

**TREMONTON CITY CORPORATION
DEVELOPMENT REVIEW COMMITTEE
NOVEMBER 5, 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—excused
Tiffany Lannefeld, Deputy Recorder

Chairman Seedall called the Development Review Committee Meeting to order at 9:36 a.m. The meeting was held November 5, 2025 in the City Council Meeting Room at 102 South Tremont Street, Tremonton, Utah. Chairman Seedall, Assistant Director Beecher, Engineer Breinholt, Director LeFevre, Director Mackley, and Deputy Recorder Lannefeld were in attendance. Manager Nessen was excused.

1. Approval of agenda:

Motion by Chairman Seedall to approve the November 5, 2025 agenda. Motion seconded by Engineer Breinholt. Vote: Chairman Seedall – yes, Assistant Director Beecher – yes, Engineer Breinholt – yes, Director LeFevre – absent, Director Mackley – yes, Manager Nessen – absent. Motion approved.

2. Approval of minutes—October 8, 2025

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

3. New Business:

- a. Discussion and consideration of the Golden West Credit Union Site Plan—Eric Malburg and Butch Campbell (via phone)

Mr. Malburg said we addressed the comments from Engineer Breinholt on the stormwater release rate. We brought it down to 0.06 CFS per acre. We have also addressed the comments regarding the trash enclosure—having a man door and following City standards. There was a comment on the right turn lane queuing length of 100 feet for exiting the development onto the westbound lanes of Main Street. We are aware the improvements on the main access into the overall development are not complete. We are working with the owner and contractor on that and to get the storm drainage on the site to discharge into that shared detention basin. Ultimately, our goal is to eliminate the underground storage chambers on the Golden West site and let that detention volume into the master developer's basin. We will hold some of the storm

water on our own site in an above ground basin. We are trying to eliminate the need for any underground detention chambers. Chairman Seedall said I am good with the site layout and hope you can keep working with the owner and his design engineer.

Motion by Engineer Breinholt to approve the site plan, pending final approval of the stormwater changes that have been discussed. Motion seconded by Director Mackley. Vote: Chairman Seedall – yes, Assistant Director Beecher – yes, Engineer Breinholt – yes, Director LeFevre – absent, Director Mackley – yes, Manager Nessen – absent. Motion approved.

b. Discussion and consideration of River Valley Phase 10 Final Plat—Garth Day

Mr. Day said this phase was broken into multiple phases (9, 10, 11, 12, and 13). We started back in 2021, designing it and have been through a bunch of iterations. We are now part of the new PUD ordinance. I think everybody is familiar with River Valley and how it is laid out and how the townhomes stack. On 450 we wanted to try something different, so we flipped the buildings, so the fronts are facing the main road. When we did this, we were trying to up our standards. We want something more colorful. We have more finishes, and the elevations are not so flat. We also have more pop outs. They look a lot better. However, when we did that, it created a problem with setbacks. Our whole point was to move them closer to the road, making it a little more neighborly. Now, we are in conflict with the setback requirement. I believe the PUD and a development agreement will allow us to alter those. This configuration works better for a lot of reasons, including snow removal and trash pick-up, as well as for fire protection. There has far better access. We are just kind of stuck on that 10-foot setback that faces 450. Could we consider the fronts as the sides? Addressing them off at 2900 then those that front the streets would be considered the side yards. Otherwise, we have to use this other configuration, which I do not think is as good a product. With the PUD, we did not really ask for higher densities. It is just for some flexibility in how we place the buildings. Director Seedall said I am comfortable with it. I like this layout more. I sent the development agreement out for everyone to review. I was going to send it over to the city attorney as well and get it on the agenda for the Council to approve the final. Engineer Breinholt said we would never consider those frontages. I do not know why we would consider them differently than the ones across the street, but I am going to leave the setback and zoning to Chairman Seedall to tell us if this complies with our code. I want to make sure we have on record that this is a discussion of frontages as legitimate questions. It is consistent with an interpretation—one side of the street from the other. Chairman Seedall said it does if we use the interpretation that 2900 is the front. The interpretation of having 2900 be the main frontage works on both sides of the road. Mr. Day said we shifted that whole building to the west. I think the development agreement protects you. These are all going to be the same. We have moved them back. We just want to get them as close to the road as possible. The Committee spent more time understanding the layout and how those buildings would front the road. Based off their interpretation the Committee agreed there were no issues with the setbacks.

Motion by Director Mackley to table this item until their next meeting. Motion seconded by Director LeFevre. Vote: Chairman Seedall – yes, Assistant Director Beecher – yes, Engineer Breinholt – yes, Director LeFevre – absent, Director Mackley – yes, Manager Nessen – absent. Motion approved.

- c. Discussion and consideration of Parkview Subdivision Amendment—Ben Johnston

Mr. Johnston said there are two subdivisions. The north subdivision is Parkview, and the south one is Ponderosa, which was never recorded. On the north side you can see where the hash road is coming through. That is how it was platted in 1961. They have a house built where the road is dedicated. We are just straightening it up and doing a dedication plat to dedicating that road officially. That will vacate the road where there is a house, and it can revert back to Dennis Furman. These two parcels were actually owned by the school district, who was supposed to have deeded it to him in 1970, but that never got recorded. Two months ago, they deeded it back. Now he has all those parcels, and we are the last piece of the puzzle to get it vacated and rededicated. We will come back in and do a boundary line adjustment. Engineer Breinholt said I think we should put the curb in now. After some discussion, Mr. Johnston said I will slide that over, it all pretty much lines up with what is going south. I can modify that and put that radius there and will change those descriptions.

Motion by Chairman Seedall to approve the Parkview subdivision dedication and vacation plat with the changes discussed. Motion seconded by Director Mackley. Vote: Chairman Seedall – yes, Assistant Director Beecher – yes, Engineer Breinholt – yes, Director LeFevre – absent, Director Mackley – yes, Manager Nessen – absent. Motion approved.

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

4. Comments/Reports: None.

5. Public comments: None.

6. Adjournment:

Motion by Chairman Seedall to adjourn the meeting. Motion seconded by consensus of the Committee. The meeting adjourned at 10:20 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

Development Review Committee

November 5, 2025

***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.