

**TREMONTON CITY CORPORATION
PLANNING COMMISSION
APRIL 28, 2026**

Members Present:

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

Chairman Van Tassell called the Planning Commission Meeting to order at 5:30 p.m. The meeting was held April 28, 2026 in the City Council Meeting Room at 102 South Tremont Street, Tremonton, Utah. Chairman Van Tassell, Commission Members Capener, Miller, and Stickney, Administrator Epling, Planner Lance, and Deputy Recorder Lannefeld were in attendance. Commission Member Ellsworth and Phillips were excused.

1. Approval of agenda:

Motion by Commission Member Stickney to approve the April 28, 2026 agenda. Motion seconded by Commission Member Miller. Vote: Chairman Van Tassell – yes, Commission Member Capener – yes, Commission Member Ellsworth – absent, Commission Member Miller – yes, Commission Member Phillips – absent, Commission Member Stickney – yes. Motion approved.

2. Declaration of Conflict of Interest: None.

3. Approval of minutes—March 24, 2026

Motion by Commission Member Stickney to approve the minutes of March 24, 2026. Motion seconded by Commission Member Capener. Vote: Chairman Van Tassell – yes, Commission Member Capener – yes, Commission Member Ellsworth – absent, Commission Member Miller – yes, Commission Member Phillips – absent, Commission Member Stickney – yes. Motion approved.

4. Presentations—Zoning Administrator ChrisDean Epling and Planner Jeremy Lance
a. Tremont Project Rezone (MU to R1-8)

Administrator Epling said in the future, we will have a full staff report with all the information you need. It will be a brief synopsis of the project. We are asking for a

continuance of these three projects for two reasons. To ensure we have a complete application with the associated fees being paid and to give staff enough time to review all required documentation to present a full and accurate representation of the project. Planner Lance said regarding legislative and administrative items there are key differences between the two. Administrative items are where you read code and it defines what is allowed. If you check all the boxes, it must be approved. It is not a maybe we like the development maybe we do not, you shall recommend it to the approving body for administrative items. Legislative items differ in that you are looking at either changes to the ordinance or changing your zoning, which means you are changing your entitlements. Changing the standards of the code. On our agenda today, staff would like to request more time to bring these items back so they can fully consider the standards as outlined in our code.

The three projects on the agenda were then reviewed. Planner Lance said for the rezone, the current zoning is multi-use. The future land use map comes from the Integrated Land Use Plan from 2023 and shows this as single-family residential, of the low-density character. There are 40.08 acres. The request is to rezone these acres from multi-use to residential R1-8. When it comes to rezones, the questions as a legislative item should be, does it fit the character of the area? Does it provide a buffer? Does it follow good planning principles? Could it generally work all right? The applicant has a right to request a rezone, and we would get ourselves in hot water asking about intent right off the bat. Commission Member Capener said residential is already allowed in the Mixed-Use zone. Why would they want to down zone it unless there are advantages. They are going from a Mixed-Use that allows pretty much everything to a very limited R1-8. Administrator Epling said we need to meet with the developer before we answer more questions. Tonight, would be a great night to interact with the public and see their sentiments as we move forward and make decisions on May 26. The staff report should be detailed enough that it answers all questions from the public. A continuance still honors the public notices so we do not have to re-notice, but it will allow us to move forward in the legislative process.

Planner Lance said for the Clover Fields transitional overlay, the current zoning is R1-10, but that was changed for 3.5 acres. The request is for approval of a preliminary plat for the Cloverfield subdivision Phase 3 PUD for the creation of more lots. Administrator Epling said they want to apply for this transitional overlay. They reviewed the concept plan, showing the configuration for the two parcels owned by two owners, along with the road and private drives. The current lots in the neighborhood are 10,000 square feet. This overlay allows them to have 4,000 to 5,000 square foot lots.

Planner Lance said next is the Valley Vista PUD application. The current designation is R1-12. The general plan designation for this property is single-family residential. The request for the 58.62 acres is approval of a PUD preliminary plat for the creation of 285 units. Administrator Epling said this is 1000 North and a main arterial road. Development will come on both sides of that. They reviewed the layout and that all townhomes would

be in one location. There is a transition from smaller lots with larger lots around the perimeter. There are also walkways and paths, with open space for playgrounds. There are two locations for detention ponds that could potentially be used as park space but would need to be discussed with Parks and Recreation to confirm usable space.

