

**TREMONTON CITY CORPORATION
PLANNING COMMISSION
OCTOBER 14, 2025**

Members Present:

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

Chairman Van Tassell called the Planning Commission Meeting to order at 5:31 p.m. The meeting was held October 14, 2025, in the City Council Meeting Room at 102 South Tremont Street, Tremonton, Utah. Chairman Van Tassell, Commission Members Capener, Ellsworth, Phillips, Stickney, Thompson, City Councilmember Rohde, Director Seedall, and Deputy Recorder Lannefeld were in attendance. Commission Member Miller and Manager Nessen were excused.

1. Approval of agenda:

Motion by Commission Member Ellsworth to approve the October 14, 2025 agenda.

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

2. Declaration of Conflict of Interest:

Chairman Capener suggested the Conflict of Interest be reviewed and updated. Councilmember Rohde would bring it to the Council for discussion.

3. Public Comments: None.

4. Approval of minutes—September 9, 2025

Motion by Commission Member Ellsworth to approve the September 9, 2025, minutes. Motion seconded by Commission Member Thompson. Vote: Chairman Van Tassell – yes, Commission Member Capener – yes, Commission Member Ellsworth – yes, Commission Member Miller – absent, Commission Member Phillips – yes,

Commission Member Thompson – yes, Commission Member Stickney – yes. Motion approved.

5. Approval of 2026 Planning Commission Annual Schedule

Motion by Commission Member Stickney to approve the annual schedule. Motion seconded by Commission Member Ellsworth. Vote: Chairman Van Tassell – yes, Commission Member Capener – yes, Commission Member Ellsworth – yes, Commission Member Miller – absent, Commission Member Phillips – yes, Commission Member Thompson – yes, Commission Member Stickney – yes. Motion approved.

Chairman Van Tassell called a Public Hearing to order at 5:38 p.m. to discuss amendments to the chapters listed below. There was one person in attendance.

6. Public Hearing:

- a. To receive public input on proposed amendments to Chapter 1.10 Public Facilities Zone Districts, Chapter 1.11 Sensitive Area Zone District/Protection Area Zone District, Chapter 1.12 Flood Damage Protection Overlay Zone District, Chapter 1.13 Sexually Oriented Business Overlay Zone District, Chapter 1.14, and Chapter 1.15 Water Source Protection Overlay Zone District.

There were no public comments. Chairman Van Tassell closed the Public Hearing at 5:39 p.m. Chairman Van Tassell called a Public Hearing to order at 5:39 p.m. to receive public input on the proposed amendments listed below. There was one person in attendance.

- b. To receive public input on proposed amendments to Chapter 1.09 Mixed Use Zone District

There were no public comments. Chairman Van Tassell closed the Public Hearing at 5:40 p.m.

7. New Business:

- a. Discussion and consideration of Chapter 1.10 Public Facilities Zone Districts, Chapter 1.11 Sensitive Area Zone District/Protection Area Zone District, Chapter 1.12 Flood Damage Protection Overlay Zone District, Chapter 1.13 Sexually Oriented Business Overlay Zone District, Chapter 1.14, and Chapter 1.15 Water Source Protection Overlay Zone District.

Director Seedall said I wanted to make room for new code in the zoning ordinances. The simplest way to do so was to combine five chapters into one and rename it. Substantively, nothing has changed. This makes room to build out some of our codes, like the Main Street Mixed-Use. Commission Member Stickney said what kind of sexually oriented businesses would we allow in our community? Director Seedall said so far, none. Commission Member Capener

said technically, you have to allow a place for them in your city. You cannot ban them if they meet State code. Director Seedall said we do not have a spot where they are zoned. We just have to have regulations around what it would take.

Motion by Commission Member Capener to approve this to the Council as modified. Motion seconded by Commission Member Ellsworth. Vote: Chairman Van Tassell – yes, Commission Member Capener – yes, Commission Member Ellsworth – yes, Commission Member Miller – absent, Commission Member Phillips – yes, Commission Member Thompson – yes, Commission Member Stickney – yes. Motion approved.

