

**TREMONTON CITY CORPORATION  
PLANNING COMMISSION  
APRIL 14, 2026**

Members Present:

Raulon Van Tassell, Chairman—excused  
Micah Capener, Commission Member  
Karen Ellsworth, Commission Member  
Andrea Miller, Commission Member—excused  
Ashley Phillips, Commission Member  
Jack Stickney, Commission Member  
ChrisDean Epling, Zoning Administrator  
Tiffany Lannefeld, Deputy Recorder

Co-Chairman Capener called the Planning Commission Meeting to order at 5:31 p.m. The meeting was held April 14, 2026, in the City Council Meeting Room at 102 South Tremont Street, Tremonton, Utah. Co-Chairman Capener, Commission Members Ellsworth, Phillips, Stickney, Zoning Administrator Epling, and Deputy Recorder Lannefeld were in attendance. Chairman Van Tassell and Commission Member Miller were excused.

1. Approval of agenda:

Administrator Epling asked that item number 4. b. of the presentations be removed from the agenda for discussion today. The developer would like to be present when any discussions are had.

**Motion by Commission Member Stickney to approve the April 14, 2026, agenda with that amendment.** Motion seconded by Commission Member Ellsworth. Vote: Chairman Van Tassell – absent, Co-Chairman Capener – yes, Commission Member Ellsworth – yes, Commission Member Miller – absent, Commission Member Phillips – yes, Commission Member Stickney – yes. Motion approved.

2. Declaration of Conflict of Interest: None.

3. Approval of amended minutes—November 25, 2025

Co-Chairman Capener said the minutes included an error on 5a. Public hearing. The minutes state “To receive public input on amending Chapter 1.27 Sign Permit.” The Public Hearing was to receive input on the Annexation Plan. The minutes should read “To receive public input on the annexation policy plan.”

**Motion by Commission Member Ellsworth to approve the minutes with that change.** Motion seconded by Commission Member Phillips. Vote: Chairman Van Tassell – absent, Co-Chairman Capener – yes, Commission Member Ellsworth – yes, Commission Member Miller – absent, Commission Member Phillips – yes, Commission Member

Stickney – yes. Motion approved.

4. Presentations

a. Discussion Only — potential revisions to the Planned Unit Development (PUD)

Administrator Epling said we discussed this previously and I have heard back from our lawyer. I really want your direction as a Planning Commission on how to proceed with code changes. I will adjust code according to what you want. This is a legislative process supported by State code. One of the confusions with PUDs is that it is an overlay that everybody has and it is attached to zoning. That is not true, it has to be applied individually for each project. A developer may apply for consideration of the approval of the PUD overlay zone. The City Council shall review and may approve such applications after receiving a recommendation from the Planning Commission. A public hearing is required. We have a contradiction in our code. This whole paragraph contradicts what it says at the beginning because it gives DRC the ability to approve or actually under administrative decisions. This confuses the process. Co-Chairman Capener said we put this in specifically because it was not clear if a concept plan could be gone through initially. The issue was sometimes people start spending thousands of dollars drawing up things that are never going to fly. DRC knows what is feasible. This basically said they can submit a concept plan. They are not vested at that level. The vision was to submit so DRC could identify issues and hurdles. To my knowledge, that section was not necessarily designed for a final approval. Administrator Epling said that makes sense, but some people are wanting to use this as a final approval process to deviate from the legislative process. The lawyer said it needs to be clearer. Vested rights really are not triggered until they get the base zoning. Since they have to apply for a PUD overlay, which establishes a base zoning, do you want the PUD overlay to be done at the beginning and then hash out all the details? In DRC we spent a lot of time hashing things out and to have it come to the very end and not get approval can be hard. The lawyer was very clear. It does not matter if it is done at the beginning or the end, it still has to go through the legislative process. He suggested doing the PUD overlay at the beginning, so thousands of dollars are not spent in negotiating with the City. That could be done so they have a basis. The development agreement comes in at the end and establishes expectations upfront. He recommended the City Council and Planning Commission, attach a drafted development agreement or a clause, something this is what we would like to see in the negotiations. Then there are expectations upfront. The PUD overlay does not guarantee public infrastructure improvement. That is done with a development agreement. I love that the PUD sets architectural standards that we cannot negotiate in any other way and creates more of a master development and park space. These are good things for a community.