5. Public Hearing:

Chairman Van Tassell called a Public Hearing to order at 6 p.m. to receive input on the proposed rezone listed below. There were 34 people in attendance.

- a. To receive public input on proposed rezoning from MU (Multi-Use) to R1-8 (Single-Family house on 8000 square foot lots) of parcel 05-181-0025 and 05-181-0007.

River Park said from my understanding, there are 400 plus townhomes planned in that area. Chairman Capener said they are proposing a rezone of R1-8. Townhomes are not allowed unless they do a PUD. Administrator Epling said we are still in negotiations with them, so we do not know the full intent. R1-8 might be a steppingstone, but we do not know yet. Staff has not verified what the final intent of the applicant is. Mrs. Park said my understanding was that it would be a large housing development. I live on that road. It would be right behind my house. My main concerns would be having that high of a density in that area, surrounded by the freeways. It works for me and my one neighbor, but I wonder about having so many townhomes there. If this is the plan they want to present, their emergency lane is currently my driveway and our only access point to Iowa String Road. It is the most northern access point back to the develop, which makes me think that will be the default road, even though they say the southernmost road they are going to build is going to be the primary road. I believe the ungated emergency access point will be used as the primary because people will want to turn in sooner. I am concerned about that being our driveway. It is not technically on our property, but it is our only access point, and we do maintain it.

William Pickett said being in the middle of the freeway, there is only one exit and entrance for how many people? How many homes? Code wise, my recollection is that on any development, you must have two roads, one in and one out. If you do not have the two roads, you are in violation. There is going to be an awful lot of noise from the freeway, and I do not think people would appreciate it.

John Butler said with the increase in the number of houses and apartments, is the infrastructure going to be able to handle it? Does this go along with our city planning map? Does this match the density of the housing and what the City has already planned. A week ago, we met and saw a map of the ideas the City had for layouts for the general area and making sure these layouts are going to coincide with the general plan we have already established.

Chairman Van Tassell closed the Public Hearing at 6:06 p.m. Chairman Van Tassell called a Public Hearing to order at 6:06 p.m. to receive input on the transition overlay listed below. There were 34 people in attendance.

- b. To receive input on proposed application of the Single-Family Residential Transition Overlay (found in Chapter 1.16.235) to parcels 05-060-0088 and 05-060-0089

Jay Zundel said I like the thought that this possibly gives younger people an opportunity to get into a home. The part I wonder about is the spot zoning challenge. I have done a little research. It says spot zoning occurs when a small area is singled out for a different treatment than the surrounding land primarily for the benefit of a private owner rather than the public interest. Does the overlay create an island of higher density than is inconsistent with the City's comprehensive plan? If the City's long-term plan designates an area for low density residential, but the overlay suddenly allows for higher density transitional units without a documented printing justification, a court may find it arbitrary and capricious. I just do not know if the plan to put that right in the middle of a neighborhood that had horses and animals into high density, is being handled correctly.

Chairman Van Tassell closed the Public Hearing at 6:09 p.m. Chairman Van Tassell called a Public Hearing to order at 6:09 p.m. to receive input on the proposed PUD listed below. There were 34 people in attendance.

- c. To receive input on proposed application of PUD Overlay Zone (found in Chapter 1.33) to parcel 06-059-0105

Micah Miles said it looks like it might be a nice sub development, but there is one road in and out. What road does that come down to? How much development is around that road? A whole bunch. What does that empty out on? 10th North. Have you guys done a traffic study? Do you know if it can handle that many cars coming and going at the same time of day? What if there is evacuation or a medical emergency? We really need to know these things. You will need stop signs and lights. Wider roads and crosswalks for kids going to school. Your infrastructure needs a lot of help. Secondly, the sewer plant is having big issues. This would add 285 more homes, possibly 200 homes down on those 40 acres and then the one on the hill wants 508 units. That is a lot of sewage. You also have water and storm drain issues in this City. Everything is different sizes, and you are going to push that all the way off the hill at that speed, shoving smaller pipes into a big pipe into a small pipe. We need to get that fixed. I do not see what is wrong with just using the plain zoning and not a PUD. It was zoned that way for a reason. We do not need to change everything to create higher density. We need to make sure we take care of our community and safety for our kids going up and down the roads.

