

**TREMONTON CITY CORPORATION
PLANNING COMMISSION
FEBRUARY 10, 2026**

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 (not voting)
Jack Stickney, Commission Member
Kristie Bowcutt, 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 February 10, 2026 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 Bowcutt, 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 Capener to approve the February 10, 2026 agenda with the modification of adding Councilmember Bowcutt to present to the Commission prior to their discuss, per her request. 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 Thompson – yes, Commission Member Stickney – yes. Motion approved.

Councilmember Bowcutt said Director Seedall has put in his resignation. It would be wise for the Commission to not make any changes to the form-based or mixed-use code while we are in the hiring process. With new staff members coming on board, they should have the opportunity to make these recommendations themselves. It does not make sense to have someone who is transitioning out to set the direction of long-term policy. I recommend tabling item 3. b. The new hire should set the rules and regulations rather than coming in and absorbing something someone else has already done.

2. Declaration of Conflict of Interest:

Commission Member Capener said I have visited with one of the parties on 3. a. in a

professional capacity, but we have not entered a contractual relationship.

3. New Business:

- a. Discussion and Consideration of Preliminary Plat—Cloverfield Estates, Phase 3
Keith Russell (northern property owner) and Russell Thornley (southern property owner)

Mr. Russell said I had my first meeting with the DRC in July and was directed to rework the design. There were a lot of conversations about access and design over the next month and meeting the ordinances. Our options came down to a cul-de-sac or trying to integrate to the south, either with this development or at a future time. The engineer said a cul-de-sac makes a lot of sense, but if there is a real option to connect the road through, we ought to look into it. I talked to the owner and spent nearly three months trying to figure out how this could happen. There were no problems, but it came down to timing. Both of us need to protect our interests. What we each need to be comfortable, probably will not happen in such short notice. Mr. Thornley said when we bought the property from Sierra Homes and built our home, we were told both properties had been abandoned as future subdivisions and would be horse property. That is the whole reason I built my home there. Things have changed and now five to six properties will be built on the back of my fence—two levels looking into my yard. This changes things. I respect it and am not opposed to people doing what they want with their property, but it is not what we went into this for. If I knew it was going to be developed, I would not have put our house there. I should not be expected to give up my property without a contract and I hope people will respect that. We are not opposed to selling. In fact, I have actually submitted and rezoned it so I can have that option as soon as possible. Frankly, knowing that this is going in, we intend to sell—either to a developer or to partner with someone to develop it. Our intention is to follow the same suit as to what is being allowed here. If there is a stub road, I am not opposed to connecting. If there is a cul-de-sac, that is fine, too. I would intend to do the exact same pattern as Mr. Russell for access and an overlay zone allowing more density.

The Commission discussed layout options and how a road could connect through these properties. Due to the increased density these lot widths would be 45 feet wide. Commission Member Capener said we should do it now and solve the problem by making this a through street. Cul-de-sacs will be a nightmare for snow removal, garbage and emergencies. Mr. Russell said with a stubbed road I lose two lots and then I have to realign things. A cul-de-sac on their property and a cul-de-sac on my property is a reasonable thing to pass. I have been to four DRC meetings, and we have looked at six or seven different options and settled on this one.

Motion by Commission Member Stickney to approve the Cloverfield Estate Phase 3 preliminary plat as laid out. Motion seconded by Commission Member Thompson. Vote: Chairman Van Tassell – no, Commission Member Capener – no, Commission Member Ellsworth – no, Commission Member Miller – absent, Commission Member

Thompson – yes, Commission Member Stickney – yes. Motion failed by a 3-2 vote.

Commission Member Capener said I do not think the master plan addresses this particular road so technically the way the code is written, we cannot make him put the road in, but we do not have to approve the density increase either. Legally, he can do this, but he can do it on the current R1-10 zoning, which would remove 60% of those lots. If we, as a committee have the opportunity to get rid of two cul-de-sacs, we should. We would encourage the developers to develop together and minimize a whole bunch of issues. Not only does it minimize the cul-de-sacs, it minimizes dead-end water lines. We are supposed to plan and encourage conformity with landowners working together. If both landowners are on board, we can have them put the overlay together and work together in some fashion. We will approve the overlay contingent upon them figuring out how to get the road through. If you have more homes, there is even more reason to connect because you have a greater likelihood for concern. Mr. Thornley said I am not opposed to working with him to get this done or even selling to him. Commission Member Capener said even if they do not develop it at the same time I still think, from a City perspective, this is way better planning than two cul-de-sacs. The concession we are making is we are doubling the density. We are doubling return with the same amount of road. R1-10 is what all the neighboring homes are. I do not mind the overlay, but it is a minor thing to have the road go through and be delayed a couple months to do it correctly. Double the density, is big. Mr. Russell said when you talk about timing, you are being unrealistic because I am already three months behind. I have met every code the City is required for this development. Commission Member Capener said the best option was to connect the road. With him here, we have an option to do that and I think we should work on it. We can do it quickly by having Mr. Thornley join with you on the overlay zone. We could approve the overlay in two phases, requiring Mr. Thornley to sign that he will allow the temporary turnaround if Mr. Russell is ahead of him and problem solved. Director Seedall said that could work. We would create a development agreement for all three parties to sign and the overlay will be approved with it. The other party recognizes that the temporary turnaround will be put on their space depending on which person ends up developing first. Commission Member Capener said I think it is a better plan for you to work together and figure out a way to connect the dots. Bringing the overlay back is best for everybody involved.

b. Discussion of Mixed-Use Development Code—presentation by Jeff Seedall

Director Seedall said the recommendation from the Commission was to expand this to include industrial areas as well, which is why we named this the Mixed-Use Development Code. It now covers any development area within City boundaries that would be commercially or industrially zoned. I want to talk less about what the code entails and more about what this is philosophically changing for the City. All the commercial and industrial zones would be replaced with this, if this is adopted. This is the second time the Planning Commission has seen it. Here are some of the goals set in chapter 1.5. It is of the Land Use plan we adopted in 2023. It was more a pedestrian-

oriented transportation, creating a more attractive and vibrant commerce area. Some of the pictures in the Land Use Code illustrate buildings within the Wasatch Front mapping out what we are hoping to accomplish with this code. We are still in the flux of some changes. As you read this code over the next couple weeks, I want you to think about the vision the Planning Commission has to help push our developmental code toward the goals we set in the Land Use Plan. This really redirects the trend of how non-residential growth would happen and the requirements they would have to meet. How would you like to approach discussing this and over how many meetings? Lastly, what possible samples or other documentation could I provide the Planning Commission to help as we are going through this? Chairman Van Tassell said send us an email with your main questions. That will help guide our study, instead of just trying to read through it. We appreciate all the work you have done.

4. Public Comments: None.
5. Comments and Reports: None.
6. Adjournment

Motion by Commission Member Ellsworth to adjourn the meeting. Motion seconded by consensus of the Board. The meeting adjourned at 6:48 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 _____, 2026.

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.