

**TREMONTON CITY CORPORATION
DEVELOPMENT REVIEW COMMITTEE
NOVEMBER 19, 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 9:35 a.m. The meeting was held November 19, 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 (arrived at 10:53), Manager Nessen and Deputy Recorder Lannefeld were in attendance.

1. Approval of agenda:

Motion by Chairman Seedall to approve the November 19, 2025 agenda. Motion seconded by Engineer Breinholt. Vote: Chairman Seedall – yes, Assistant Director Beecher – yes, Engineer Breinholt – yes, Director LeFevre – yes, Director Mackley – absent, Manager Nessen – yes. Motion approved.

2. Approval of minutes—October 22, 2025

Motion by Assistant Director Breecher to approve the October 22, 2025 minutes. Motion seconded by Director LeFevre. Vote: Chairman Seedall – yes, Assistant Director Beecher – yes, Engineer Breinholt – yes, Director LeFevre – yes, Director Mackley – absent, Manager Nessen – yes. Motion approved.

3. Approval of Amended Annual Schedule 2026

Motion by Chairman Seedall to approve the amended Annual Schedule for 2026. Motion seconded by Engineer Breinholt. Vote: Chairman Seedall – yes, Assistant Director Beecher – yes, Engineer Breinholt – yes, Director LeFevre – yes, Director Mackley – absent, Manager Nessen – yes. Motion approved.

4. New Business:

a. Discussion and consideration of Old Grist Mill Site Plan

Chairman Seedall said from a zoning perspective this works, especially with the existing structure. This meets our mixed-use code. Engineer Breinholt said a landscape plan is required to be stamped by a landscape architect. When asked about fencing, the developer said there is an existing chain link fence in a bearing wall. The Committee

discussed the layout and accesses, which are yet to be determined and require assistance from UDOT. They also discussed parking and drive isle requirements.

Motion by Chairman Seedall for conditional approval upon approving the landscape plan. Motion seconded by Director LeFevre. Vote: Chairman Seedall – yes, Assistant Director Beecher – yes, Engineer Breinholt – yes, Director LeFevre – yes, Director Mackley – absent, Manager Nessen – yes. Motion approved.

b. Discussion and consideration of Harvest Village Phase 2 Plat—Garth Day

Mr. Day said we approved Phase 1 and 2. All the public improvements are in with the exception of some sidewalk down 100 East. Half the improvements are in for Phase 3. We had to run the sewer line under the canal over to 100. Can you provide me with cost estimate for the public improvements that are left? Before we record, I want to double check that. Phase 3 has an easement for the sewer line, which runs down the middle aisle. Curb and gutter on 100 East are done all the way down. We need the addresses. For 100 East, the sidewalk comes around and then stops before the end of this phase because there is a pole in the way. We are having difficulties getting those moved. Engineer Breinholt said continue to work on that, we need to get it right. We probably have to reapprove this, even though nothing has changed, because it is likely expired.

Motion by Chairman Seedall to reapprove the plat for Harvest Village Phase 2 as long as it matches the one that was approved previously. 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.

c. Discussion of River Valley PUD Development Agreement

Mr. Day said River Valley 10 is part of a much larger project that has an existing development agreement, which includes a participation agreement on BR Mountain Road. What used to be River Valley 9, is now River Valley phases 9-13. We wanted to redo the development agreement and get it in the PUD ordinance and back to the Council. This would clarify some timeframes and other issues. Chairman Seedall said I added to the DA some clarification on timing. At the completion of Phase 12 the road and the regional storm drain basin will be done. That gives the City two or three years to allocate the funding. That would be for the basin at Stokes Park and our part of the roadway widening for BR Mountain Road. That was not very clear through the previous DA. After some discussion, Chairman Seedall said we would probably have the developer build the road out and reimbursed him versus the City putting it out to bid. It makes sense for them to put that in as it fits their construction schedule. The City would just have to have the money available and bid for someone to dig a hole for the pond.

Engineer Breinholt said we need to make it clear what shares they will provide for this area as a whole. We also need a landscape plan that identifies exactly what the acreage is at this point. You could put that in as a reference. It needs to be tied to that landscape

plan and what the actual area is. The Committee further discussed the sizing of those pipes, potential layouts and what would handle capacity. Mr. Day said we will run the utility easement all the way from 450 to BR Mountain Road. That would be 20-feet wide because we do have water in there, too. Engineer Breinholt said we need to clearly identify the public and private utilities on this site as part of the Development Agreement. We want Director Mackley's input on that since Public Works will have to take care of anything public.

Engineer Breinholt said State code says you cannot put two homes on a single service. Anything serving more than one connection has to be owned by a political body, which is the City unless there is a single, responsible owner there. Does an HOA constitute a single owner? If the recording documents for the HOA specify, they own the sewer, it could. You do not want shared ownership and responsibility because if something goes wrong then who is responsible. You have to have a responsible party. Mr. Day said on the townhomes we have individual laterals and water feeds. We usually run it in front of the building. The HOA owns a master lateral and then each of the laterals go in. Engineer Breinholt said if we just make sure the HOA is set up as the owner and specify, they are the responsible party for issues, then you could. The HOA will handle all the landscaping, snow removal, building maintenance and site maintenance. They will pay the water bills and handle their on-site storm drain. We need to make that record because that is a larger line that looks like a City line. The Committee suggested having the City Attorney provide his opinions on some of the language in the DA for this.

d. Walk-ins:

Rod Hill was in attendance to discuss potential options with his property. Mr. Hill said I am looking at pushing property lines to the south, to give me an easement on the side of my house. The house is in the City. Steve Diamond owns this, so I want to trade this parcel for this one and straighten this line all the way across. That would then push this line 50 feet into that subdivision. This would basically make this a bigger lot. There would still be two parcels, just basically moving lot lines. Engineer Breinholt said if you are just moving lot lines, it is completely separate, and you do not fall under the subdivision code.

After much discussion, Manager Nessen suggested he have a chat with the County about his options. Mr. Hill said I have, and they said everything looks good, but that little piece is going to be illegal because it has no frontage. They suggested coming to the City to see if we can push that over. Assistant Director Breecher said he is trying to adjust his lot line, but the County will not let him isolate a lot. Manager Nessen said you are not creating a new lot you are just changing the size. The Committee read through code. Engineer Breinholt said I do not think that code limits this lot because it is not being subdivided further. Mr. Hill said at the end of the day I would like this to be a parcel. Chairman Seedall said this is likely one where he shows what the lot line adjustment is on a final plat and then the City confirms it is good and approves it. From there you would start the annexation petition against because that is the legal

description you need to adjust a City boundary. A lot line adjustment is something Engineer Breinholt and I can review over email. If we can get a final plat we feel good about that shows a legal description for both parcels we will go into the annexation process. I do not see the Council denying this annexation where it is all your property. No one else is involved. This would have been an easy process had it all been in the City. We will begin this process.

5. Comments/Reports: None.
6. Public comments: No public comments.
7. Adjournment:

Motion by Chairman Seedall to adjourn the meeting. Motion seconded by consensus of the Committee. The meeting adjourned at 11:14 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.