Debbie Bratner said I live on the old side of town, not even close to Valley Vista and my concern is all this new building and how that will affect the sewer plant. I am in the

middle of town and the sewer for these new homes is going to come down, past my house, across to the sewer plant. All summer, last summer, there was a truck that would stop right next to my house and pump out sewer of the main drain. We already have a problem with the sewer. The guy over the sewer plant has said we are going to have an issue with our sewer because of these homes coming in. Why do I have to worry about these new homes affecting the sewer at my house? Something must be done with our infrastructure before we add to it.

John Nicholas said my big concern is all this construction and truck traffic. My road is almost a gravel road. I do not understand why we cannot take care of what we already have. There is a weight limit on that road (12,000 pounds), but there are trucks on those roads every day. My friend, who lives up on 1000, said they put a truck turn around sign on the wrong side of the road. If you are trying to detour trucks from coming down 1000, the sign has to be on the right side of the road. Also in the wintertime snow removal is a problem. I have seen deep ruts on 2300. I am afraid somebody is going to get killed there. Families walk on that road all the time. I have tried to get a cement sidewalk down one side of it, but it is too expensive.

Ben Greener said I live on the mountain road and this does not match what I envisioned my housing area to look like. Tremonton does not need any more apartments or townhouses. We already have a lot. We need more nice residential areas. One road in is just ridiculous. At the bottom there is a bus stop. This is not a good fit for our City.

Megan Miles said can you pull up the General Comprehensive Zoning Master Plan for everybody to see? When they do updates for a city about our size, it costs us tax dollars of \$125,000 to \$500,000. One concern I have is the overlay does not meet what the current zoning is or has been for our short- or long-term plan. When we are planning, we need to look at infrastructure needs when those zones are put in place. You have professionals to look at that. With zone changes on the hill, we are looking at an additional 860 doors. We currently have about 14,000 residents. If we put in that many homes, averaging a three-person household, we would be looking at increasing our percentage of the area up 18% just in those homes on the hill. That is a lot more people, especially with our needs. When we look at schools, sewers and roads, that does not match our master plan with the zoning. We have taken a lot of time and effort in doing these studies. I am concerned about multi-dwelling resident units. On average, a lot of those units are not owned, they are rentals. We want to foster people who are going to be here long term and good productive people. Not that those in rentals are not, but we have areas that are zoned specifically for townhomes and multi-dwells. I am really concerned about the kids and our schools. They are already at capacity. We will have lot more students needing teaching, and we do not want to have our kids suffer.

Eldon Peterson said I live in this area as well. It has a beautiful view, and I can see why people want to live there. I admit that is a much better place to build homes than down on the farm ground in the valley but let us build the right kind of homes. The things

mentioned tonight are very true. We have to have additional access points in and out of there. Right now, at certain time of the day I cannot get out of this subdivision for five minutes. I have to wait for the traffic to clear. That top row of houses is almost at that same level and will have no water pressure. We need to get water up there high enough, so it does not restrict the amount of volume available for those who live there currently and for new people. We already have that problem a little further west on the top homes. I hope you will look at those things as you address this.

Layne Wilding said I am part of the Tremonton West NPI group. Currently we have over 70 members. This is a list of questions and concerns that residents have voiced to me. I would like to have all of them addressed in writing, so we understand what the position really is. In writing would solidify that better than just the verbal back and forth. I feel our residents have taken a lot of time to think about the impact this is going to have on our community. I think a lot of these questions would apply to all subdivisions. We have to talk about secondary and culinary water, sewer supplies, streets, roads, infrastructure, and all that stuff. These are questions residents in this area have and would apply across the board. I would like to see answers. I hope you would consider and respect this. Tremonton is trying to make an effort to reach out to citizens and get their input relative to growth for the future. This is our first shot at giving you the input. Take time to consider it carefully.

