

**TREMONTON CITY CORPORATION
PLANNING COMMISSION
NOVEMBER 25, 2025**

Members Present:

Raulon Van Tassell, Chairman
Micah Capener, Commission Member—excused
Karen Ellsworth, Commission Member
Andrea Miller, Commission Member
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 5:30 p.m. The meeting was held November 25, 2025 in the City Council Meeting Room at 102 South Tremont Street, Tremonton, Utah. Chairman Van Tassell, Commission Members Ellsworth, Miller, Phillips, Stickney, Thompson, City Councilmember Rohde, Director Seedall, and Deputy Recorder Lannefeld were in attendance. Commission Member Capener and Manager Nessen were excused.

1. Approval of agenda:

Motion by Commission Member Ellsworth to approve the November 25, 2025 agenda. Motion seconded by Commission Member Phillips. Vote: Chairman Van Tassell – yes, Commission Member Capener – absent, Commission Member Ellsworth – yes, Commission Member Miller – yes, Commission Member Phillips – yes, Commission Member Thompson – yes, Commission Member Stickney – yes. Motion approved.

2. Declaration of Conflict of Interest:

Councilmember Rohde informed the Commission that the City Council approved an amendment to the Conflict of Interest statement. It says a conflict exists if it is a direct benefit to you financially or anyone in your household. If so, then you need to reclude yourself from the conversation. There were no conflicts at this time.

3. Approval of minutes—October 14, 2025

Motion by Commission Member Thompson to approve October 14, 2025 minutes. Motion seconded by Commission Member Phillips. Vote: Chairman Van Tassell – yes, Commission Member Capener – absent, Commission Member Ellsworth – yes, Commission Member Miller – yes, Commission Member Phillips – yes, Commission

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

4. Presentation of Annexation Policy Plan

Director Seedall said this is a guiding document for the Council. The first was adopted in the early 2000s. We have amended it a couple times since. I have had discussions with landowners recently and felt an amendment to the map was needed. The plan itself is governed a lot by State code. This is a plan the Planning Commission oversees and recommends to the Council. I am a proponent of following some natural boundaries. They reviewed which areas were being added or removed based on service possibility due to natural boundaries. Director Seedall said this area on the other side of Salt Creek would be hard to service with utilities to the other side. I proposed changing it so everything east of Salt Creek could be under future consideration for annexation. Two larger areas are Radio Hill. After discussions with property owners, it is likely we see an annexation petition from some of them. It is an area that can work toward master planning in terms of utility infrastructure, as well as a significant master plan community that could bring a lot in terms of outdoor recreation. The south yellow area is an area I feel could be well serviced by Tremonton in terms of connecting into our existing infrastructure. The east had an adjustment to an area where we had a lot of conversations with property owners of what they can do because part of their properties are in the City boundary. We are straightening that boundary out to follow 1000 North until you get to the Bear River. Adopting this plan tonight is not an annexation for the entire boundary to now be in Tremonton. This is just a document to allow the Planning Commission and Council to review how annexations take place. We cannot annex something that is in a municipality now. They would have to leave that municipality and go into unincorporated County and then come into the City by approval of the Council. Annexation is a process initiated by landowners not the City.

Chairman Van Tassell called a Public Hearing to order at 5:41 p.m. to receive public input on amending the chapter listed below. There were 15 people in attendance.

5. Public Hearing:

a. To receive public input on amending Chapter 1.27 Sign Permit

Jonathan Gardner said I am a landowner east of 8400 West, just east of the Salt Creek area. I agree with removing the area west of Salt Creek and further move that the area west of I-84 also be removed. I am here on behalf of myself and neighbors who will be affected by the proposed annexation policy changes. We respectfully oppose expanding the City's future annexation area to include our properties and therefore wish to have our properties removed from the plan. I want to be clear none of us in this area receive any city services—no water, sewer, garbage pickup, gas, fire hydrant access, road maintenance, and we are not requesting those services. Our area is already fully supported by County level and private systems that function well without the City. Under Utah code, an

