

**TREMONTON CITY CORPORATION
PLANNING COMMISSION
JUNE 24, 2025**

Members Present:

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

Chairman Capener called the Planning Commission Meeting to order at 5:30 p.m. The meeting was held June 24, 2025 in the City Council Meeting Room at 102 South Tremont Street, Tremonton, Utah. Chairman Capener, Commission Members Ellsworth, Miller, Stickney, Thompson, Van Tassell, City Councilmember Rohde (via Zoom), Manager Cobabe, Director Seedall, and Deputy Recorder Lannefeld were in attendance. Commission Member Phillips was excused.

1. Approval of agenda:

Motion by Commission Member Ellsworth to approve the June 24, 2025 agenda.

Motion seconded by Commission Member Van Tassell. Vote: Chairman Capener – yes, Commission Member Ellsworth – yes, Commission Member Miller – yes, Commission Member Phillips – absent, Commission Member Thompson – yes, Commission Member Stickney – yes, Commission Member Van Tassell – yes. Motion approved.

2. Declaration of Conflict of Interest: None.

3. Public Comments:

Christine Epling said over the past month, I have studied the City Land Use Plan and the principles of plan-based development and read Utah's Land Use. It states that my role as a resident is to offer contrasting perspectives, provide community insight and speak up when issues affect the integrity of community. Tonight, I am here to offer perspectives that might have been overlooked regarding item 5. b. I am not opposed to the City's long-term vision of this area eventually becoming an urban hub if and when the infrastructure is in place, such as freeway access and other supporting services. We are not there yet. The area in question is not even mapped on the current Land Use Plan. Today, it is surrounded by agricultural land, one to two-acre rural lots and open space. Future

adjacent zoning recommends single-family houses on moderate lots around 12,000 square feet, not dense multi-housing. My concern is not about the future vision, but the timing. Introducing high density, new housing in an area that is disconnected from services, schools and transits would be premature. It conflicts with the plan's own guidance to build in a way that is complementary to the existing look and feel of the area. I also think we need to pay close attention to balance. With 953 single-family houses and 1,238 multi-family units already approved, City growth is tipping toward higher density. Infrastructure has not caught up, especially on Iowa String. We have already seen the consequences of letting development get ahead of infrastructure, like 1000 North where 71 homes were approved without sidewalks and safe road access. Iowa String is even busier and far less prepared. The City as a whole is showing signs of strain. Schools are over capacity. At the most recent Council meeting, the police chief stated that the department is already operating at full capacity and cautioned that additional growth would stretch resources. The same concerns apply to our fire department. All of these realities must be considered carefully when approving zoning changes. Growth without an adequate support system puts families at risk. I understand the need for affordable housing. High density development would stretch our infrastructure, not strengthen it. More people mean more pressure, roads, police, parks, and schools, not necessarily more income. Development should not drive infrastructure; infrastructure should guide development. Placing dense housing on the outskirts, detached from the community core without safe roads or parks, do not serve families or the City well and creates more long-term strain. I respectfully ask the Commission to align with the City's plan, not just in vision, but in readiness. Zone this area in a way that fits the present landscape and supports balanced growth and sets the City up for success when the time is truly right.

Kelly Wood said I am also concerned about item 5. b. the annexation and zoning of that property. I live and grew up out there. Obviously, it is a rural area. We are not opposed to growth or outsiders. We feel outsiders have enriched our community and neighborhood, but it is the type of growth we are opposed to. We have one to two acre lots on agriculture land. That is what fits in that area. In the last few planning meetings, I have heard a lot of talk about efficiency. What is efficient for our community? As a social worker, I learned early on that we should focus on what is effective over what is efficient. When looking at our schools, we are taking a track that is not effective for our community. We are doing what is efficient and it is causing a lot of harm. I attended the school board meeting last month. McKinley and North Park, which feeds over 2,000 new units recently approved in their boundary. This is without any of that growth. They already have 16 cubicles classrooms and are teaching in hallways and gymnasiums. We do not have any schools approved for the kind of growth we are allowing. The survey that the City did shows we value open space and rural character. Over 90% of the residents said, we are concerned about roads and safety. If you look at the current Land Use Plan and the priorities set, that is to preserve the rural agriculture feel of this community, to preserve open space, which is important out where we have larger lots, to preserve the agriculture area. I feel passionate that we have a responsibility to bring people in that will enrich and grow our community, but especially to the people that are

already there that have built those areas, that we preserve the values of our agriculture and rural heritage, that they are respected, protected and preserved, and that we develop with a preservation mindset.

