

**TREMONTON CITY CORPORATION  
DEVELOPMENT REVIEW COMMITTEE  
APRIL 15, 2026**

Members Present:

ChrisDean Epling, Chairman & Zoning Administrator  
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 Epling called the Development Review Committee Meeting to order at 9:30 a.m. The meeting was held April 15, 2026, in the City Council Meeting Room at 102 South Tremont Street, Tremonton, Utah. Chairman Epling, Assistant Director Beecher, Engineer Breinholt, Director LeFevre (arrived at 10:53 a.m.), Director Mackley, Manager Nessen (arrived at 9:34 a.m.) and Deputy Recorder Lannefeld were in attendance.

1. Approval of agenda:

**Motion by Director Mackley to approve the April 25, 2026 agenda with item 3. b. removed from this week's agenda.** Motion seconded by Engineer Breinholt. Vote: Chairman Epling – yes, Assistant Director Beecher – yes, Engineer Breinholt – yes, Director LeFevre – absent, Director Mackley – yes, Manager Nessen – absent. Motion approved.

2. Approval of minutes— February 18, 2026 and March 4, 2026

**Motion by Assistant Beecher to approve the minutes stated above.** Motion seconded by Director Mackley. Vote: Chairman Epling – yes, Assistant Director Beecher – yes, Engineer Breinholt – yes, Director LeFevre – absent, Director Mackley – yes, Manager Nessen – absent. Motion approved.

The following items were discussed out of order.

3. New Business:

a. Discussion of Updated Elementary School Design—Brady Thompson, Dave Cox, Brianna Savage and Nichole Luthi

Mr. Thompson said we have had this property at 500 North 2900 West in Tremonton since 2017. We completed the design in 2018 for a new elementary school, but due to enrollment, the School Board tabled the project. We now need to provide additional classrooms and school space for elementary schools in Tremonton. The design is basically the same, the difference is we have added more office space. There are site improvements, and we are trying to create additional parking. The Commission reviewed the layout of this single story, roughly 84,000 square foot building. Mrs. Luthi then addressed utility related questions from when this was originally designed in 2018

and the anticipated utility work coming versus what is there now, along with capacity. They first discussed storm water and detention ponds. According to their Geotech report the groundwater in this area is about four feet deep. She then reviewed how sewer and water would flow and where stubs or hydrants would be located. Engineer Breinholt said the maps were done from the construction drawings. That was not surveyed information. If you go out there on site, hopefully you will find the valves. Mrs. Luthi said we are not making a dramatic change for the 2018 plans as far as sewer goes. When asked about secondary water, Engineer Breinholt said it was installed as a dry line but is active now. Mr. Thompson said in terms of accommodating your requirements, this is just preliminary. Based on your feedback, we will start finalizing these documents. The details we discussed will be provided so you can review those and give us direction.

- b. Discussion of Preliminary Review for Kent’s Concept Plan—Mike Macfarlane, Alexis Riggs, Jared, and John

Mr. Macfarlane said we have had several iterations of this and feel comfortable where we are. We have made a lot of design changes. The groundwater is about two feet so we will have some fill on the site. We have a preliminary utility plan showing where we are expecting our tie-ins. We have discussed all accesses with UDOT and are coordinating with O'Reilly's and Maverick on that shared access. Utility wise, here is where we are tying in for sewer and water. We have an eight-inch sewer coming in here through this access point. Our water tie-in is going to come up through that access with an eight-inch line. That will serve all our hydrants and then loop. We will have a second tie-in on this side. Storm drain will be in here and it is all retained on site. Engineer Breinholt said is there a ditch that takes water away? Where does that water go now when it is irrigated? My thoughts are if that were retention, if that were spilling where would it go? Mrs. Riggs said there is a ditch south of our property and a ditch easement in place. I do not think we are encroaching into that area with the setback requirements. On the northwest corner there is a ditch, and we are in the process of working on that. There is ownership to make sure we get it either underground or vacated. They further discussed the flow of utilities. Director Mackley said I like big master meters, but the City wants as few as possible. We generally own everything up to the meter.

After some discussion, Engineer Breinholt said all my comments are subject to revision. I did not have a chance to really look at this. I want to look at the utilities and layout so I can give comments. Chairman Epling said we do not need a motion we are just going to move on to a site plan, take the feedback and bring this back when you want to get on the agenda. I can put together a checklist for you.

