

**TREMONTON CITY CORPORATION
DEVELOPMENT REVIEW COMMITTEE
SEPTEMBER 17, 2025**

Members Present:

Jeff Seedall, Chairman & Community Development Director
Andrew Beecher, Assistant Public Works Director
Chris Breinholt, City Engineer
Zach LeFevre, Parks and Recreation Director
Carl Mackley, Public Works Director
Linsey Nessen, City Manager
Tiffany Lannefeld, Deputy Recorder

Chairman Seedall called the Development Review Committee Meeting to order at 9:32 a.m. The meeting was held on September 17, 2025 in the City Council Meeting Room at 102 South Tremont Street, Tremonton, Utah. Chairman Seedall, Assistant Director Beecher, Engineer Breinholt, Director Mackley, Manager Nessen and Deputy Recorder Lannefeld were in attendance. Mayor Lyle Holmgren was also in attendance for most of the meeting.

1. Approval of agenda:

Motion by Chairman Seedall to approve the September 17, 2025 agenda. Motion seconded by Director LeFevre. Vote: Chairman Seedall – yes, Assistant Director Beecher – yes, Engineer Breinholt – yes, Director LeFevre – yes, Director Mackley – yes, Manager Nessen – yes. Motion approved.

2. Approval of minutes— August 6, 2025 & August 20, 2025

Motion by Director Mackley to approve the minutes stated above. Motion seconded by Director Beecher. Vote: Chairman Seedall – yes, Assistant Director Beecher – yes, Engineer Breinholt – yes, Director LeFevre – yes, Director Mackley – yes, Manager Nessen – yes. Motion approved.

The following items were discussed out of order.

3. New Business:

a. Discussion and consideration Ridge North—Phase 2 Final Plat Dominique Rogers

The Committee first discussed the bridge that would be installed over the canal this winter. Mr. Rogers said the canal company has approved it, but they will get an official letter. The intersection has also been submitted to UDOT. Engineer Breinholt said on the turn lane I am worried about that 11 and a half foot receiving lane. It is too narrow. The Committee discussed how that crosswalk should flow for children going to school. Chairman Seedall said will you be completing the trail with Phase 2? Mr. Rogers said we are starting on the trail now. It is best to do in increments. Engineer Breinholt said we originally had the property dedicated to the City for the trail. The road will come out of the middle and connect, the property jogs. That trail would cross onto your site to

connect to the road. Can we get that adjusted to dedicate the rest of that trail to the City? The trail will continue north of 600 North on the other side of the canal. Chairman Seedall said so besides the changes for the striping at the intersection of 600 North and 200 West and changes to the plat boundary for the trail dedicated, are there any other comments before we give approval? Engineer Breinholt said I might have other comments when I send my notes, but nothing significant.

Motion by Chairman Seedall to approve Phase 2 on the condition of getting site plan approval from Engineer Breinholt. Motion seconded by Director Mackley. Vote: Chairman Seedall – yes, Assistant Director Beecher – yes, Engineer Breinholt – yes, Director LeFevre – yes, Director Mackley – yes, Manager Nessen – yes. Motion approved.

b. Discussion and consideration of Rivers Edge—Phase 5 Final Plat Nik Porter

Mr. Porter provided updates on River's Edge. Phase 1 is fully built out, and Phase 2 is close. Phase 3 will have apartments and will make the connection with UDOT. We had a bit of a delay working with the sandwich shop. I am also working with Rocky Mountain Power to move poles and then can finish that connection. I have missed the window to work in their UDOT right-of-way this year. We will finish the UDOT piece in the spring. Another weird delay we had are the pumps for the pump station. They are 95% complete. We hope to have that done this spring because all those homes need secondary water. I have to bring power to the pumps and Rocky Mountain Power wants a very specific right-of-way easement for it. That will go through the canal company's property. They have an agreement they want signed, but Rocky Mountain Power does not want to. The canal company hired an attorney to create an easement for this. Hopefully they can meet in the middle, but that is starting to stall out, too.

