

**TREMONTON CITY CORPORATION  
PLANNING COMMISSION  
SEPTEMBER 9, 2025**

Members Present:

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

Co-Chairman Ellsworth called the Planning Commission Meeting to order at 5:30 p.m. The meeting was held on September 9, 2025 in the City Council Meeting Room at 102 South Tremont Street, Tremonton, Utah. Co-Chairman Ellsworth, Commission Members Capener, Miller, Stickney, Thompson, City Councilmember Rohde, Director Seedall, and Deputy Recorder Lannefeld were in attendance. Chairman Van Tassell, Commission Member Phillips and Manager Nessen were excused.

1. Approval of agenda:

**Motion by Commission Member Miller to approve the September 9, 2025 agenda.**

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

2. Declaration of Conflict of Interest: None.

3. Public Comments:

Tiffany Purcell said, and I am here to represent some of the thoughts in my neighborhood. It is a beautiful neighborhood, we love it. We do not want to see higher density housing there. I have heard time and time again that we have to make sure we are protecting our property owner's rights, and I absolutely agree. I am not saying stop building. I am asking that we stop rezoning to a higher density. The hills are not safe for our kids. I feel having higher density housing really is a safety issue and every time this is brought up, I feel like we have a decent number of residents come here and say we do not want this. We would like to know that we are being heard. At the last planning meeting we had 10 to 15 people come up and say we do not want higher density housing. Shortly

after I heard everybody say oh you know what fixes all the problems is higher density housing. I am not sure we are being heard. We like the single-family homes and neighborhood feel. We do not want to change that. I ask for you not to rezone it. I am all for development, just not the rezone.

ChrisDean Epling said I am here to present a report that documents the concerns of a significant portion of my neighborhood. This report documents a clear message. The vast majority of residents oppose the zoning change as it is a step closer to multi-family housing. With a 43% response rate out of 281 households on Radio Hill, 80.9% of these households would support a special zoning area to prohibit all forms of multi-family housing. The top three concerns were increased traffic, strain on infrastructure and a change in the neighborhood's character. This clearly shows our community's desire to maintain a residential feel. The proposed zoning directly contradicts the City's own Integrated Land Use Plan. We also have serious fiscal and safety concerns about a proposal that has the potential to triple the number of houses on the hill. Has a formal trade study been conducted to determine the actual benefit or detriment to the City? We have vital questions that require professional response. Has a traffic study been conducted to ensure that 1000 North can handle the increased density? Has there been environmental studies regarding the landfill site and underground springs? We are here to protect our community values. As evidenced in our survey, residents overwhelmingly preferred single-family homes on large lots with R1-12 and Rural Residential being the top two zoning choices. This perfectly aligns with the current Land Use Plan. Deviation from a foundational document required solid evidence to justify the change. With the current rate of development, we are projected to meet the 2050 population outlined in the Integrated Land Use Plan within the next five years. That is a fundamental flaw that proves the plan is no longer a viable guiding document. As the land use institute handbook states, "the tendency is for government officials and citizens alike to skip the preliminary steps required to understanding the General Plan. Skipping such is short-sighted and more likely to fail if challenged and more likely to breed cynicism to those most affected." We are not just asking you to deny this request we are asking you to take a step back and engage in a collaborative process to create a plan that is capable of guiding our City's growth in a safe and fiscally responsible way. It would be wise to wait until a new viable plan is created. We are here ready to work with you but listen to us.

Eric Richardson said I also live in Spring Acres and feel we are not being heard. I do not know how many times we have to come back to similar committees or councils to say the same thing. We are asking to stay with the plan that was already created, specifically the zoning plan. We do not want to go to higher density housing. Just leave it at R1-12. I feel some City members and this committee are not working to serve the citizens. We have a plan in place, and some outside influence is pressuring you to deviate. Pressuring you to make more money. Not you individually, but if you can go to a higher density housing you put more homes in the City and that is what we are trying to avoid. We want to stay at the R1-12 for a couple of reasons. A couple of years ago, a House Bill came through about secondary water and the requirements for all communities in the State to become

compliant with metered secondary water. The concern was we are out of resources and do not have water. That specifically addresses the residential unit of irrigation. A home with secondary only consumes a .33 credit. If a home only has culinary water, it consumes a whole credit. By adding secondary water, you effectively triple the size of the City. We are on track to exceed our 2050 growth plan. That means we are growing faster than we would like. I do not understand why we are continuing to push the throttle and grow the City at increased densities. This has already been voted down multiple times. It has been punted from this committee and was punted and voted down by the City Council. Yet here we are again a third time. Our votes and voices should be compounded. It is as if this committee feels like if you stall long enough you do not have to listen to the people. Do not change the density, leave it as is.