David Heise said thank you for hearing our community. We all know that emotions can get heated and listening to a disagreeable voice can be very difficult. I am not fully versed in the laws and regulations that constrict what this Commission can or cannot do. The question at hand is whether or not these changes provide sufficient public benefit. This is somewhat vague, perhaps a better question would be what is best for our community? We need to consider the economics of today and the future. Many feel things are bad and only going to get worse. Cost of goods go up and down, yet pricing of housing magically does not. We often hear from developers a proposal, but we must always remember that developers are a business. While their designs may or may not be beneficial to the community, they are trying to make money. Though a good builder does want their customers to be happy with their homes and community, they do not have to deal with the future of their designs. The only tool we have is zoning. Townhomes and apartments have their place, but in my opinion, they are not a solution to affordable housing. They always lead to a higher density, which leads to increased strain on community services, traffic, sewer, water, police, fire, etc. Townhome prices are just as ridiculously high as a house. Higher density housing only benefits the builder, not the community. There is a plethora of evidence of these results. Change is hard for everyone involved. Therefore, we must keep the vision for our community in mind, which does not match the current plan. A zoning change proposed for Valley Vista will have a negative impact on our community. I know there are future plans that would alleviate some of these issues, but this PUD is independent of a future plan that may or may not materialize.

John Alico said I live on the hill and am associated with the NPI West group. All the concerns people have brought up are very real. In 2023, Tremonton adopted an Integrated Land Use Plan. Let me read part of that. Land uses were made that reflect existing growth patterns and long-term needs, particularly for locations on the west side of the interstate road system. The result is a long-term vision and coordinated land use/transportation vision, suitable for growth and development through 2050 and beyond. The plan also incorporates the general findings and directions established through previous planning efforts for parks, open space, recreation and trails, with targeted adjustments and updates that support a unified and comprehensive planning vision for the City. The areas being considered on the hill for Valley Vista and also Overlook, which I understand is not being addressed tonight, are clearly reserved in the land use plan for single-family residential, low to medium density, which is single-family homes on 8,000 to 12,000 square foot lots. Trading that in for a paved path or a little bit of grass is absolutely not a compelling reason to deviate from a plan that was thought through and has the long-term growth of this town in mind. I strongly encourage the Planning Commission stand behind the Integrated Land Use plan.

Michelle Martineau said I also wanted to talk about the Integrated Land Use Plan. That plan was adopted less than three years ago and we are already deviating from it. Let me read some of that plan. Based on input provided by the public involvement process and further discussions with the Plan Advisory Committee and City staff, it is clear that Tremonton residents want to preserve the rural small-town atmosphere of the City. For many, the small-town feel is the primary reason they chose to live here. Ironically, that desirable quality has also contributed to population growth, which is transforming the town. Residents are particularly concerned about diminishing agricultural land in their community and the impact higher-density development is having on the rural and open feel of the City. There is a desire to minimize the impact of growth and introduce new forms of development, so they better align with existing patterns. Based on the input received, a set of guiding principles were established that address the opportunities and challenges of future growth and change in Tremonton. These were presented and confirmed by the Plan Advisory Committee and eventually streamlined to encapsulate the community vision and land use priorities. It says, concentrate development in existing urban areas and commercial corridors or along arterial or collectors. Under housing, it says, strive for a balanced provision of attached and detached housing types. Targeting multi-family options in the denser urban core of the City and along the central trail corridor, which will provide good access to parks, the Citywide trail system and alternative transportation options. The new land use vision is comprehensive and far-reaching. It balances the public voices that were heard and the ideas that they expressed to establish a clear future land use plan and concludes with specific goals, policies and implementation measures to ensure the integrated land use vision is achieved. Under environmental conditions, it says, development will be more challenging in the northwest project as water sources are limited at higher elevations in the foothills without additional infrastructure. To me, if a developer is going to develop that high, then part of his job is to offer and bring in water towers.