Mr. Porter then updated the Committee on Phase 5. Visionary would like to start that in the spring. This is pretty cut and dry. It is 26 homes. Engineer Breinholt said you have to have a paved, temporary turnaround at the end of this street because that is the end of the project. Hammer heads do not work well. This is not just a Public Works turnaround this is a fire safety turnaround. We do not want a cul-de-sac because we want it to connect in the future as development happens farther north. They discussed ways that could be redesigned. Mr. Porter said I will resubmit this. We might change what this looks like. Engineer Breinholt said that street needs to go through. That is the north-south direct route, so it needs to be continuous. We cannot have a 300-foot dead-end stub. Mr. Porter said at some point we need to have a conversation about River's Edge Master Development, which anticipated a PID (Public Infrastructure District). The park was intended to be built immediately using a PID. We did not go for a PID on this and now we need to have a conversation of what this looks like because everyone is going to want this park. When asked about the total number of units, Chairman Seedall said the total count in River's Edge is 702 with the eight-acre park. After more discussion, Engineer Breinholt said stormwater has to get down there and we need to construct that basin, rather than continuing to kick that can down the road.

Motion by Chairman Seedall to table River's Edge Phase 5. Motion seconded by Director Mackley. Vote: Chairman Seedall – yes, Assistant Director Beecher – yes, Engineer Breinholt – yes, Director LeFevre – yes, Director Mackley – yes, Manager Nessen – yes. Motion approved.

c. Discussion and consideration of Tremont Center—Phase 3B Site Plan Micah Capener

Mr. Capener said we made the updates you wanted adding the drive-through on the south. I got Golden West on board. They were supposed to send you the updated design. Originally, they wanted to do a shared driveway. We did not do the shared driveway, but we did the shared access on the south side so it will all connect. I moved the dumpster and will build that enclosure by the pond. I am going to add additional parking there. I am going to put the double dumpster there for all these buildings. We coordinated all the utilities with Golden West, so they stub to the west. I have some other tenants interested. Both buildings were designed for a drive thru. Rocky Mountain Power has got back with me, and we are going to bury those poles.

Mr. Capener then asked about adjusting the access to Main. The way UDOT had me design that is terrible. There is a point, and I wondered if I could cut that off. Would that break any rule? When people make the corner, they catch their tire on that point. It would just take the point off and not pop a tire. It will be easier when this parking lot is installed because you can come straight, but right now people have to double back, and they always catch their tire on that. Chairman Seedall said I wonder if it is worth mimicking the geometry over here and then having the curb come out this way. The other entrance is coming in on the other side with the light. Is that going to be a better turning radius to come in and then use this drive aisle all the way along.

Engineer Breinholt said the overall requirement for any dumpster has to be enclosed with a gate. The current standard is hard wall. Mr. Capener said EconoWaste opens the gates and then leaves them. The tenants and landlord do not have time to close them. We have to make sure they close the gates when they dump it. I think we should change that enclosure. The single dumpster enclosure is way too big. Matheson has a great design with walkways, so tenants do not have to open the gates. I plan to build the cement enclosure as a double. When I add these, it is going to exceed a single dumpster.

Mr. Capener said I submitted all this to UDOT. You probably saw details on the new access we have been going back and forth with. They want me to put curb and gutter along Main Street to the part we are not going to bury the canal. Engineer Breinholt said the RDA included burial of the whole canal. That is the way it is written and was in the agreement. Mr. Capener said if we had enough money. I do not think it says we have to bury it all. It just says if we bury it, we will get a reimbursement. There is no way we would have promised to bury the whole thing without any potential mechanism to reimburse. Engineer Breinholt said my understanding was that it was required as part of the whole thing. Chairman Seedall said it is a little vague because it says how many square feet of the canal have to be buried but does not give any dimensions of how to measure that. Engineer Breinholt said we need to look at it and make sure we are

following it. Mr. Capener said there is no feasible way that it will ever pencil. It is just too much. We proposed the CDA to say, if we can create and build the increment then we could use that money to bury it. In the process costs tripled and my numbers did not move. If we could build the increment, the proposal was to try to extend it to meet other Main Street and City improvement components.

When discussing the grocery store, Chairman Seedall said we had a conversation with them on the concept plan, but I have not seen a site plan application for approval. All our comments were relatively minor changes. Really the only two comments we had was, could we look at creating a better connection from the light back to Matheson with that road and making sure their storm drainage was worked out with the master plan.

