

**TREMONTON CITY CORPORATION
DEVELOPMENT REVIEW COMMITTEE
OCTOBER 8, 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—excused
Linsey Nessen, City Manager
Tiffany Lannefeld, Deputy Recorder

Chairman Seedall called the Development Review Committee Meeting to order at 9:42 a.m. The meeting was held October 8, 2025 in the City Council Meeting Room at 102 South Tremont Street, Tremonton, Utah. Chairman Seedall, Assistant Director Beecher, Engineer Breinholt (via Zoom), Manager Nessen (left at 9:48 a.m.) and Deputy Recorder Lannefeld were in attendance. Director Mackley was excused.

1. Approval of agenda:

Motion by Chairman Seedall to approve the October 8, 2025 agenda. Motion seconded by Assistant Director Beecher. Vote: Chairman Seedall – yes, Assistant Director Beecher – yes, Engineer Breinholt – yes, Director LeFevre – yes, Director Mackley – absent, Manager Nessen – yes. Motion approved.

2. New Business:

- a. Discussion and consideration of the site plan application for Golden West Credit Union—Erik Molberg and Butch Campbell

They discussed the geo tech report and storm drain system. Engineer Breinholt said I always have concerns with underground stormwater. The groundwater is fairly shallow. I am not sure it will work out there. Another issue is the release rate for this whole site is less than what was modeled. Mr. Molberg explained their plan for stormwater retention and detention on site and how that would flow to follow protocol. Engineer Breinholt said that would come down to an agreement between Golden West and the landowner. Mr. Molberg said we are developing agreements, both cross-access and drainage, with the master developer. I know he is working with another entity that wants to develop a property to the north of us. We can adjust it to City standards. Chairman Seedall said I am good with the site layout. I would make a motion we table this pending further clarification on stormwater drainage. Everything else on the site looks good. If Engineer Breinholt has comments, we will add them into what we send out and put through Civic Review.

Motion by Chairman Seedall to table the item. Motion seconded by Director LeFevre. Vote: Chairman Seedall – yes, Assistant Director Beecher – yes, Engineer

Breinholt – yes, Director LeFevre – yes, Director Mackley – absent, Manager Nessen – absent. Motion approved.

- b. Discussion of Island Park (formerly known as the Junction)—Trevor Williams, Dale Bennett and Mark Stevenson, Chris Poulsen joined via Zoom

Mr. Williams provided an update and explained the summary that was sent. We hope to answer any questions or concerns and nail this down. We would also like to understand the process for submitting for approval. What are the steps between now and final approval? Chairman Seedall said our City Engineer had comments that were forward to you, but those are things that can be easily addressed. The Committee reviewed the layout and accesses. Mr. Williams said currently as designed, it would serve as access to storage only, not the residential, and it serves as a fire emergency exit. It would provide a secondary access. Engineer Breinholt said but it is not a full road. I think we need to provide a street stub to that property. Chairman Seedall said it will have to be improved, right now it is just a small drive. It will just be considered an emergency access lane. All the traffic will have to come through this. Engineer Breinholt said what do they need to do to meet the requirements of the second access in the code? What does the code say on secondary access? The original plan had a full width access lined up with that road intersection to the northwest. I thought that was a better point for that rather than squeezing it in between a couple of units. That was a far better width and placement. I think that access route needs to be more than just a gravel lane. We could look at other options, but I would like to see what everybody else thinks.

The Committee further discussed layout options. Chairman Seedall said I like this one with the open space. We could look at what we want to do along here in terms of the flow, you could have a small dog park under the power line. Mr. Williams said Parks and Recs, was not interested in this being a City park. It was not within the framework of their plan. We do not have an issue either way, but they said they do not want to maintain that. Director LeFevre said I think the biggest issue was the access into it. We do not want to force more of the City into that tight area to use the park. We would rather have it used by the neighborhood and remain private. Chairman Seedall said that could be nice and you could look at doing smaller basins through it. You could move these lots over here and do another little park, just to get away from this. Mr. Williams said that would be a good place for a park and really frame the neighborhood, especially if we could move a few units over here. It kind of all connects and has good breaks and be walkable. They then discussed connectivity and a trail system.