- b. Discussion and consideration of Chapter 1.09 Mixed Use Zone District—Mark Vlasic with Landmark Design

Mr. Vlasic said the fixed-use code was in response to your Land Use Plan that was adopted in 2023. This new vision focused on establishing the Main Street corridor as very important. The recommendation was to come up with a new code so as development happens it meets the vision. The code is compiled of four sub-districts. This is a different type of code that focuses on creating the types of uses and buildings we envision. It focuses much more on design, layout of buildings and the relationship to streets. These are the physical capacities of the code. These things are much more detailed. Once staffed gets used to it, it is a very simple tool and a checklist system. This works really well for a smaller community. The code is divided into 10 chapters. They start with a list of districts and then go into sub-districts. We then talk about street types and uses. Most of what you have in place focus on use instead of form and layout. It is important, but not as important as some of the other chapters such as building types, landscape standards and street or sign types. It is pretty easy to determine whether something fits or not. If not, it has a procedure for either accepting it or asking the applicant to move on with a different type of use. Here is our Main Street District. As part of this, we are also looking at primary streets, secondary streets and how development will relate to those. The relationship of building facades is increasingly important or less important, depending on the streets and their priority. As you move forward, we are trying to establish the sense of a street wall on many of these.

Mr. Vlasic then reviewed the different districts and what that feel and look would be for each. New roads will include what the expectations are and how they should be designed. This is a general section as far as the configuration of the typical street. It includes the roadway and edges of the street, as well as the sidewalk zones and downstream zones for a bike lane. As things change over time the roads change and these things become very important for making modifications. The uses are similar to the description of what you have for use in your existing codes. Permitting has three categories and most fit into outright permitted. Things that are not listed but are similar to ones that would be

permitted are allowed. If it is permitted by the zoning administrator, it is not permitted. If you want to include it then you would have to modify the zoning ordinance. This is an opportunity to have some control over use.

Mr. Vlasic said the building types, in my experience, is probably the most important chapter. This is all about architecture, but it really talks about the forms and relationships of buildings on individual project sites and how they relate within the site to the parking and other things, but also to neighboring uses. Once you have identified that it is permitted in your sub-district, you go through this checklist. There are also some general discussions about things that apply to all building types. We find that once developers and architects get used to it, they like this because it allows them to figure out what they can get on their property, how it fits in with their vision and how they can make things work. Instead of having to negotiate and reevaluate. Next you have open space types that have been narrowed down to three. We then have landscape standards, which work hand in hand with your existing general landscape requirement code. Every chapter starts with goals and principles of why this is being done and how they work. The section on parking ensures it is adequate. In this code, we are also referring other chapters. We do not want to get into a situation where this code says something and then it gets updated and does not match what was in the other code. You just have to make sure you are looking at these other existing code references.

Mr. Vlasic said the first few months we really looked at calibrating the uses to the situations you have in Tremonton. This is a very important chapter. Just like you have administrated components to your existing codes. We provided our own administration for this code. It really clarifies the processes for approving your site plan. There is a request for exceptions and variances. Exceptions are really minor changes and modifications. If a project did not meet the requirements of the code without a major change, that would mean they have to revise it, or we would have to change the ordinance to accommodate that. Those things will not be taken lightly. It also clarifies who is making the decisions. At the end is a discussion of terms of use throughout the code. If you have any questions about what is meant by something, turn to the back section of Chapter 10 and it will clarify key phrases used throughout the code.

When asked about the existing overlay zones, Director Seedall said that is something I have not come to a consensus with yet on what to do with the overlay zone. Most of what we have are already under existing development agreements or master plan communities. I do not think we would have the ability to overwrite them, especially with their vested rights. I would like to leave this in place so if there were ever any large changes that this is the code that would apply to help build that continuity.