Amanda Jones said I am a single mom on the west side of Tremonton. I have been going to Council and town hall meetings over this last year. Now I am in the NPI for the west side and with all the comments I have heard from people this last year, people do not want high density development. Also in the land use plan, which has been referenced. I have the key principles from that 140-something page document. I read through the whole Land Use Plan. If we do high density development, it should be in the core of the City not on the outskirts. It does not go along with this land use plan, which they took 10 years to develop. With all the time and effort and money that was put into this, please use this as your Bible. Please follow it because it took so much effort and had so much input. This is what the people want. Last meeting, I was upset because a lot of citizens' input and the land use plan was not referenced. Also, I noticed that a lot of the conversation was about high density and how to cater to the developers, and how to put in low income or moderate-income housing. That is not what residents want. Being a single mom, it is hard to afford things, but I can do it. I do not have to have all this high-density housing to get something. The majority of the people do not want dense development in Tremonton. I was upset as I went through and did homework and found out, Commission Member Capener is a developer and real estate agent over rental units. That bothered me because you are pushing high density development. That feels like a conflict of interest with you being on this Commission. That is not right and needs to change. Please listen to the people.

Ken Firth said I live up on top of 1000 North, toward the State road sheds. We have a front yard, but I have never developed my backyard. Water on a gravel hill does not go very far. It soaks in. I am thinking down the line when you get all these houses and they have gardens and lawns, how are we going to keep up with the water? We have a shortage now. We are worried about losing our shares. The Great Salt Lake is fighting for water shares. There is not a lot of water access and when the water is there, it is not going to go very far.

Chris Oyler said I have lived here all my life and have seen flood after flood. These 100-year storms come quite often. Detention ponds never work. In some areas you have made it worse. There is nowhere for the water to go. When you start putting roads, sidewalks and all that in, that water has one place to go and it is not in the ground. There is no secondary water up there and no water rights for that mountain. From my understanding they are going to add a reservoir for secondary water. If I was you, I would go to the farmers and see what they think. Taking a farmer's water could get someone killed. I have a pretty nice well sitting right next to the water district. When you start putting that kind of housing in and start to dump water into them will you take my water away from me? That is my livelihood you are messing with.

William Pickett said in regard to the development on Radio Hill, three quick points. One was covered fairly well—water. To go along with that, every summer we get requests from the City, County and State to cut back our water usage. And yet, we have

developers coming in wanting to put in more water meters for water we have to cut back on during the summer. That sounds stupid. Some jurisdictions in Arizona and California, auction water meters when their water becomes available. Number two, fire. The situation on Radio Hill is very much like the Palisades in California. They could not get fire trucks in there because there were only a couple of streets in and out that were being blocked by traffic. With 900 new doors, that is about 3,500 new residents and you still only have 1000 North as an in and out for all those people up there already, plus another 3,500?

John Butler said I live on 2300 West, on McDonald's road. You have the school going back in behind us now on the west side of 2300 and that subdivision. There is only one road going into that school. You have to have multiple roads. Not only are you going to have all this high-density housing on 1000, you will also have stuff coming from below. There are two tanks there currently and from my understanding, one of those needs to be replaced. They have talked about building two more tanks for water storage and retention ponds. Do these developers already have the water rights? If not, that needs to be allocated first to make sure they can obtain that. We are going to high density housing again even though that is not in the Land Use Plan. I second everything that has been said. Emergency egress coming off that mountain is important since it gets dry. If you have emergency responders trying to go up and everybody is coming out, there is no way they can respond. If you put in high density housing, that is going to spread just like the Palisades. There is a time and place for high-density in the central, not on the outskirts. You are going to have to pump water uphill just to get it up there. From what I understand, people at the top already do not have water pressure. Are the new water tanks to help those who are there? Is that providing pressure so that they can take showers and use their appliances or is that supposed to update and feed all this newer stuff that is accounted for? That would be almost 1,000 homes on those two tanks. The Land Use Plan was there for a reason. People put in their input, expecting and hoping you guys make good decisions for our community. We want people who are going to invest in the community. We do not want people just coming in and out all the time.