Jami Poppleton said thank you for allowing this to be YouTubed, but I received a message saying all they see is the screen. Can we get that fixed? There are a lot of people interested in this and being able to see it along with the Council meeting.

Danielle Barfuss said LB Land Holdings is new ground on Iowa String that is going to be developed. Are the lots or homes going to face Iowa String because that will affect the flow of traffic. Will the speed limit be knocked down to 25 miles per hour? Are the outlets going to go to Rocket Road? It is already a pain in the butt trying to get into Tremonton now with Tremont Street only being 25 miles per hour. In the Harvest Village development, they are parking on the gravel on Rocket Road. Is that going to be a common thing because we already face enough issues trying to see through that hill when cars come up and are speeding. I called Sierra Holmes and asked them to move their sign back because it was blocking the vision of the road. I know there is going to be growth in Tremonton, but infrastructure is key. Are we taking into consideration all these things when we are planning developments? I do not feel we are. The parking on Tremont Street is a mess. Somebody is going to get hurt. It is just getting out of control.

Kyle Jeppesen said I am an engineer at Hill Air Force Base. One of the many reasons I decided to make my home here in Tremonton is because of the rural characteristic of the community. I do not want to live in Ogden, Roy or any of those closer communities to Hill Air Force Base. This makes my commute 45 minutes, which I have been told by many of my colleagues is a very long commute. Again, I chose that because of the rural characteristic here. I wanted to live here. I think there are many others like me who are willing to commute because of the rural characteristic that is here. Townhomes are considered high density housing in a rural characteristic area. I feel that the most effective zoning for this property that could maintain the rural characteristic of the community is one acre lots.

Ben Hunsaker said I have been in this area for 90 years. There are tile lines and drainage districts in this area. Some of them were put in back in the turn of the century. The main line was put in the 60s, which I worked on myself. If those lines are disrupted there will be hundreds of acres of farmland that will be absolutely useless. That is why they put these lines in over a hundred years ago. I do not know if anybody knows what they are dealing with. There is a document called the Utah Code, and it deals with tile lines and drainage districts. I gave a copy to Councilmember Vance some time ago. If you have not heard of it or seen it, it would pay you to look at that very earnestly. This is a bigger problem than you think. I appreciate your concern.

Jamie Crowther said according to Workforce Services, the major employer in and around Box Elder County, specifically Tremonton was manufacturing. I think manufacturing is a

major employer of this area and there is a need for people coming in, but it is concerning to me as a resident. We have a lot of people coming in and working but look at our schools. How many Title I schools do we have in this area. A Title I school is reflective of medium income. There needs to be a balance to support Title I schools. Is there a possibility to make higher end home availability for bigger lots, which might bring a different demographic of people compared to multi-family housing on smaller acreage? Is there consideration of who we are drawing to the City? Who we draw will eventually end up in our schools and be employed here. Could we hold off on multi-family developments or so much development. How are we going to take care of all these people coming in? How are we going to support them with food and roads? Is downtown Tremonton accommodating to the people who are coming in? Is traffic flow good? Rocket Road is horrible as far as the road goes. Will that be fixed and what is the timeline? More people are coming into the City using these roads is there consideration of that? We are approving developments because we need it, but are we making it available to all different types of demographics? There needs to be an equal balance of housing. Are we drawing in bigger acreage sizes for people who want them? As we approve and develop what is the demographic we will bring here? What type of people? Where are they working and commuting to? Do we want them to stay here to work, eat and recreate or are we just making it so they are going somewhere else to do those things? I would like to see them come here and stay here, shop and support local.