- c. Discussion and Consideration of Clover Fields Site Plan—Keith Russell and Russell Thornley

Chairman Epling said they are using the single-family residential transitions overlay zone to create the density. We are grateful these two property owners are working together to create a through street. Code does require 25% of the houses to be 5,000 square foot lots and the rest can be on a 4,000. We are just applying the overlay to both

parcels, regardless of ownership. We would treat it as one development and one overlay as long as both property owners are okay with it. We cannot change the zoning unless we have both owners on board. Since this is an overlay, it still has to go to the Council. I will put out the public notices on Thursday, and they could be on the Planning Commission's agenda on April 28.

**Motion by Director Mackley to approve this design preliminary plat concept.** Motion seconded by Engineer Breinholt. Vote: Chairman Epling – yes, Assistant Director Beecher – yes, Engineer Breinholt – yes, Director LeFevre – absent, Director Mackley – yes, Manager Nessen – yes. Motion approved.

d. Discussion and Consideration of Valley Vista Preliminary Plan

This item was removed from this week's agenda and will be discussed in the future.

e. Discussion and Consideration of Tremon Project Concept Plan—Allison Albert, Dale Bennett, Trevor Williams (via phone), and Mark

Mr. Williams said we are kind of starting over. Not on the full plan, but in getting up to speed. We can look at it together and determine the next steps. We have gone through a couple different potential processes and are trying to make a successful project. Our very first submittal was two years ago and included roughly 440 units. We had included all the initial reports and surveys. It was shown that this project could effectively handle 440 units. Since that time, our project density has gone down significantly. There is a home at the entrance of the property sitting on about 2.5 acres and that parcel will be cut out of this plan. We will revise that, which will lower the density even further. Everything else as far as layout, traffic, fire, drainage, engineering, open space, etc. has been fully aligned with all the pertinent parties. We started with a PUD, which was a preliminary plat to final plat alongside a development agreement. One of the concerns was if we go that direction, it will alter our proposed density unless we were able to get the full 50% bonus density as allowed. If we get the full 50%, we are probably close to sixes on the density count. However, if we did not get that and are significantly less than that, then we do not even have a viable project. Chairman Epling said I was under the assumption you were applying for the PUD and that was the process you were pursuing, but you are saying the original process was a development agreement with your own overlay zone without using our PUD mechanism? You would have to go from mixed-use to residential zoning and then do a PUD overlay. The roads are wider with the mixed-use and it was not going to work. That makes a big difference. I thought in order to do the mixed-use zone he had to have bigger streets and that you were originally going through the PUD overlay. The PUD route adds a lot more red tape. Mr. Williams said we are doing mixed-use, preliminary plat to final plat through the mixed-use zone. We have two questions. First, under this mixed-use, can we include storage units? Secondly, another proposed use we would like to consider is a park model RV resort. We are fine with either. You can buy a park model home for around \$80,000, allowing an affordable housing solution without all the red tape of that program. A park model is essentially a tiny home. They are legally a recreational vehicle with wheels,

like an RV. They are typically around 400 square feet with one to two bedrooms. On the outside, they look exactly like a tiny home. From a bird's eye view, it looks like an RV park with pads for the unit, a side patio, a parking space and privacy fencing between units. They do get skirted and do not require the footing foundation. Chairman Epling said I do not know the mixed-use code as well as I should to give you an educated answer on our recommendation. I think we would have to change the code in order to do that since the mixed-use does not allow that. I will have to do some research.

Engineer Breinholt said I think the less density you can have in this tiny access, the better. Chairman Epling said I did meet with our current fire chief and he has different opinions than the last fire chief. In order to adequately serve this area and get their trucks around that bottleneck area, they would need an entrance on the west. That would mean going under the freeway. He told me all the reasons why he would not like to fight a fire here. We are trying to create connectivity as a City. There are no sidewalks, and my concern is the safety of children. We walked that street and talked about putting a sidewalk all the way there or at least underneath the freeway until they could get to a viable place where there was a shoulder. We want to have adequate places for people to walk. I would not want to get fully behind all this density if we have unsafe places for our residents to get into town. I know that is not your issue, but it is something we want to work with developers on. Mr. Williams said we could do that as part of the approval. They further discussed accesses along with the sewer lift station.

The Committee then discussed setbacks and what would be required for approval. Chairman Epling said we as a City are shifting to using our standardized PUD instead of making different overlay zones for every developer. That is why I offered the PUD as a route so the City has more of a standardized overlay. Mr. Williams said if we stay with the mixed-use, which is currently the clearest, fastest and simplest process for density, or we need to look at an overlay zone with a development agreement. Chairman Epling said that PUD overlay zone would be the one you would use to qualify for bonus density. This is a standardized way for developers to use an overlay to create different housing options. It is a tool that helps you have those smaller setbacks and create multi-family housing. It also gives us some types of standardized throughout the entire community. You should have the flexibility within our PUD code to do what you want. With a PUD, you still have to do development agreement, which hashes out all the details. The development agreement has the meat and the PUD gives the tool to create the density. They would be added to the Planning Commission's agenda for April 28.