Bruce Hancock said I live on the hill and in 40 years I have never met a developer who sticks to the zoning. They all want to come in and change it. I find that interesting. They knew the zoning when they bought the ground and yet they all want to change it. It would be nice for our City, our Councils and Commissions to stand up and say, this has been zoned this way for 20 years, and it is in our long-term zoning plan to stay that way. I think it is important we honor those commitments. Existing residents buy into an area and say, I like this and want to be here for a reason. Then we go and change it because the developer wants to put more bucks in their pockets. I think that is wrong. I do not think that is fair to the residents already here. The other thing is water. The only way we are going to get more water is if we all cut back. In my yard, I am taking out a lot of grass and mow strips and putting in rocks, because I recognize, there is a benefit there. The cities keep pushing to cut back. We put in an expensive secondary water system, and now we want everybody to cut back there. Eventually we are going to have all rocks in our

yards and who is going to pay for that secondary water system? I am going to be really upset when they come to me and say you have to pay another \$100 a month just because we have this service and very few will be using the system because we do not have the water to do it. We need to step back and make the developer adhere to the zoning that is already in place. We as residents expect that.

Linda Taylor said I live on 2650 West and my mother lives on Hollow Drive. When she moved there, she went to transfer her homeowner's insurance and was denied because of the fire danger in that area. I am not anti-development. My mother-in-law actually developed some of her land and I think it was great people got to live in that wonderful area. Tremonton is a wonderful place to live and I am very grateful. I am just saying development needs to be workable for everybody. I would love to have my kids be able to afford to live here. I do not know if that is possible the way it is now, but I also do not want to ruin the City with so much high density.

Maralee Resick said I am here for much more vain reasons. If we are bringing in productive citizens and taking care of the future, if the townhouses do get passed or even if they are in the middle of the city, I hope we are intentional in the design to encourage people to care of their area. Everyone loves the small-town feel. It would be really nice if the townhouses look less like second thoughts and more intentional. Kind of like how they do in Park City so they add value and do not take away from our property values. If we can go from the direction of not caring what is being built to making this place look really nice. While I do not want townhouses, if they do go in, I hope they make the people living in them proud to be there, instead of feeling like secondhand citizens in the way that we design them.

Wendell Dillon said I live on Radio Hill and second what everybody has said. I wish everybody here would remember this State is the second driest in the nation. so why are we letting all this stuff come up here to use water that is not there. Not only that, everybody that has a house wants a park strip and lawn. My front and side yards are all rock. I have a little back lawn because that is all anybody needs.

Chris Oyler said I own a little bit of ground and do not want anybody telling me if I can sell it or not. If a developer comes to me, I would sell, but in return, I do not expect Box Elder County or Tremonton to step in and have to furnish the development of water, sewer, sidewalk and roads. That is not Tremonton's responsibility. They bought the ground and should have looked into getting all the facilities. That is something you ought to realize. I have seen a couple subdivisions going out west and I am not very happy with them. All that has done is trash up my farm up. The bottom line is I do not think Tremonton has a responsibility to furnish development for the landowner.

Chairman Van Tassell closed the Public Hearing at 7:00 p.m.

6. Public Comments

Layne Wilding said this is a comment relative to the NPI. We are going into this new era of the Neighborhood Partnership Initiative and plowing new ground. We have never been down this path where we have had this kind of resident input into decisions for the Commission and Council. We need to be patient with each other as we go down this path, talking back and forth. I hope we have dialogue and ask questions. This quick chart shows the projected population growth for 2050 assuming we have a 3% growth rate per year. The next chart is what came out at the beginning of the year. I wanted to point out that the residents are number one on the top of the chart. You have the Mayor, City Council and Planning Commission. The next one is a flow chart between the Council, Mayor, Planning Commission, NPIs and planners. This is my take at what I think the flow of information should be. Here are the neighbors and property owners or developers. There is a line between the two. We have not had a conversation face to face with the developer and I would encourage having that interchange. I also think we should be interacting with each other. I believe we should get together and establish an ordinance or whatever it is about how this process is going to work. How much time we are going to spend in each of the steps, who is responsible for the information flow and how are the questions going to flow back and forth. I would like to see us get together and figure that out so we are all on the same page. Finally, as I watched the news, they were talking about the data center coming south of Snowville on 40,000 acres. Where will those 4,000 construction workers live? They are planning to have 2,000 permanent jobs. Where are those people going to live? What about utilities? Are they going to take Tremonton's water to run out there? What retail businesses are we going to have here to capture that influx of people?