Lisa Christensen said putting high density on the fringe of the City creates an infrastructure lag and the current Land Use Plan advises keeping high density near the urban hub.

Molley Teasdale said I live on the hill. I have heard several words repeated in these meetings—easiest solution and easiest route. Just because it is the easiest does not mean it is the best way to do it. We want it to be quality not quantity up there. Minimum requirements have also been repeated multiple times here. Why go for the minimum when you can reach higher? It just does not make any sense to me. As far as safety goes with kids and traffic you are going to add construction traffic. How are you going to keep everybody safe, especially if the speed limit is 40 mph. It is already scary. I want us to keep the integrity on that hill as is. I know there is a water shortage. If a fire breaks out while construction is happening, what are you going to do? Where are you going to get that water? I am not against growth; I just want you guys to do it the right way.

Marisha Menlove said I have a different perspective. I am a property owner and my family lives in Tremonton. I am all about sustainable growth and planned growth for the future. I have four kids and wonder how they are going to afford a place to live. A lot of the people we have heard from probably paid much less for their homes a long time ago. Their mortgage may be up to \$300,000 dollars a year. What can you buy for that now? I want all of my family to be able to live here. When the City has a plan of sustainable growth, developers can come in and help repair some of the infrastructure costs that may be lacking. The City gets money from taxpayers and developers from sales tax. I look at some of the City problems and ask the developers how can you solve some of these? If the road is dangerous, can you widen it? How close are you to a freeway entrance and exit? This development brings easy access to the freeway. It is going to solve some sewer and water pressure issues that are currently on the hill. I would assume that a lot of the kids who grew up on Radio Hill would love to live by their parents someday. This would provide a product that is attainable and sustainable for them.

Debbie Brantner said I have lived here most of my life. I have four children and only one of them still lives here. I do not see where that is a problem worrying about where our

children are going to live. I saw something on FOX 13 news talking about water issues. We live in a desert and do not get much rain here. Our dirt is in dire need. Building is taking on more water. They are telling us to conserve water, so we do. They also tell the farmers not to use so much water. We are taking the water away because we are building so much. We need the farmers to water so we have food. We are building all these darn houses so not our kids live here, but people from other areas. I do not agree with that. I think we need to slow down the flow of building and take care of ourselves. Let us take care of who already lives here.

Lisa Christensen said I just want to give some input from my perspective of my kids living here. We could not bribe our kids and give them property. They will not live here because we do not have enough in Tremonton. They have to drive to other places to fulfill their needs. I would like to see you focus more on bringing businesses, the things that will bring my kids back here.

4. Approval of minutes—August 12, 2025

**Motion by Commission Member Miller to approve the August 12, 2025 minutes.**

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

5. New Business:

a. Discussion and consideration of the Overlook Development rezone.

Director Seedall said Civil Engineer Chris Cave with Reece and Associates and Developer Seth Rosier with Lync Construction are here. We have been working with them to cover a lot of the capital infrastructure needs on the hill. We have had discussions about partnering to solve those issues. They have expressed interest in utilizing the Planned Unit Development code (PUD). Their plan is to take the base density for R1-10 and work on clustering denser units down by the road. There are single-family lots (10,000 square feet), too. I think there are four total product types over 86 acres to help diversify the housing we see in Tremonton and bring products that have had success in other counties. He also addressed the road flow and connectivity.

Civil Engineer Cave said we are planning on doing a 3.27-acre centralized park and another 12 acres of open space with trails so 18% of this project is open space. We are buffering existing homes with open space and larger lots. We will start at the bottom corner and work our way up. When we get where the water tank has to go, we will work with another developer on the neighboring property to put the water tank in to service this whole area. He is going to build a reservoir for secondary water that will service this area as well. Sewer is at this intersection

so we will bring it down to 1,000 North. The overall density is 6.5 units per acre. We are trying to transition things down, but Director Seedall wants the housing types mixed. That is why you have pockets of different types of units. The townhomes would be down in the first phase. These additional units help spread the cost of the water tank, the reservoir for secondary and running the sewer line. We are trying to make these units attainable. If you fill it up with 12,000 square foot lots, then we lose the open space, and it will just be a subdivision. Commission Member Miller said I like that six-pack concept. It is a benefit to have bike paths and walking paths rather than just big roadways for everyone to walk on. I love the idea of that six-pack lot because then you have all that walkability without having to worry about a driveway at each house. Developer Rosier said that is why master planning this way creates safety. This gives that runway for kids to play on and it keeps the maintenance down. In 25 years when the city has to redo those asphalt roads, this is way cheaper than doing cul-de-sacs. We are trying to structure the density, so it comes out and goes to the freeway, and the streets have flow. This location is the perfect place for density, being so close to the on ramp. This is where the growth should happen, on a hillside, not necessarily on farm ground. Also, the parks and trails will be open to the public. It is not private or HOA owned and maintained. It will be City maintained. The HOA will maintain the entrance and townhomes. Director Seedall said if the HOA wants it, they need to fence and sign it. We will work with them on clustering all of that open space as much as we can, so it makes sense for the City to have it maintained as a park.