Commission Member Stickney said my concern is if we approve a PUD or a development, what guarantees certain things happen? Administrator Epling said the

development agreement guarantees those things. The PUD will set some standards that the developer and City can use to negotiate. There is a bonus density calculator for the PUD overlay, which allows flexibility. The number one thing it allows is architectural standards and landscaping. When a developer applies for the PUD overlay, they are agreeing to architectural standards. It is then up to the engineers and developers to hash out all the details and ensure it meets code. I really do think the PUD is a good tool for the City. It just needs to be known how to use it. In the past, infrastructure improvements have been tied to it. Those are separate. When you approve a PUD just know that you do not have the infrastructure. That is tied to the development agreement. It protects the developers and City when you already have that legislative process done ahead of time. A great tool has been the Neighborhood Partnership Initiative and one of the biggest things of the NPI has been educating citizens on this process. We do not have all the variables worked out because that is the way the tool is designed. It is supposed to be flexible, but we do have guidelines. Co-Chairman Capener said we have never used the PUD in our City and the whole vision was to make the overlays more transparent and equal. Administrator Epling said when a developer comes in, it is nice to have something established instead of creating a whole new overlay for every single development. Since we are changing density with a PUD, it must go through the legislative process. I think it should be done at the beginning. If you are okay with that, I will make that clearer in the code. The Commission suggested Administrator Epling make the modifications in a word doc with red strike throughs and run it by the attorney before returning to the Commission. Co-Chairman Capener said if the changes are reasonable, we are probably going to be okay with them. If they are not, then we can provide our suggestions. The Commission would review this document prior to their next discussion. Co-Chairman Capener said I would love to see a staff report from the DRC meetings explaining what was discussed as developments come in.

Administrator Epling then explained the flow process. Concept plan, landscape designs and all things submitted to DRC will be forwarded to you before our meetings so you can have a general idea of their vision. We will have a public hearing and then the Commission will make recommendations to the Council, who will decide if it is approved or not. If so, we move forward with the preliminary and final plat approval process. The amenities with a PUD include open space, recreation, streetscape, and other things we cannot ask developers to do that will make our City look better. That would be a great resource. How the density bonuses work right now is they can get the base, let us say 100 houses on a parcel. According to every amenity upgrade, like streetscaping, open space, they get a certain percentage of added density bonuses for that, up to 50% so they can get up to 150 houses on that acreage. Items D and E make it so they can get more than that through senior living and moderate-income housing units. We do not have a definite ending of that and as a city planner, I worry about that and how to regulate that. If you approve the PUD overlay with the assumption they are going to add 150 homes, but now there are 300, it can be tricky. Are you okay with keeping that in the code? Chairman Capener said

I feel fine with it, but I do not particularly want projects that are all one type of housing. We need a variety of housing throughout. We went back to the Land Use Plan and our whole target was to get open space and nicer buildings, along with parks and trails, clubhouses and all sorts of amenities. That is why we have agreed to give more density, but they must create at least 15% open space. They reviewed how the density calculator worked and Administrator Epling said it is up to DRC to make sure developers meet code, but it is important for the Planning Commission to understand the code so as we approve things you know what we are doing.

b. Discussion Only — upcoming legislative items

Overview and preliminary discussion of land use applications anticipated to proceed through the legislative process

1. Zoning Map Amendment—Rezoning Application

*Parcel No. 05-173-0044, located north of the 100 North and 1650 West Intersection.*

Administrator Epling said this is just a concept for discussion so we can determine how to move forward. Part of his land is already RM-16. Something we have talked about is extending that and making this whole strip RM-16. Developer Tyler Farr, the owner of Farr Built Homes and Stag Investments, said I worked with the previous planner for about a year. He did not seem to be portraying to the City what we were going to do. He suggested I just apply for RM-16, then could do whatever I wanted. Obviously, we do not need to do that, so I am grateful I met Administrator Epling. I do not want to create hundreds of the same product. I want a diverse community that meets multiple needs—smaller single-family homes, some duplexes, townhomes and apartment living. I want to make a nice community that fits a whole bunch of needs. I will have to have more discussions with Administrator Epling to accomplish our goals and determine what kind of zoning we need to put apartments. We want to keep them along I-15. We do have a chunk of RM-16 already but would like to extend that all the way to the north to keep those along I-15. Everything to the east of that road is going to be 1650 and will eventually connect to 1000 North. Administrator Epling said my recommendation is to zone the RM-16 along that strip and keep the R1-10. He could apply the PUD overlay if he wanted more flexibility to bring in townhomes or other things that would be more congruent with his vision. Co-Chairman Capener said we have a policy that allows for 44 units, max on a dead-end road. This one is already at nearly 100. You will have to get an exit out of there before you can do anything. Mr. Farr said they are working with another group on making that happen in the future. If everything lines up, we are hoping to start next summer. Administrator Epling said one thing I like about this project is our Land Use Plan says to keep multi-family housing in the urban core, and this project is closer to that than any of the other places being proposed for development recently. This is just a discussion so I can put out a public notice for

the rezone, to extend the RM-16. This will be on a future agenda.