Kim Detweiler said I taught at McKinley Elementary and now teach at Garland. I want to tell you about the impact of more and more apartments as a teacher. I know not all apartment livers are a problem, but I see more vandalism in McKinley and Garland bathrooms and the whole school. There are colors for testing. At McKinley half are in the red and half are in the green. We are losing that middle ground. Garland used to be significantly green and blue and a little red, but that is now shifting. We are getting lower. We cannot hardly have community activities because of the quantity of children. There is no parking and no places to put people. It is really breaking up this sweet feel of community. What kind of people do we want to draw? Those who build apartments get paid every month no matter who lives there. Those people are not going to complain. Our taxes are going to increase, and we are the ones who are going to drive through the congestions and be victims of the population. I wish we could step back and put on the brakes for a minute to evaluate what we really could do for the benefit of all of us.

Jim Peterson said we have this pressure to try to do things or if we do not it will develop within the County and the City will be stuck with it. What brother Hunsaker shared tonight should put the City on oneness because these tile lines are a big deal. Building on those will interrupt the flow. Water will come up in those immediate properties, especially during a wet season. I think there needs to be some wisdom and stepping back and truly taking into consideration the points he raised, along with other social economic impacts. I can appreciate the pressure developers make and petitioning to get a decision to move ahead, but these are long-term consequences that the City is facing, and that we as residents, the county are coming in as uninvited. We have no right to vote. We have no

input into what is going on in the City, yet we are 100% impacted by it.

4. Approval of minutes—May 13, 2025 & May 27, 2025

Motion by Commission Member Van Tassell to approve the minutes stated above.

Motion seconded by Commission Member Ellsworth. Vote: Chairman Capener – yes, Commission Member Ellsworth – yes, Commission Member Miller – yes, Commission Member Phillips – absent, Commission Member Thompson – yes, Commission Member Stickney – yes, Commission Member Van Tassell – yes. Motion approved.

5. New Business:

a. Discussion and consideration for new Head of Planning Commission

After some discussion the Planning Commission nominated both Commission Members Thompson and Van Tassell. Commission Member Van Tassell received the most votes and was recommended as the new Chairman after Director Seedall puts together a resolution for approval by the City Council.

b. Discussion and consideration of LB Land Holdings

Director Seedall said LB Land Holdings feel it would be hard to develop with the amount of capital improvements to service this development. They are worried about their ability to cash flow positively with less units than the R1-8. They will add a lift pump and loop both the drinking water and secondary water from the Rocket Road and Iowa String intersection over to and under the railroad tracks toward the Harvest Acreage development. The lift station is a large capital improvement, but the water lines are not a small feat either. The key will be having land around the lift station so if it needs to be upsized or overhauled, we already have the square footage in place to do that without having to do massive renovations to the entire site. I would recommend we get some kind of zoning in place, so it has regulations on it. Right now, it does not have anything. We are waiting to get a recommendation from the Planning Commission before we start moving things along. This would allow the City to have a regional lift station along Iowa string instead of multiple ones. The developer is only responsible for his development. Anything above is a negotiation. Development agreements help with that. This zoning and these densities have been part of what has been going on for over a year trying to work through bringing the utilities to existing residents while also making it economical for the City to have this area as part of its service district.

When asked about the R1-8 zoning, Director Seedall said they are 8,000 square foot lots. The developer has expressed doing more of a conservation subdivision. The approach through the whole State is to keep those units together to reduce construction costs but also to promote open space through trails and park

amenities. The PUD and the conservation approach clusters them so you can have a variety of lot sizes. Townhomes would be closer to the cement plant, and we will look at not having driveway accesses onto roads. That is a group of demographics that accepts those kinds of living conditions better than having your backyard up against there. We would put extra density along environments where it does not make as much sense to have single-family homes. The zoning is the first step.