John Butler said I am glad that Administrator Epling and Planner Lance are here. Thank you for doing all your work. I do feel it has made a change already. I appreciate it because it feels like there is actually care with our City and input that is being heard from the citizens and that is how it should be. There was a comment earlier about bringing in people who are going to contribute. If we want a good society, we need to bring people in and keep them here. We keep talking about affordable housing. Last year, the City talked about the average household income (\$60,000). They said for affordable housing, it should be three times that amount. You cannot find a house for under \$300,000. If you want families or kids to be able to afford this, the jobs have to come. We just keep throwing houses in to be a revenue for the City and it does not jive. All our money is going to Logan, Brigham and Ogden. What kind of businesses are coming in and what kind of demands are they going to have on the systems? What do we want to build? Not only residences, but how are we willing to build our community? We want to have a nice place here. We all want to enjoy the company of each other and have good neighborhoods and allow kids to have a place to go instead of just running in between neighbor houses. Give them a place to be. A place to play and be kids. We have jam-packed so many apartments and townhomes that we have kids running in the streets. I get tired of about hitting kids on the side of the road because they are playing in the road since there is not a place for them to go.

William Pickett said the culinary water for the City has on the bill a charge for the sewage and that is basically the water consumption. They determine a fee for the sewage charge. Since we have had so many issues in the last several years with the sewage, is there even room to put more processing in? A couple of years ago, the guy that was in charge, told me they had a map and were trying to add the dates they were installed so they could replace the older ones. Some of the original stuff is what they are still running into when they dig. We need to look after the infrastructure prior to doing any work adding to the population that could reach 46,000 by 2050. I hope I am not here for that.

Maralee Resick said I am also worried about the data center and about them taking energy from the grid and raising our prices. Kaysville City, from my understanding, is actually considered an off-grid city and I would love Tremonton to be more self-sufficient in that matter so we are not getting our energy pulled into a data center.

7. New Business:
 - a. Discussion of Tremont Project Rezone
 - b. Discussion of Clover Fields Overlay
 - c. Discussion of Valley Vista PUD Application

Motion by Commission Member Capener to table these items until their next meeting on May 26, 2026. Motion seconded by Commission Member Miller. Vote: Chairman Van Tassell – yes, Commission Member Capener – yes, Commission Member Ellsworth – absent, Commission Member Miller – yes, Commission Member Phillips – absent, Commission Member Stickney – yes. Motion approved.

8. Commission/Staff Reports

Commission Member Stickney said I am a resident, too. I am not a professional planner. I serve on the Planning Commission. I am interested in the direction of the City as well so I appreciate your input. I hope we can take it into consideration as we move forward. All these issues are major concerns. As a Commission we have questioned some of these same areas. We are getting more information coming to us and are looking forward to having better information to make decisions. I want to express my appreciation to the Commission Members. They each have their own points of view and expertise. I appreciate their input, but once again, thank you for yours.

Chairman Van Tassell said before the PUD ordinance, everything was done as an individual agreement with every single developer. It seemed like every case we were getting was a whole new deal and drawn from scratch. Doing that, how can we give developers flexibility while maintaining a standard. That is where the PUD ordinance came from. I think the reason why you are seeing things not follow the Land Use Plan is for that very reason, because every single development agreement was unique. It started to piece apart this future land use map pretty quick. Those types of things kind of go by

the wayside because we were trying to fit every single puzzle piece into a spot that probably should not have been there. We do have these conversations, but I appreciate the input, otherwise it is just our own individual thought processes. Please come back for future discussion so we can keep having these conversations and you can hear the thought processes behind the decisions.

Commission Member Capener said we hear all the problems, but we need to hear solutions, too. Chairman Van Tassell said relying a lot on the staff and knowing what is available to us as a City will help.

9. Adjournment

Motion by Commission Member Capener to adjourn the meeting. Motion seconded by consensus of the Board. The meeting adjourned at 7:20 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.