

**TREMONTON CITY CORPORATION
PLANNING COMMISSION
JULY 8, 2025**

Members Present:

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

Chairman Van Tassell called the Planning Commission Meeting to order at 5:30 p.m. The meeting was held July 8, 2025 in the City Council Meeting Room at 102 South Tremont Street, Tremonton, Utah. Chairman Van Tassell, Commission Members Capener, Ellsworth, Phillips, Stickney, City Councilmember Rohde, Manager Cobabe, Director Seedall, and Deputy Recorder Lannefeld were in attendance. Commission Members Miller and Thompson were excused.

1. Approval of agenda:

Motion by Commission Member Ellis to approve the July 8, 2025 agenda. Motion seconded by Commission Member Stickney. Vote: Chairman Van Tassell – yes, Commission Member Capener – yes, Commission Member Ellsworth – yes, Commission Member Miller – absent, Commission Member Phillips – yes, Commission Member Thompson – absent, Commission Member Stickney – yes. Motion approved.

2. Declaration of Conflict of Interest: None.

3. Public Comments: None.

Chairman Van Tassell called a Public Hearing to order at 5:32 p.m. to receive input on amending the chapter listed below. There were five people in attendance.

4. Public Hearing:

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

There were no public comments. Chairman Van Tassell closed the Public Hearing at 5:35 p.m.

5. New Business:

Planning Commission

July 8, 2025

a. Discussion and consideration of rezoning of parcel 05-068-0075

Director Seedall said for 75 it is RM-16 and for 88 it is R1-10. The landowner believed they could get three, fourplexes in here with the setbacks. We have not seen a drawing yet. The site is going to be constrained by its general geometry and traffic safety so we will not get up to the maximizing density of RM-16. We would probably be looking at 9, maybe 10 units. We would probably do a private lane that accesses off the cul-de-sac. That would be a private lane with a hammerhead for a turnaround. This could be RM-8 and we would likely end up with the same unit count with the current layout that the landowner is proposing. On his application he said RM-16 so that is what I am bringing before you. This is an infill piece. The infill development is something our code does not have a lot of regulation for. Once you get down into three acres or less, you really get constrained on accessibility and setbacks. While you can develop your property, the general size does not allow for a lot of flexibility. I can add that as part of my to-do list to create a code that would help guide those infill decisions. They will continue to come as we grow.

When asked about potential obstructed views, Director Seedall said we have landscape and site triangle guidelines they will have to meet to protect that intersection. Chairman Capener said with the freeway right there, I personally think it would be a good buffer area between that and the residential. The Commission spent time discussing the City's General Plan that was adopted in 2002 and the Integrated Land Use Plan, adopted in 2023. Commission Member Stickney said there ought to be something written there that says we revisit the General Plan every so often. We could review it and see if changes ought to be made at least every five years. We ought to revisit and use it for guidance when these issues come up. Commission Member Van Tassell said I think it would dovetail into the infill planning really well. Let us make it look good, usable and profitable, with good standards. There are a lot of things not happening on Main Street. There are corridors we do not have. There are pieces we need in order to push past the next 10 years. I get the argument for small and affordable homes, but how do you get people across town? Where do you go when they are here? That is the other part of the discussion I want to have with infill and the new plan.

Commission Member Phillips said if we can see that they could only build RM-8, why not just give them RM-8? Director Seedall said I was going to have it meet whatever the recommended zoning is from the Planning Commission. We have not seen what the site layout actually looks like or received any engineering drawings because they do not know if they are going to get the zoning. The site constraints are going to limit how many units can fit. Manager Cobabe said one of the things you need to think about when you allow a zone change is what is currently allowed by the code. We have to think the worst-case scenario. If the code allows for something based on the zoning, you give that is what will go in. If

we allow this zoning that is what you will get on the property. If you want to recommend to the applicant they go with RM-8, please do not vote on that now. We are voting on this application which is for RM-16. We are recommending denial or approval. The developer could work with Director Seedall on a revised application at no additional fee. Commission Member Stickney said just looking at the neighborhood and taking into consideration that it would be accessed off that cul-de-sac, those four residents there now would not be too happy to have 16 units in that area coming through their front yard.

Motion by Commission Member Stickney to deny the request for an RM-16.

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

b. Discussion and consideration of rezoning of parcel 05-060-0088

Director Seedall said they are looking to rezone to R1-10 to match the rest of the residential development to the east. There is a house in the northeast corner that will have its own lot, and everything will be developed under the R1-10 guidelines unless the Planning Commission approves an overlay zone down the road. At two acres, there is not enough to do a PUD. Manager Cobabe said if someone bought it and wanted to keep it in its current use, animal rights would be grandfathered in. Director Seedall said where the road needs to go it is hard to get curves to match that. I have looked at all four acres and tried to figure out how to plan connectivity. That needs to be figured out to fit two or three homes.