annexation policy plan must demonstrate the future annexation areas are logical and orderly, feasible for service delivery, economically efficient and non-burdensome, and consistent with the long-term health, safety and welfare of both current and future residents. The proposed expansion does not meet this criteria. The City cannot logically or economically provide services here. To comply with State law, an APP must identify how municipal services could be provided and financed. Extending water, sewer, roads, police jurisdiction and utilities west of I-84 would require new utility lines and pumping systems, additional road infrastructure, expanded fire and police coverage, large capital investment and long-term operational costs. Under Utah code, the City must show that service provision is practical and economically feasible. At this time, no plan exists. Tremonton City is already running on a tight budget. Placing our land inside this without a service plan does not meet the statutory requirement. Without a plan there is no feasible or economic service plan. This cannot be legally justified. The use of the land west of I-84 is rural. Our properties are rural, agricultural and low density. Some of the proposed land is APA (agricultural protection area). Under Utah code, APA requires cities to avoid annexing land that would interfere with agricultural operations, avoid imposing incompatible zoning or urban service obligations. Planning for annexation of agricultural land knowing that APA is in place is inconsistent with state policy and creates unnecessary conflict between the City and County planning goals. The purpose of APA is to protect agriculture, preserve rural character and maintain agricultural operations. The goal of the inland port zone proposes to bring some of the same APA land to an industrial inland port with freight logistics, warehousing and heavy truck traffic. This contradicts the purpose of proposed APAs under Utah law and Box Elder County's agricultural land use plans. You cannot meaningfully protect agricultural land while simultaneously planning to convert it into an industrial inland port zone.

Darwin Thompson said I live on Harvey Drive. I would like you to explain exactly where each one of these annexation areas are. I have reviewed the City's annexation policy very well over the last month. Personally, I do not think it was followed in the last annexation. There are many steps that need to be followed by the City. I did not see a lot of that. That is something we should review and comply. Documents need to be signed from the developer on exactly what they will provide. In the last meeting for the annexation on Radio Hill, there was many things said by the developers that they would look at. There was nothing that was signed by them stating exactly what they would do. Would they provide water, secondary water, sewer? All of it was just stated, yeah, we will look at that. When annexations happen, according to your policy, there is contracts that need to be written up. Some of us as homeowners might be a bit happier about annexations if we actually knew what the developer was going to do. There are certain time requirements and letters that need to be written. There is an opportunity to protest. This is something we need to review, and contracts need to be signed. The City

Council, as well as you are here to protect the citizens of Tremonton and the City from people that want to come in and take advantage of us.

Lane Walding said I live on Harley Drive. I have concerns about zoning and how that takes place. I have yet to find anywhere that describes when property is annexed, what is the process for determining the zone? I already have industrial in front of my house, which I am not excited about. I prefer the Stokes Trucking versus a Loves gas station, but I am not excited about having that kind of industry behind my house. I would like to know where and how we establish that when property is annexed. What is the zoning going to be around us? What is that process? Where can I find it? Right now, the property behind my house is zone zero. I have no idea what that means other than the person who builds on it can build whatever they want. If they want to be annexed by the City, the City should have the opportunity to say, what they want. I would like to see more visibility on what and how zoning takes place. When I get annexed into the City, will I get a voice in the zone that happens around me?

Jamie Gardner said we built our home in Box Elder County. Everything we have is not connected to Tremonton City because we used to live on Radio Hill and had tons of issues with water. People are still struggling to get water. So, it worries me that we are continuing to build when there are so many issues there already. No property owner's west of I-84 are seeking annexation. We really love where we live and are totally fine without Tremonton City coming in. No one has requested City utilities. We are all sufficient with what we have. We are all opposed to joining Tremonton because we are surviving and thriving. There is a huge issue with water all throughout Tremonton. We are just happy with what we have. I am speaking for like 20 that I live by who could not be here tonight. Hopefully, you take that into consideration. Planning for the future annexation of unwilling landowners contradicts the core requirement of public interest.

Kristie Bowcutt said I was voted by the people and will stand up for the people. I ask you to really listen to what the residents are saying. This does affect their lifestyle. On the last annexation, residents were not heard and it was pushed through. They are very upset. We are close to not having water, especially during the summer. This is a life changing thing. Take a step back and realize you are here for the people, not a developer. Developers need to learn to conform to Tremonton, not Tremonton conforming to developers. Since I have been involved citizens have paid royally to get development in. The residents are paying for roads into developments out of our pockets. There are many things that need to be asked that are not being asked. Listen to our residents because it is their livelihood. I grew up in the County all my life and loved it. I grew up with a septic system that did not fail.

Tyler Thompson said I live on Harley Drive. With what is being considered here,

it is changing lives. It is not just a matter of are we going to allow a developer to do one thing or another. We are here because this would affect and change our lifestyle. Not everybody gets to enjoy the freedom of being in the County. I love being on a septic tank and having a well. I love the freedoms I enjoy. There is a lot that goes into determining where you want to raise a family and there are reasons why we live where we live. There are things we can do outside City limits we cannot do inside. We lack water. Where are all these people going to get water? We realize people love Tremonton. It is a rural area and that is why people want to come here, but we are tired of what Tremonton is attempting to become. We love Tremonton the way it is. Are we going to stop growth? No, it is healthy to have some growth, but this is a lot.