The Commission spent time reviewing this and some of the changes that could trigger additional improvements. Director Seedall said we were trying to be sensitive to the fact that this is the first ever attempted code like this in Tremonton. I feel like we got pretty close with saying, if you cross this, it is a substantial enough change to trigger the code, but if not then it is okay. We will get into this as we start looking into facade grants and what the rest of the RDA funding can generate. That will help us determine how costly it would be to bring this stuff and create a priority list. I have talked to commercial developers, who have said they have seen stuff like this before. If we can set expectations out the gate, architects and design professionals are good about meeting this kind of code. Mr. Vlasic said it gives them a lot of flexibility and opportunity to see what they can fit onto a site and be creative. I am not sure there would be more costs other than maybe more material requirements. They would just need their building to be maximized and would do a site plan to figure that out. Once that is established, that tells them their general cost trade-offs. That gives them their big picture numbers. These requirements are probably not a whole lot different than you might see in other communities. Director Seedall said we are still tweaking this and will have some growing pains. He suggested tabling the item so they can finalize things and answer more questions.

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

- c. Discussion and consideration of Chapter 1.08 Commercial and Industrial Zone District

Director Seedall said we feel like the enforcement on excessive water consumption would be best done through business licenses. Those have to be renewed every year, and we could review how much water they project using. We need to stop having generic business licenses for everyone and start having some specifics or different types. Our business licenses are in revised ordinances, but we are going to work on updating those. If there is an overage in their usage, we can either assess them a fee or have a discussion on why they used so much more.

Commission Member Capener asked about things not being allowed in the commercial zones while others are. Director Seedall said honestly a lot of those commercial zones are going to be absorbed into the Main Street one. After the Main Street code is adopted, we will go through and clean this up because most of our commercial zones will now be part of the Mixed-Use zones. That will be the discussion as we move forward in the commercial zone. We want to simplify this

and give each one their own chapter (residential, commercial, industrial and Main Street Mixed Use). Our commercial zone needs a lot of updating, but to me the Main Street Mixed Use code will take over a lot of those. My hope is that we are able to get through this in about six months and be able to update the residential.

The Commission spent time on hypotheticals and where storage sheds would be permitted or best suited. Chairman Van Tassell said honestly, I need to read it more. The Commission agreed. Commission Member Capener said have other cities picked and chose some of it and just done their downtown only? Director Seedall said they have tried to tie in. It is something we can definitely look at, but it has taken about seven months to get the form-based code to where it is now. I would like to get some of these updates into code for the Inland Port and we can work on doing more of a form-based industrial code. I will put that before the General Plan and Integrated Land Use Plan updates. Commission Member Capener said I am not sure which way is best. I do not know that it really matters as long as it does what we are trying to have it do. I am not sure what the big advantage either way is. A 30-acre building is more critical to get right than an individual house. It feels weird to have one section for the commercial industrial that is vague and does not have any teeth, but our town people and the commercial downtown are going to get the screws put to them. If you want to build downtown, you have to do exactly what we are telling you, but if you build a 30-acre building we do not even care. Councilmember Rohde said the only caution I would throw is if we get a big industry coming let us not scare them away with our code. We have to be careful. Commission Member Capener said it is not just those people. We need to make sure that all of them are not going to be scared away. However, we also need to make sure that whatever we do, we can live with our minimum standards.

Motion by Commission Member Capener to table this item until their next meeting. Motion seconded by Commission Member Thompson. Vote: Chairman Van Tassell – yes, Commission Member Capener – yes, Commission Member Ellsworth – yes, Commission Member Miller – absent, Commission Member Phillips – yes, Commission Member Thompson – yes, Commission Member Stickney – yes. Motion approved.

8. Planning commission comments/reports

Director Seedall said December 3 is a dinner at Maddox for our Christmas party.

9. Adjournment

Motion by Commission Member Capener to adjourn the meeting. Motion seconded by consensus of the Board. The meeting adjourned at 7:09 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.