Motion by Commission Member Stickney to recommend to the City Council to take it to R1-10. Motion seconded by Commission Member Phillips. Vote: Chairman Van Tassell – yes, Commission Member Capener – yes, Commission Member Ellsworth – yes, Commission Member Miller – absent, Commission Member Phillips – yes, Commission Member Thompson – absent, Commission Member Stickney – yes. Motion approved.

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

Director Seedall said Tremonton is expecting industrial growth in the short-term and long-term. Currently the Inland Port has about 250 acres ready to be used for industrial. The purpose of bringing it to the Planning Commission is to start a discussion with the changes we have put in place. We have worked it through a and it is ready to come here for consideration. Last time we asked what do we really want in the MFB zone, which is supposed to be a flex business park, less heavy industrial and more about commercial industrial blended space. Staff have

proposed a section reporting infrastructure impact and demand to quantify water usage, waste water generation, storm water practices and transportation demand trips. This will help the DRC have a better summary of what we can expect as industrial growth comes. That way we can better plan and start working on mitigation plans with the proposed industrial grouped. The other section included parameters around conditional uses and specific things like bulk storage. If you are going to have large material piles out back, what we do in terms of screening or accessibility and dust control. Here are the code and definitions. This area talks about creating buffer zoning between current commercial spaces and heavier industrial and trying to transition between those, so it is not such an abrupt change. There is also clarification between light manufacturing and hybrid manufacturing. They then reviewed the conditional uses. Knowing that new industrial growth is coming in, we are trying to get this passed so if we had an application for a new industrial park, we are ready. Manager Cobabe said they could look into incentives, but mostly what we do is set up a standard so that if a property owner needed to replace a fence, it would be upgraded to the new standard. Director Seedall said we can be patient with this review and approval process, but it is something I would like to have in place if the Inland Port triggered something. I am all for design standards, but I also do not want to write code that costs somebody an extra \$3 million per building because the building code is doing that well enough with construction costs. We are trying to make standards that will help protect the City's interests, but that also make sense. The Commission agreed to take some time to review this.

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

d. Discussion of Tremonton Center Community Development Project Area Report.

Manager Cobabe said this report is submitted to the Planning Commission yearly for your review regarding the status of the Community Development Project Area. It is a requirement per our contract with the Governor's Office of Economic Development. Nothing really new to report, just an extension of what happened last year. In short, the CDA area is doing really well. It is growing better than we had anticipated. The work is being completed and should be paid off sooner rather than later, which is good for the RDA because that will mean we have some additional money. When asked about covering the canal, Manager Cobabe said the developer completed the work and will be reimbursed by the RDA. The base year established what the value is at a certain period of time. As the value changes, either due to market conditions and through expenses or investments in

the property, that value changes. Those changes in taxes, minus the base year goes to the RDA to help pay for infrastructure and other projects in that area. Commission Member Capener said next year it will be fully paid off on the canal side and then there should be at least \$350,000 that can go toward reimbursing the City for projects. Ultimately, it can be used for whatever the RDA board decides. Manager Cobabe said we have about seven years left of potential growth. If things go the way they are, we are looking at \$2.5 million that we can invest in this RDA area. That is just the tax collection period. The RDA would continue until the funds are completely used up. We do not have to use them all within the seven-year period. We do have projects in place we are working on along the way. They do have to be within this area and for development that will enhance businesses in the area. One of the things we are considering could be facade grants. These are tax dollars that would have gone to the City, County and the School District mostly, there are some other smaller taxing entities that contribute. This was instead redirected to the RDA. Commission Member Capener said the vision was if we put a project together that would work, we could use the funds to rebuild Main Street. Just the apartments alone were assessed at \$77 million this year (\$443,000 taxes per year).

6. Planning commission comments/reports:

Director Seedall said the Utah League of Cities and Towns and the Utah Chapter of the American Planning Association have announced their fall conferences in Salt Lake the first part of October. Discounted tickets are available for citizen planners. Let me know if any of you are interested in going.

Commission Member Capener said in a future meeting can we review the off-premises sign. Visionary has been putting up signs all over. I wondered what the legality is.

7. Adjournment

Motion by Commission Member Capener to adjourn the meeting. Motion seconded by consensus of the Board. The meeting adjourned at 6:56 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.