and have some concerns. Currently there is only one way out. They have plans to add a second access, which is good, but realistically nobody is going that way to go into town. Lots of kids live along that road. I worry about increased traffic and now we want to take them from R1-12 down to R1-8. That is going to add a lot more homes. I have lived there five years and two of those years have had serious flooding. Pumps were running all the time and neighbors had to rip out drywall. I hope that is being addressed, but I do not know how you address it

since it is runoff that seeps into the mountain and then comes out where the current homes exist. Those homes are already at a risk of flooding. The other concern, is having water. I worry how it is going to affect water pressure. Over time my pressure has slightly decreased and my sprinkling system does not cover like it used to.

Michael Allen said I voiced my opinion at the last meeting and I just want to reiterate that. We do not want multi-dwellings south of the freeway. We want to maintain a country feel and a place where you know your neighbors. The country feel, in that when people move in, they will accept the fact that there are horses, cows, sheep and goats, and not make a stink about it. They will not try to force the City to change and get rid of that country feel. I have seen that happen in other places. People move in and kick farmers out. We do not want that. We want to maintain that feel of country living. That can be done as we zone it for anything, but high-density housing. Again, we need to take into consideration Iowa String which is a two-lane road. If we put additional traffic on that road it is going to be difficult. There are times even now that the big trucks actually rattle my home. Engine breaks are used and it is not controlled or monitored. People go down that road faster than 45 mph. That has to be considered if we increase the amount of traffic on that road. My solution is not to zone it as anything but single-family dwellings and do away with the multiple housing.

Kristi Bowcutt said again what is the cost going to be to taxpayers with these developments as they come in? As taxpayers we deserve to know. Is there going to be extra expenses with water storage that the residents are going to have to pay for? Who is going to pay for the lift station and pump station? Is it going to be the taxpayers? I think that is something the City needs to start disclosing.

Chairman Capener closed the Public Hearing at 5:52 p.m.

5. New Business:

- a. Discussion and consideration of zoning of the property referred to as the Riverfront Annexation (Tax ID Nos 05-200-0016)

Chairman Capener stepped down again and Co-Chairman Van Tassell took over. Commission Member Miller said I am fine with it. A lot of the concerns will be addressed with the engineers. We as a Planning Commission do not have that control or responsibility. Commission Member Ellsworth said I agree with you, but I disagree too, only in the way of making sure that we understand what we are zoning for. As long as it cannot be abused in any way. Do we understand what we are doing and could we have any kickback? I agree we will have engineers, but it starts with us so we have to make sure we understand what we are doing. Commission Member Stickney said I like the idea of having it zoned similarly to the adjacent properties. That makes sense.

Motion by Commission Member Stickney to recommend the Council

approve the proposed zoning. Motion seconded by Commission Member Ellsworth. Vote: Chairman Capener – abstained, Commission Member Ellsworth – yes, Commission Member Miller – yes, Commission Member Stickney – yes, Commission Member Thompson – absent, Commission Member Van Tassell – yes. Motion approved.

- b. Discussion and consideration of rezoning of parcels 05-175-0030 and 06-059-0082 from R1-12 to R1-8.

Planner Seedall said we have met with the developer and are looking at doing the base density of R1-8 using the PUD ordinance to get creative approaches to land development. We have discussed needs for secondary water in the area and the elevations. At 4,600 feet the pressures get too low to meet code and so there will have to be a new water tank established on the hill as part of the capital infrastructure. The sewer also will have to be extended down 1000 North. Those are two of the larger capital costs facing the development. With that, they would like to get extra density to help pencil those costs. The PUD decreases the setbacks. Both concepts have been in front of the DRC. There has been a lot of good discussions. When asked about the difference in density, Planner Seedall said they would go from 12,000 to 8,000 square feet or about three and a half units per acre to a little over five units per acre. The developer will work with the City to dedicate a park space on the hill. There could be other amenities like pickleball and basketball courts. They would also have a walking trail interconnected and around the entire perimeter. The goal is to have different levels of housing. The Commission spent time discussing setbacks.

Chairman Capener said we ought to have our public works director discuss future water. We need the housing, but at some point, we have to expand the water equally with all these projects. We are not really allocated water at this stage—we are just subdividing property. I do not want these developers spending millions to put in roads and secondary infrastructure and then when they go to pull a permit, we do not have the water. Going from R1-12 to the R1-8 would essentially allow an additional 228 units. The Commission then reviewed culinary and secondary.

Chairman Capener said if we do not rezone to R1-8 they lose density, which makes the cost of lots and homes more expensive. He is trying to make them attainable. The proposal right now is 658 units. On his design it would be 176 more units with the rezone and roughly 7.6 units per acre. Commission Member Van Tassell said my concern stems from the original concerns of our last meeting. A lot of people are concerned about high density housing. We are having the same conversation in every other meeting. Before I feel confident about deciding this, I would like to know what is the cost to the City? The real hard numbers of what it costs and I think that is what everybody is concerned about. What does it

mean to our budget and how does it affect it realistically? You will have more use, more traffic and higher wear and tear.