Developer Rosier said when someone owns a home and someone rents a home with the same income and lifestyle, the person who owns has a net worth of around \$396,000, while the renter has a network of around \$10,000. We are trying to get attainable housing where you can buy a house for basically the same price of renting. If we cannot get attainable housing, people are going to be stuck renting. This development will allow us to follow the guidelines and requirements the State is putting in to meet requirements for attainable housing. Commission Member Miller said someone mentioned in the comments the external pressure we as a Planning Commission have. Our only external pressure is wanting to build people in Tremonton and their net worth. We want people to have a house here. It is us wanting to build a better life for the people. Developer Rosier said if you do not do master plan building like this, you just go back to the old ways and that does not work anymore. The cost and maintenance are too expensive.

The Commission reviewed some of the construction costs in today's Market, as well as requirements to improve a development. Developer Rosier said this is going to cost me about \$4 million dollars before I even get to my subdivision. If we do not have density to cover that, it makes it impossible. What brought me up here is the demand. The growth is coming, and buyers want to be here. If you do not plan correctly, you are just going to get subdivisions. A master

plan makes things flow and fit better. Five acres is not enough to work with the PUD and put your infrastructure in. You are stuck and only get new houses all in a square. That is not going to make your land use or streets better. If you do not do smart, planned growth then you are going to get the growth, but in a way that nobody wants. Growth is already here, let us do it right.

Commission Member Capener said all of the people who spoke, all of their homes and their subdivisions are what caused these problems. The traffic, water pressure and fire risk, all that was caused by the people who had already come in. This actually is a solution to those issues. He is essentially going to pay to fix all the problems. Co-Chairman Ellsworth said we know there are problems that need to be solved, and these guys are willing to solve them. If we want to listen to you as citizens and take what you are saying, we need solutions. Director Seedall said 6.5 units an acre is really close to the density that Archibald Estates and Visionary have. Those two areas on our Integrated Land Use plan are the same. That is in our plan for low to medium density. The 6.5 units per acre is on par with some of the master plan developments we have in Tremonton.

The Commission also reviewed traffic studies and how that would be handled. Developer Rosier said we do our own traffic studies because the last thing I want to do is build something like this and then something everybody hates. We have done our own traffic studies, and this is a great location. We would not invest and do all this if our traffic study said no. Commission Member Capener said there are multiple roads throughout the State that have two lanes and run 50,000 cars a day. The roads are capable if they are adequately sized and maintained. We are not even in the park of a traffic problem in my opinion. Commission Member Stickney said although there are safety concerns, I think this would improve safety for youth and students because we would be able to improve transportation to the schools.

Commission Member Miller shared a story about a family member dealing with something similar in their hometown. She went to every single planning and council meeting for months asking for things not to happen because they do not think it is going to be the best thing for their neighborhood or what they want next to them. Ultimately, it passed. She is excited about it now, but for a long time, she really opposed it. Overall, these boards determine what is going to benefit the community. It might not feel like this is the best thing for you right now, but ultimately, this could be of benefit to our area. I see you guys here every week and I know what you are feeling. I understand how much it sucks, but as a volunteer I am trying to choose what I think is best for the City. This zoning change could allow more people to come here and become homeowners and improve their net worth. To me, that is worth it. I understand how hard that is and that you feel like your voice is not being heard and I am really sorry, but I also think we are here to help make recommendations to Council that we think are best

for the entire city.

**Motion by Commission Member Miller to approve the zoning changes of the Overlook Development rezone from R1-12 to R1-10.** Motion seconded by Commission Member Stickney. Vote: Chairman Van Tassell – absent, Co-Chairman Ellsworth – yes, Commission Member Capener – yes, Commission Member Miller – yes, Commission Member Phillips – absent, Commission Member Thompson – yes, Commission Member Stickney – yes. Motion approved.