2. Zoning Map Amendment—Overlay Zone Proposal  
*Parcel No. 06-059-0105, located north and east of Hallow Drive—Valley Vista*  
**This item was removed from the agenda and will be discussed later.**
3. Zoning Map Amendment—Single-Family Residential Transition Overlay (Chapter 1.16.235)  
*Parcel No. 05-060-0088 and 05-060-0089, located at 190 South 900 West and 890 West 110 South, Tremonton—Clover Fields*

Administrator Epling said all these items are scheduled to help you make decisions in the next meeting. This is just for your information. They are using this PUD overlay in our code. It is a single-family residential transition overlay zone. I have read through this extensively and it allows them, since they are next to a commercial district, to have 4,000 to 5,000 square foot lots, but 25% must be 5,000 square foot lots. This has two property owners working together. I suggested being able to apply the 25% to the project as a whole, as long as we have an agreement from both property owners. The problem is the project does not go through to the bottom so most of the 5,000 square foot lots are on the parcel below. It is not distributed proportionately throughout, but I do not know how to fix that. Let me know if you are okay approving it together or if we need to make adjustments. It would be really hard for them to figure out the 25% for each parcel. He meets the requirements of this overlay zone and both landowners have talked to me personally. I am scheduling a public hearing because this does require a legislative process.

4. Zoning Map Amendment and PUD Overlay  
*Parcels No. 05-181-0025, 05-181-0007 and 05-181-0006, located east of 1000 West and approximately 1098 South. Request to rezone from R1-20 to R1-10 and apply a PUD Overlay—Tremont Project*

Administrator Epling said this is currently zoned Mixed-Use. I have had discussions to ensure it meets code and follows the Land Use Plan. If the fire or police departments have issues, I want to bring them to you for your information but know that is a City Council decision on whether or not they are approve based on their concerns. I included the letter from the fire and police chiefs, but that does not really have to do with our Land Use Plan. That has to do with overall development. Basically, their main concern is that we are adding more people for the officers to take care of, and they are not getting more budget. This is a concern to be aware of, but it is the City Council who will have to have this discussion with the general budget. In the future, I will not bring police matters to the Planning Commission, but I might bring fire issues to you still. The biggest concern for the fire department is having two egresses with this many houses. Our

Chief is concerned about getting fire trucks through there. He does not think it is adequate to make turns. Even if he does get a truck in here, it would block this entrance and not be enough space to get two fire trucks here. Our fire chief has been in discussions with the County and State fire marshals. They agreed that another access point on the left side would be needed and that could be accomplished by burrowing under the freeway. These roads are so small and need to have fire lines. He is concerned about safety for the people who would live here. It is zoned Mixed-Use, but they want residential and a PUD overlay. There would be several four-plexes throughout, with hundreds of units. There are currently two homes in here already. There are still a lot of kinks being worked out. The DRC is meeting with them tomorrow; I just wanted to give you a heads up. Looking at land use, this is something you as a Planning Commission can look at. Instead of saying, this is what the developer wants to do with this land, what do we want to do with it? I think an IFA store there would be great, with maybe 20 houses with larger lots. It is appropriately zoned for Mixed-Use for safety reasons. You will help determine what should this be used for? The fire department had no problem with retail stores being there or light commercial, even light industrial, because they could get in and serve that a lot better than having all those smaller streets and homes.

Administrator Epling said I will be sending out public notices this week and will send a copy of the concept plan for Valley Vista because they want the PUD overlay. This is on Radio Hill. The Central District Rezone application will also be on the agenda for a decision, along with the Tremont project. There was a lot to discuss, and I did not want you guys having to hash all of that out in one meeting. That is why I thought this meeting was important to get details before that is brought to you for a decision. Co-Chairman Capener suggested they allow citizens to submit concerns about topics in advance so they can obtain answers and better inform the public. We would have an idea of how many are going to speak and what their concerns are. I would love it if they would say, here is my issue and a resolution. Sometimes all we get are complaints, but we need more ideas on how to solve issues. The Commission suggested a QR code to a Google form where people can address their concern for better discussions. Administrator Epling said it has been expected of you to be informed, answer public questions and decide all in one meeting. That seems very unfair to everybody.

They further discussed the NPI and some of the developments coming in. Administrator Epling said I do appreciate the process that goes into this. One last comment about Overlook. How it was presented was if they get the density, they will provide the infrastructure. Well, they want to use impact fees for that project to be reimbursed for sidewalks and things, which I am fine with, if it is okay with Public Works. They might want that money to be used elsewhere. If those impact fees are reimbursed, then the developer is getting paid for the work, so we should not be gauging that based off density requirements. That can be a bit misleading.

5. Public Comments

Aaron Stint said I am one of the owners of the building at 83 Tremont Street. This building needs a lot of work and is going to be a big project. One plan we have is using it for a daycare with a residential unit above. That corner is open to whatever is the newest whim of my partner or something that works for the City. We are one block away from the CDA line and wondered if there was a process that could include us in that boundary. We would like to put in something with outdoor dining—European style. It would be a place you would see people out eating. It could be a bakery where you would be able to see the bread and everything being made, like a Great Harvest, but with more selection. Right now, it is a building with a roof caved in. We would love to present our plans and see if we could figure something out. They also discussed the parking.

6. Adjournment

**Motion by Commission Member Ellsworth to adjourn the meeting.** Motion seconded by consensus of the Board. The meeting adjourned at 6:55 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.