Natalie Thompson said I live on Harley Drive as well. I believe people are more important than things and quality is more important than quantity. I am concerned with some of the decisions Tremonton is making right now. Money is a tool and a vehicle to help people improve their lives and take care of people, but I see the dollar signs taking charge of people. I lived in a Tremonton subdivision, and we moved our family into the County, because we wanted a different way of life. Now people are trying to take that away from us. I am asking you to put the dollar signs in their place and put people first. Think before we act for money.

Colton Hare said I live on Harley Drive, we bought in 2021. I have been getting more involved over the past two months. As I have been listening to all the decisions that have been made about developments and annexations, I have had to take a step back and ask myself why? I feel like sometimes we get caught up so much in the dollar signs or in the excitement of moving forward. Sometimes we have to take a step back and ask ourselves, why are we pushing so hard? I understand a lot of that is developers. They are buying land and pushing for the annexation. Sometimes the City acts as if, what choice do we have? Well, if you did not have a say in it or a purpose behind it, why would you have a Council in the first place? In the last meeting, I heard a lot of, well, we do not have any leverage if we do not let them change the zone. That sounds like entrapment to me. If you do not let us change the zone, we are just going to do whatever we want on the zone that is currently there. We have to take a step back and think about things and ask why? Why are we pushing so hard to grow so quickly? Growth is going to happen. I understand that, but do we really need to triple or quadruple our population in the next 10 to 15 years?

Jamie Poppleton said I am a Tremonton resident and I want to echo what was said about taking a step back. I would appreciate you explaining exactly what these boundaries are. Are there plans now for a developer to come in and take these over and are we going to annex now? We need that information in detail.

Chairman Van Tassell closed the Public Hearing at 6:06 p.m.

6. Public Comment:

Darwin Thompson said a lot has been said about water and sewer. My company does a lot of work for Tremonton on their sewer and water systems, and we are in trouble. I know you hear it from everybody. Where is our water coming from? I am only going to talk about water because the sewer system could take a long time. For water you have five pumps and three of those are dead in the water right now. They are broken and not running. You are working on getting those running by spring, but that takes tons of money to keep them in operation. Two of those pumps are your main pumps. You also have a teeny one in a shack with rats and snakes. Then you have another small pump that pumps Garland's overflow. They have overflow in the winter, but not much in the summer. That pump is no good when you really need it. You guys are working hard to keep this stuff running. I could go on and on about the sewer and waste treatment plant, but I do not have another three minutes. You just need to be aware that this is an issue.

Jonathan Gardner said annexation interest is one sided and unwanted. Annexation policy plans must reflect community preferences. In this case, no property owners west of I-84 are seeking annexation. None have requested City water, sewer or utilities and all neighbors I have contacted are opposed to becoming part of Tremonton. Planning for future annexation of unwilling landowners contradicts the core requirement that annexation be in the public interest, not just the City's interest. This expansion west of I-84 is not consistent with Tremonton's purpose or capacity. Growth is already occurring where there is existing water and sewer systems, along the established transportation corridors. Expanding into rural county lands runs counter to the orderly growth principles and State code, and places unnecessary administrative and political burdens on the City. In conclusion, the proposed expansion and inclusion of the area west of I-84 lacks a feasible and economical service plan and conflicts with existing and future agricultural protections. This does not reflect landowners or community need and creates unnecessary tension between the City and County. For these reasons, we respectfully request the Planning Commission remove all properties east of Salt Creek to I-84 from the annexation policy plan update. Thank you for your time, your service to our community and for hearing us out.

Colton Hare said I would really like to see some detailed projections of water usage in the area—graphs of what has been used and projected. We implemented secondary water and this improved culinary by how much? Do we have projected numbers based on the number of homes that would be going into these annexations and how that would affect water in the area? That number would be important to know. There was a small mention of this in the last meeting, something about being able to sustain 200 more homes under the current setup. We would have to expand beyond that in order to add any more. That is the first time I have heard any kind of projection.

Laurie Thompson said when we moved out there 30 years ago, there were hardly any

houses on that road. Heading from I-15 to I-84. Now, when you get off the freeway, you sit there and wait to get across 1000 North, just to go up to 2300 West and turn. Plus, you have people coming from town heading west to the development that is there now. I can only imagine the traffic that is going to be there because of the subdivision that was approved last week. That road needed to be widened all the way out. It is ridiculous how narrow it is. What are you going to do with the people who build houses there? They are not going to jump on I-84 and come down to Tremonton, they are going to come down that road. It needs to be widened.