**Motion by Engineer Breinholt that we approve this proposed zoning to the Planning Commission for review.** Motion seconded by Director Mackley. Vote: Chairman Epling – yes, Assistant Director Beecher – yes, Engineer Breinholt – yes, Director LeFevre – yes, Director Mackley – yes, Manager Nessen – yes. Motion approved.

- f. Discussion and Consideration of Overlook Project—Jeff Seedall consultant to Seth Rosier

Mr. Seedall said we have adjusted some of the unit types and added utilities. The last City Planner liked having preliminary plats into the development agreement because they are the roadmap for the development as a whole. Are you good with the park amenities and layouts? Director LeFevre said it is a very usable space. I think it is the direction I would like to see. Mr. Seedall said in terms of connectivity, we were hoping that since the trails tie the detention basin to the park, the City would be okay taking over all green space for maintenance. Director LeFevre said I had mentioned before doing some standards for detention of basins. We have an open area, but with landscaping so it is not just a hole. There is also the pump track. We want that to be asphalted for easy maintenance. To the east it looks like there is a lot of room for expansion to bring the trails in. Mr. Seedall said we can have that as part of the landscape plans with the construction drawings. Director Mackley said what is your plan for water and the whole north are? Mr. Seedall said we have been working with other developers in the area to determine the tank size needed for that service area. Director Mackley said I do not see a reason for the City to get involved as far as contributing to that. I feel those negotiations should be done between developers. Chairman Epling said for zoning we need to work out an agreeable development agreement to address issues for finishing sidewalk along 1000 North. We have done a lot of work to take the PUD overlay with the development agreement as a finished package to the Commission and Council. There will be a lot of work we need to figure out on the development agreement for improvements. The two main issues up there are, how are we going to ensure the water tanks are put in and how are we going to address improvements on 1000 North. That all has to be in the development agreement. There will also be timing concerns as far as residents wanting the improvements before density goes in and figuring out how that is going to work. I will do my homework and work on getting that development agreement together. As soon as we have more information, we will get you on the DRC agenda.

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

g. Walk-ins:

Nic Porter and Garrett Kelley with River's Edge were a 'walk in'. Mr. Porter said for phases 5 and 6, and the construction documents you mentioned, something needed to happen before you would sign this. Engineer Breinholt said it is the escrow. I can sign it, but somebody has to be the gatekeeper. We cannot record it until the escrow is established. Usually, I hold that up until I have the escrow done. We just need an established gatekeeper from the city. Manager Nessen said that would be our City Recorder Nelson. She will not record it until the escrow is in place.

When discussing secondary water, Mr. Porter said we are going to have the pump station set up soon. They are starting to run the line. Director Mackley said as soon as there is water in the canal, we can test that. Let us shoot for Monday May 11, to meet.

Water would be available by then. Mr. Porter said we need to expand a sidewalk into the park strip on property we do not own anymore and were hoping the City could help knock those doors and let them know what is happening. We were supposed to put in a wider trail from our project over to the nature preserve. The problem is some of the homes were never part of our project in Holmgren Estates and others have already been sold and developed. It is right-of-way, but we were hoping the City could drive that conversation. Engineer Breinholt said you do have to complete that requirement of the continued eight-foot sidewalk from that intersection to the park. Mr. Porter said we will do that in conjunction with Phase 6.

Todd Thornley and Ben Johnston were also in attendance to discuss parking on Tremont Street. Mr. Johnston said essentially, he is fixing this up. In front of his business there are five existing stalls for parallel parking. That is not enough for future growth and to operate there. The sidewalk jogs right here at this spot and then runs all the way up through here. We are proposing to cut the sidewalk back and gain eight more parking spots with angled parking instead. They also discussed parking in the back lot and how that area is being improved, along with drainage concerns. They addressed the dumpster area and how it is affecting one of the alleys. They would get on the agenda soon for further discussion.

4. Public comments: None.
5. Staff Reports: None.
6. Adjournment:

**Motion by Engineer Breinholt to adjourn the meeting.** Motion seconded by consensus of the Committee. The meeting adjourned at 12:00 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 Development Review Committee Meeting held on the above referenced date. Minutes 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.