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

Director Seedall said all these changes are focused on the industrial districts. We have discussed this on and off for a few months, but other pressing matters have come up. Everything in red is a potential change. We are just changing how the zones are defined. We really wanted this in terms of a flex industrial/business park so you could have a hybrid between commercial and industrial uses. They have become quite popular through the Wasatch Front, where you have an office space in front with some manufacturing, light assembly type work in the back. These are not the types of businesses that get freight traffic normally associated with industrial. This is a good spot to get some startup businesses that do not have the noise or air pollution of heavy industrial. With light manufacturing and distribution, we start getting into a little bit heavier work where we have some conditional uses. We are okay if they are doing some traditional industrial work, but there has to be conditions set forth mainly because of the zoning they are adjacent to. Then we have our heavy manufacturing and distribution. That is for those who have freight traffic. We are trying to keep them close to the interstate, so they are not coming through town. Those are the changes we made to the manufacturing zone and are trying to make the definitions more robust. This is just a rundown and will be on October's agenda. I would love your input.

Commission Member Miller said I have a question on the residential facilities for elderly persons and persons with disabilities. It looks like the Chapter is crossed out. Director Seedall said I am working on pulling them out and combining them. Chapter 19 is quite extensive and there is a lot buried there. This is a use I think we might see coming as we continue to grow and would prefer those standards are out in a chapter that is more visible. I am also trying to combine them because there was a lot of duplicity between how they were broken out. Instead of having all the footnotes, I have worked with Sam Taylor from Landmark Design to make the special use regulations so they are in a legible font, and we can add to this if we feel like stuff in the use table needs to be defined further.

Director Seedall also reviewed changes to lot regulations. This is an item I have noted on my version to go through and continue to figure out. Commission

Member Capener said we need to bring up the commercial trash enclosure and have that conversation again. The more I have looked at it, the more I do not like it. It is really costly, and we need to revisit that.

Director Seedall said then we talked about the need to get a site plan permit. There is this infrastructure demand report. That is one of the required documents of the site plan application. They give us an anticipated water usage, wastewater generation and power demand. We will work with developers on this because some people just stick build their development and are not sure what is coming in. We will be flexible but want to communicate this information with Dominion Energy and Rocky Mountain Power as the service utility providers. Having a report that is concise will help keep all of us on the same page. Commission Member Capener said I like this and wonder if we need to go one step further and quantify the penalty. We would not want to approve someone who is all of a sudden taking 50% of our water system. It would be tough going back, but if we have a penalty in the code, it could help. Director Seedall said it might be nice to create an industrial business license, so they have renewals and when something is out it gives them a trigger to review discrepancies. They could pay that when they renew their operating license. Commission Member Capener said that way citizens do not have to subsidize the industry. Director Seedall said I love that idea and this would give us a basis of what information they are providing, what their anticipated use is as they are coming to build and if they are within those margins. Commission Member Capener said this would give us the ability to monitor and make sure they do not dramatically increase their use and take more impact. It all needs to be quantified, especially if we are going to open up hundreds of acres with the Inland Port. We do not want the City to be burdened with that potential risk. Director Seedall said it could also be used as an incentive to conserve water. If they come in under that we can rebate that business license. If you create a program to penalize the State also requires you to find a way to reward businesses for conservation acts. This will probably take me some time to go through, but it is a great idea to help incentivize conservation.

Commission Member Capener then asked about noise pollution. I wondered if the freeway would already exceed that standard in most of these industrial areas. How do you measure it in that instance? Director Seedall said in our noise standard, which is another chapter I have been planning to review. You can always get short bursts or something that exceeds that, but duration is key in noise pollution.

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



6. Planning commission comments/reports:

Director Seedall said the APA Fall Conference will be in Salt Lake on October 9 & 10. The Box Elder Annual Summit is September 24 from 9 a.m. to 2.30 p.m. Let us know if you are interested in attending those.

Commission Member Capener said we need to review our sign ordinance in a future meeting. Director Seedall then asked the Commission public comments at every meeting. The Commission agreed that it is vital, but the order in which they occur could be helpful. Commission Member Capener said presentations should be first then public comment and then the new business. Commission Member Stickney said at some point can we get a clear copy of this information without all the markups so we can digest it easier. Our Master Plan is definitely out of date for what we need to do nowadays. We ought to consider getting into that. I also want to express my appreciation for those who have made public comments. I enjoyed their comments and all the work that went into this report. I think we got a clearer understanding of how everybody feels, but also recognize we are in a different time when we need to consider something different.

7. Adjournment

**Motion by Commission Member Capener to adjourn the meeting.** Motion seconded by consensus of the Board. The meeting adjourned at 7:10 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.