The Commission asked questions about the property and what the intent was when it was purchased. They also addressed questions from public comments and about property rights. Will the roads be widened and what steps will be taken to ensure flow and access. Chairman Capener said it all comes down to the codes. If the development triggers anything that is not infrastructure sufficient then the DRC makes them improve that. The reason one acre lots do not work is because our codes are so restrictive. We have to put huge roads in with sidewalks, curb, gutter and storm drainage. The City is built out in the internal sites and that is why it is stretching to the external pieces. The infrastructure is the whole component. We are going to leave the RR-1 and they will be serviced by sewer, which currently are not. We are leaving this parcel in the middle to allow enough to fund all of these improvements to the infrastructure. The other zonings are not part of the bonus density. The R1-8 only allows multi-family if they dedicate open space and meet all the points. Manager Cobabe said if you were to approve this zoning that would establish a base density. The base density is the number of units you give in an R1-8 zoning district. Under the PUD you take that base density (x number of units) and if they put in open space and give other amenities, then they get considerations for that up to a 50% increase. There are two major considerations you should be thinking about. First, what is the highest and best use of this land. Is that one acre lots or something more dense? The next question you have, and that includes the infrastructure and other things the developer would bring to the table, is this the right time and place for those things? This is very subjective. Broad discretion is given to planning commissions and councils in making these decisions.

When asked about the drain tiles, Director Seedall said the City Engineer has maps of where we believe those tiles are. We discuss those during the review process and have design standards to repair or reroute them if construction goes through them. The Commission spent time addressing lift stations and how they function. Director Seedall said granting more density in this area helps with affordability and helps the developer take on the risks of the development. The City gets rewarded with the infrastructure without having to put as much down.

Director Seedall said the Planning Commission reviewed and adopted the Integrated Land Use Plan my first few meetings on Planning Commission. It is 170 pages and shows this area as industrial. It was going to be commercial and

residential. I think personally this is an area where some commercial could work. When asked about growth triggering new schools, Director Seedall said I have been trying to create a better relationship with the school district. They are looking to develop 15 acres at some point. Manager Cobabe said the current temperature in this room is, please do not do this, but at some point, a group of people decided this was the way to go. I am interested in the disparity of a disconnect. This document is intended to be an aspirational document. It will take 20 to 50 years; however, decisions we make now influence the direction it goes in the next 20 years and beyond.

There was discussion on connectivity and other services. Commission Member Van Tassell asked about transit. How do we get across town, legitimately, that is a concern. Main Street as it sits is not an adequate throughput. You cannot get through Main Street with increased population and hardly now with what we have. Maybe we do lean on this a bit, and we say we want to focus all our attention on getting across town.

Commission Member Thompson said we want to stay a small town, but we want what is best for all of us to be able to have the amenities everybody is asking for. We are between a rock and a hard place, but I think growth is what is going to happen one way or another. Manager Cobabe said the decision is will this be a housing zone or an industrial zone and it sounds like the people who live there want housing. Then it is a matter of what kind of housing and lot sizes do we want. For some reason we are letting R1-8 drive this discussion. It could be R1-10 if the R1-20s were down to R1-10. It just has to be feasible. I do not want to feel like we are making a decision because our developer needs to pay for all the infrastructure. We can work with our developers and the people and figure out a ways to do this, but we need to decide what is best for Tremonton in that area and not let the developer drive that. Tonight, the Planning Commission is making a recommendation to the City Council, who will make the final decision in the future. If the developer wants to do a PUD for the property that will be a separate public hearing and there will be more legislative items. We will do a development agreement which will create more chances to discuss and fine-tune things.

Motion by Commission Member Miller to recommend the rezoning to the City Council as proposed. Motion seconded by Commission Member Thompson. Vote: Chairman Capener – yes, Commission Member Ellsworth – yes, Commission Member Miller – yes, Commission Member Phillips – absent, Commission Member Thompson – yes, Commission Member Stickney – yes, Commission Member Van Tassell – yes. Motion approved.

- c. Discussion and consideration of 1.08 Commercial and Industrial Zones

Motion by Commission Member Van Tassell to table this item. Motion

seconded by Commission Member Miller. Vote: Chairman Capener – yes, Commission Member Ellsworth – yes, Commission Member Miller – yes, Commission Member Phillips – absent, Commission Member Thompson – yes, Commission Member Stickney – yes, Commission Member Van Tassell – yes. Motion approved.

7. Planning commission comments/reports:

Chairman Capener brought up a sidewalk that is missing from a subdivision and if it could be installed. Director Seedall would be out of town so the second Planning Commission meeting in July would be canceled.

8. Adjournment

Motion by Commission Member Van Tassell to adjourn the meeting. Motion seconded by consensus of the Board. The meeting adjourned at 7:26 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.