Tyler Thompson said I appreciate your consideration and hearing us, but there is a lot we can do with what we have now. I claim Tremonton as my own. I have grown up here, played football and done everything here my whole life. There are a lot of areas that are congested at certain times, and you wait there for 10 to 15 minutes sign trying to get onto Main or 1000 North. I take 1000 North a lot and people fly through that stop sign half the time. Law enforcement has done a good job, but unfortunately, when they are not there that is when things happen. There are also five or six potholes I have hit for about six years in a one-mile span and those are not getting repaired. I feel like we are grasping for a lot of area we cannot facilitate and take care of. Like I tell my teenager, until he can take care of what he already has and is already committed to he cannot take on more. Tremonton City is a great place. There is a lot of downtown stuff that should be happening but unfortunately is not. The new Midland Square sure looks nice, but all I hear is we do not have money to do this so are we spending our money wisely? There is so much that has gone unloiled that we are having breakdowns. It is going to become a machine that cannot move. We need to grow responsibly and slowly, so we do not have major growing pains for all of us.

7. New Business:

a. Discussion and consideration of Annexation Policy Plan

The Commission and City staff spent time discussing the boundaries with those in attendance. Commission Member Miller said we are not annexing all of this now so why is it even being proposed? Chairman Seedall said to annex any of these areas not currently incorporated, takes landowners petitioning to the City to annex. The Council would not put something together for unwilling landowners. This is just the policy, adjusting the map to areas where I have talked with landowners about becoming part of Tremonton City and squaring up spots where I feel we have some struggles in terms of getting utilities. Landowners have approached me for the most part. This is just the plan. Commission Member Miller said hypothetically, all of this could be annexed into Tremonton. Unless the owner does not want it. This discussion is just for us to say, this is in our annexation plan and if a landowner comes to us, we could consider it. That is when we start the discussions on who may be affected by the annexation, asking what are the concerns are and how to meet State code. The point of this plan is to show where our City boundaries could extend. Our responsibility as the Planning

Commission is to decide if it would be in Tremonton's best interest to add these places. Commission Member Stickney said the Inland Port area is in that plan. Did landowners approach the City for that? Chairman Seedall said no, the Inland Port does not operate under the guidance of the actual municipal body. It is an authority empowered by the State. They have adopted that area already and brought it into their boundaries as an Inland Port. The County also has recognized it as such. What would happen is if some industrial body chooses that area they can build through the financial tools of the Inland Port. The City would most likely be the one providing municipal services to that development. Councilmember Rohde said that was a decision by the County and State. If we decided not to annex it, developers could still do it in the County. Having it annexed benefits the City, who could set the rules for that development. The zone change is just the first step in a long process. As we move forward with buttoning up our General Plan and land use, we can hit these areas and say, this is the kind of zoning we want. Then we would have public discussions about what we want the City to look like. Without this on there, we cannot establish what kind of zoning we want in that area. This helps us do that. Commission Member Miller said this is just the logical future plan when looking at the map saying, where would we get utilities from? That is just planning for the future. Chairman Van Tassell said Tremonton probably should have been going uphill for a long time—it is unusable land for agriculture. This way you do not take up agricultural land by developing there. It is the most efficient living area that does not use ag and commercial property. In 50 years when I am gone, I will not be worrying about this, but if I have the ability to make the City better, what foundation stones would I set? Commission Member Stickney said as far as the framework goes, I think it is a good plan.

Motion by Commission Member Miller to recommend these boundaries for the proposed annexation policy plan to the City Council. Motion seconded by Chairman Van Tassell. Vote: Chairman Van Tassell – yes, Commission Member Capener – absent, Commission Member Ellsworth – yes, Commission Member Miller – yes, Commission Member Phillips – yes, Commission Member Thompson – no, Commission Member Stickney – yes. Motion approved.

8. Planning commission comments/reports:

Commission Member Ellsworth mentioned there will be discussions for them to have in the future and they need to make sure they are educated and ready for changes that could be coming from the State and with the City's General Plan.

Commission Member Stickney said in light of things brought up about the water situation. I am very curious about what the plan is. It sounds like we are working on improving those pumps, but I want to know we will have water. At some point can we get a report on that status and how things progress. We will need those details as we

move forward with annexations. It might be a good idea to have the different department heads attend out meetings and answer questions. We could focus on one subject per meeting and overtime have those details. Councilmember Rohde said as we go through the General Plan, we will hit each one of those areas. That may be a good guide.

9. Adjournment

Motion by Commission Member Phillips to adjourn the meeting. Motion seconded by consensus of the Board. The meeting adjourned at 7:05 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.