Chairman Seedall said with these changes, we could do another concept meeting. There is a list of the documents that need to be provided. Preliminary plat would be the next step. I do not know if you are hoping to use the PUD ordinance where this is zoned mixed-use. For preliminary you will have to show your phasing then we would do a development agreement for the whole thing. The final plat will go phase by phase and you will have to show where the lift station would be.

The Committee further discussed storm drain, as well as parking. Engineer Breinholt

said multi-family housing requires a quarter parking space for visitors per unit. Something of this size would probably qualify for a reduction. I think the duplexes would count the same. I know you can park on the street, but it is nice to have parking for events. Mr. Williams said we have some on the south side by the tennis/pickleball courts. We can have additional parking around those pocket parks, along with in between units. To make sure we are doing sufficient to meet your concern, it would be nice to get an official count of how many spaces you would like to see. After some discussion, Mr. Williams said when we add in the driveways on the duplexes, I think that will illuminate potential street parking if we combine driveways access the duplexes. Additionally, there are several spaces where there is room to add more parking. With this update, we will take the 0.1 calculation as a minimum and see if we can exceed it and resubmit this.

c. Walk-ins:

Garth Day was in attendance to discuss his projects. Mr. Day said we paved River Valley 10 yesterday. We are redesigning the plat a bit. We also changed our buildings. I have elevations coming. Chairman Seedall said Mr. Day and I have discussed what we are going to do on BR Mountain and if we want to do half a roadway as he builds out. When we get ready to do the park, we would do the other half then. That would allow us to space out the funding. It is an 80-foot right-of-way. The City is responsible for that from where it has ended to the west end of Stokes Park by Phase 12 of River Valley. Mr. Day said the City was going to do two-thirds of it and I am doing one-third. We broke River Valley up into a bunch of phases, so we could take a little more time to work there. Chairman Seedall said I do not think an 80-foot right-of-way into a field makes sense. Once we build it out, we need the on-street parking for Stokes Park. We can look at finishing out the whole right-of-way. I do not know how DRC feels about piecemealing BR Mountain between where it is now and what we are obligated to build to help get it finished.

Mr. Day said speaking of capital projects, on Rocket Road I noticed the power company got the poles moved. We have two subdivisions there that are unfinished and have been sitting for about four years. Do you have a timeline on when you are going to start working on that road? We have money sitting in escrow for our portion. I talked to Engineer Breinholt a bit about this, but it is probably a good discussion for the DRC. Do you want us to give you the money and have it as one big project or would you like us to finish our two sections? Engineer Breinholt said we want to fit it as one project. They discussed the timing for the road, park and pond. They also talked about Harvest Acres and Village. Mr. Day is going to put a walkway over the canal by the freeway. Chairman Seedall said could you put in an email what your timeline is for both River Valley 10 through 13 and Harvest Acres Phase 4. Mr. Day said I think we have three to four years until we get to BR Mountain Road.

4. Comments/Reports:

The Committee reviewed the fire code and pavement requirements for an emergency secondary

access. Engineer Breinholt said we are kind of coming up with a standard for this. I do not think we have ever done this specifically. I think the fire code requires 26 feet, but this is not just to get emergency vehicles in and out. If something happened at that other intersection, the street where it was closed off, this would be the emergency access for people. Everyone would be using it. We need enough there for two lanes of travel. Chairman Seedall said I think we need to require them to do a turn analysis. We know our ladder truck is 105 feet. They need to show a turn analysis that gets our ladder truck back in there off that secondary access. The Committee also talked about the future Stokes Park and how that would be phased. Chairman Seedall said it would be nice to finalize our landscaping standards for basins prior to sending those out to bid. We could get Landmark Design to do some landscaping plans to match our standards. We do not really have landscaping standards for ponds, and we might as well get those in place prior to sending bids. We will start working on those standards. He also asked about the hillside standards, which will be discussed at a later date.

5. Public comments: No public comments.

6. Adjournment:

Motion by Chairman Seedall to adjourn the meeting. Motion seconded by consensus of the Committee. The meeting adjourned at 10:50 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.