The Commission discussed density and housing throughout Tremonton. Planner Seedall discussed impact fees and exactions to help the Planning Commission better understand the development process. Exactions are one way cities can work or require development to help pay for itself. Impact fees are probably not keeping up with inflation, but going through an impact fee study is not cheap (about \$80,000 per utility). Other exactions are water shares for the secondary system. Developers are required to donate those to the City. Exactions are what the City can force upon developers. The State has outlined when and how fast the City has to use those impact fees for systematic improvements. Chairman Capener said by putting more units in the same amount of dirt that means we have less irrigatable acreage. Multi-family units are inherently known for less water per unit. The actual usage is much less than a traditional home. Councilmember Rohde said emergency services will increase with an increase in density. We need to make sure the fees from the real estate taxes from new people moving in are going to cover the costs of additional needs for police and fire. We should have an officer for every 800 people. The other thing is we do not really have a good economic base. We have some good businesses in town, but we could do a lot more. If others would come and if we had restaurants and more sales tax that would easily cover these things. They go hand in hand. Commission Member Miller said all this discussion is great, but no matter the zoning they are still going to have high density housing with the PUD, it will just cost people more. I say we recommend it because they are going to have multi-family housing units. It is going to be a mix. Commission Member Van Tassell said the lots up there are pretty big so it is going to change the neighborhood. People will look at it and notice a difference. Chairman Capener said they will buffer around those. Commission Member Stickney said I can imagine they would fit in just fine on the hill. Chairman Capener said if they get all the bonus density allowed, it would increase the lifestyle of the area with a park, a walking trail and pickleball courts. They will have some smaller homes, townhomes and bigger homes, but I think it will be a good living environment versus just having the same size homes with no amenities.

Motion by Commission Member Stickney to accept the zone change and recommend it to the City Council. Motion seconded by Commission Member Miller. Vote: Chairman Capener – yes, Commission Member Ellsworth – yes, Commission Member Miller – yes, Commission Member Stickney – yes, Commission Member Thompson – absent, Commission Member Van Tassell – no. Motion approved by a 4-1 vote.

- c. Discussion and consideration of zoning of the parcels within the LB Land Holdings Annexation.

Planner Seedall said the PUD would only apply to the R1-8 and R1-10 zone. Chairman Capener said the PUD would allow multi-family housing if they meet the PUD points. Planner Seedall said we are looking at having more to account for the large open space requirement due to stormwater needs. Tremonton does not have any stormwater infrastructure in the area so they will have to retain that runoff. We have discussed how to creatively approach that. We would find a creative way to have a developed park as part of the neighborhood to account for the large stormwater. Due to this some multi-family housing would be allowed. We would limit the amount of attached multi-family, but we are looking at having some smaller densities plus greater densities. That density level could bring enough units to help with the capital cost of the lift station and other utilities that will have to be constructed to service this area. They are trying to get enough units to cover the cost. The developer will work with the existing owners to meet their infrastructure needs. To make that price attainable he is asking for the R1-8 not the RM-8. He believes he can meet both goals with the R1-8 density in the PUD. The reason the annexation got to this size is for the one regional lift station that will service everything along Iowa String. That is most economical for the City in the long run. Councilmember Rohde said this has been redesigned so there is no multi-housing, it is all single-family housing. Planner Seedall said there is no multi-family density, but the PUD will allow for some. We are working on restricting how much. Chairman Capener said but they have to meet all the points, like providing open space, there are a bunch of points they have to meet to get the extra density.

The Commission asked how many homes have had issues with septic in the area. Resident Michael Allen said there are four homes in our subdivision that I am aware of that have seasonal septic tank issues. They were all built by the same builder from the Salt Lake area who has since gone bankrupt. He did not know what he was doing. Our house has had absolutely no problems whatsoever with septic. We were happy to not be annexed. We have West Corinne water and a well. The City will force us to have their secondary water and if we do not use it we still get charged. Resident Bonnie Ellis said I have had a septic tank for 50 years and have never had an issue.

Councilmember Rohde said I would ask you not to make a decision tonight because we told them we would listen before we made a decision.

Motion by Commission Member Stickney to table the item until after the planned public meeting. Motion seconded by Commission Member Miller. Vote: Chairman Capener – yes, Commission Member Ellsworth – yes, Commission Member Miller – yes, Commission Member Stickney – yes, Commission Member Thompson – yes, Commission Member Van Tassell – yes. Motion approved.

6. Planning Commission comments/reports: None.

7. Adjournment

Motion by Commission Member Ellsworth to adjourn the meeting. Motion seconded by consensus of the Board. The meeting adjourned at 7:21 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)(b) at the discretion of the presiding member of the public body,** a topic raised by the public may be discussed during an open meeting, even if the topic raised by the public was not included in the agenda or advance public notice for the meeting.