The Committee spent more time talking about improvements and connections through the site. Mr. Capener said if anything, we could connect the sidewalk on the inside of the canal tying into that area so that it is walkable. I do not see us ever connecting that sidewalk on the other side of the canal. Chairman Seedall said I would like to see some circulation through it. I know there is sidewalk on the other side, and we can look at improving or widening that. We need to figure out what the RDA is in terms of getting the canal buried. I do not know how you bury the rest of that and get reimbursed unless we work on extending the RDA. Mr. Capener said I personally do not think burying this section of the canal is worth the money. It would be more valuable as Main Street improvements. We should have that conversation at a future date. Engineer Breinholt said we need to consider the whole thing and what Main Street is going to look like. That sidewalk should continue all the way along Main. We do not want to leave future residents with costs because we did not think this through. How is Main Street going to look? If we are changing the plan, then let us think about what it is going to look like. Let us not just leave it like it is. The original plan and vision for this whole site was that the canal would be buried, and the sidewalk would be extended. I understand the cost of burying it has skyrocketed. If that needs to change, we need to consider what it is going to look like long-term. At some point, somebody is going to want to improve all Main Street, and we need to consider this site. I am just saying we should consider how it should look in the future. If we are going to shift what we are doing, let us consider the long-term outcome. Mr. Capener said the agreement said I would bury it past the entrance in order to put that road that goes through and also connect it with the apartments. That was the only agreement, to my knowledge. The Committee also discussed the landscape plan.

Motion by Chairman Seedall for conditional approval pending receipt of a Landscape Plan and revisions to details matching the Public Works standards.

Motion seconded by Director Mackley. Vote: Chairman Seedall – yes, Assistant Director Beecher – yes, Engineer Breinholt – yes, Director LeFevre – yes, Director Mackley – yes, Manager Nessen – yes. Motion approved.

d. Discussion and consideration of Hillside Development Standards

Chairman Seedall said I have read them and think they are very good. I had a few

comments on what we would do for allowing densities to be transferred out of areas that are greater than 30%. It says, when determining density calculations areas with slopes above 30% shall be subtracted from the overall project area. Do we want to say that they cannot be developed or that the density could be transferred into actual developable areas? I like the idea because I would like our hillside to be preserved. Do we want to allow them to transfer those densities and cluster them? Engineer Breinholt said I think that complicates it a lot. I think it is just developable land and that is that. I like it without being able to do that. Chairman Seedall said with determining slope areas, I was going to require that they showed each of the different slope ranges as different colors on a slope analysis plan. (20 to 29%, 30 to 39% and 40% and above). That way we would be able to differentiate where those slopes are based on their topography. Director Mackley said I think that is a fantastic idea. Chairman Seedall said we could even have one that is 10% to 19% so we can see what is considered developable for structures. You can put lots on something that is a little steeper, but you cannot put the road on it. We would have to create a grading permit. The grading permit would be the submittal they would have to do to start doing any kind of mass grading. Director Mackley said we can handle that in our general review process. It is not that big of a deal either way. I am not sure we need to create a new permit. Engineer Breinholt said unless it is an issue for individual home sites, you can just restrict any grading until you have a final approved. I think a grading permit would not be bad to have, but I do think that can be incorporated into a construction drawing review or site approval. A home site can be handled through the building permit. I would rather have it at the final.

Chairman Seedall said one thing I was going to add is the requirement that any kind of structural retaining feature has to be on the uphill lot. I wanted to have a caveat in there. Any structural slope, any retaining wall has to be included on the uphill lot side. The retaining wall has to be completely on your property and not split down a property line. The downhill lot owner is not responsible for keeping your house afloat. In the next section, I was going to have roof drains piped and directed to the public right-of-way and connected into the storm drain system, so they are not flowing down slopes. That way we are connected directly to the storm drain system and do not have ponding and infiltration issues.

The Committee then discussed landscaping and preferred plants. Chairman Seedall said that is still in the works. We want drought and fire-resistant species. I am going to move that we work on adopting those. It will be incorporated into Title III with the rest of the zoning code. We would then take it to Planning Commission and City Council for ratification. Director LeFevre said along with that, I would like to look at something that does storm drain basins also. We have several large ones we have landscaped and we want those usable. Typically, I am over the mowing contract. Anything with a playground has always been considered parks and everything without a playground is considered Public Works. We want to update those, but as parks, we never have the manpower to do that, so we have always relied on Public Works to work together on projects. I just wanted to make sure we had a plan in place. Every year, we have a meeting with our mowing contractor to either update the contract and re-sign or go over

changes. Engineer Breinholt said I would like to add a standard for landscaping ponds as we go forward with these. It sounds like that is something that is needed. Director LeFevre said it needs to be big enough to be multi-use and used by residents in that area. The Committee will continue this discussion at a later meeting.

e. Walk-ins: There were no walk-ins.

4. Comments/Reports: None.

5. Public comments: No public comments.

6. Adjournment:

Motion by Director LeFevre to adjourn the meeting. Motion seconded by consensus of the Committee. The meeting adjourned at 11:36 a.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 Development Review Committee Meeting held on the above referenced date. Minutes 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.