

**TREMONTON CITY CORPORATION
DEVELOPMENT REVIEW COMMITTEE
MAY 20, 2026**

Members Present:

ChrisDean Epling, Chairman & Zoning Administrator
Andrew Beecher, Assistant Public Works Director
Chris Breinholt, City Engineer
Jeremy Lance, City Planner
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 May 20, 2026, in the City Council Meeting Room at 102 South Tremont Street, Tremonton, Utah. Chairman Epling, Assistant Director Beecher, Engineer Breinholt, Planner Lance, Director LeFevre, Director Mackley, Manager Nessen, and Deputy Recorder Lannefeld were in attendance.

1. Approval of agenda:

Motion by Assistant Director Beecher to approve the May 20, 2026 agenda with the amendment that items a. b. and c. be for discussion only. Motion seconded by Engineer Breinholt. Vote: Chairman Epling – yes, Assistant Director Beecher – yes, Engineer Breinholt – yes, Planner Lance – yes, Director LeFevre – yes, Director Mackley – yes, Manager Nessen – yes. Motion approved.

2. New Business:

a. Discussion of Overlook Development Agreement—Seth Rosier

Chairman Epling said there is a draft of the Overlooked development agreement. The biggest thing is offsite improvements, especially for 1000 North. I think the appendix discusses where you can do the offsite agreements. There is a need for 1000 North to be updated. Engineer Breinholt said the secondary water system is not extended down to this location. They will have to put in the dry lines. We cannot do too much development without secondary anymore due to the impact it has on the culinary system. Director Mackley said the Bear River Canal Company is doing a project that Tremonton has expressed interest in doing secondary projects on. They may or may not complete those by the time that would come around. Engineer Breinholt said I think some of these reservoirs on the hills should be built by developers for this development. It should not be at City expense.

Chairman Epling said we have received counsel not to do impact fee reimbursement from our financial and legal teams so a pioneering agreement might be an option. This would be reimbursement based off of others developing. We would have to figure out how much that portion would be. There is also the PID, which is a tool we can use. It would be nice to use that with discretion and have safeguards on that, especially with informing residents who are

purchasing the home, so they do not find out last minute about special overlays. We do not currently have any PIDs in Tremonton so this would be new territory. Engineer Breinholt said if a PID was used, I think you would want to include a much larger area than just this, so those people are not the ones paying for the whole road. You also have to have some assurance that the homes are going to be built. There is going to be development happening in order to pay that bond back. I do not know how much liability it puts on the City. I do not know how much involvement you really want. For the pioneering agreements I do not know how much liability there is. To me, it feels like a pioneering agreement is a safer way to do it.

Mr. Rosier said we will either do an IFD (Infrastructure Funding District) or a PID (Public Infrastructure District). They effectively do the same thing, except for the IFD does not have to be approved by the City because it only affects the homes in the subdivision. The homeowner is notified, and we cannot sell the home if the IFD has not been paid off. The IFD cannot carry into the mortgage, but a PID can. Chairman Epling said I imagine the difference is the IFD would only cover your project scope whereas the PID could help with improvements that are bigger than your project. Mr. Rosier said yes, but we can include the water tank. It is a bond that is bought by banks and their guarantee if it is not paid back is that they have a tax-laying position on the land. Chairman Epling said this is a legislative decision the Council will have to decide, but I want to help draft a development agreement to present to the Council, so this discussion is important. Engineer Breinholt said right now, we are just talking about pluses and minuses and what might work best for the City. Mr. Rosier said we would love a pioneering agreement and then would do an IFD so there is no liability for the City. We could have a binary agreement for 1000 North. If the City wanted to participate in upsizing the culinary water tank, that could be a discussion, too. Engineer Breinholt said the City does not have money to upsize the tank. I think we need to get the developers that have interest in those tanks together to build the right size because you guys need property from the other developer to build the tank. The Committee discussed how that could function with different developers involved.

Chairman Epling said the City would like to see 1000 North be improved to the full roadway section as seen in the Public Works standards. These improvements would run from end to end to the I-84 interchange with curb, gutter and sidewalk. There is an eight-foot sidewalk on the north side. With the growth that is coming, is the Public Works standard going to be big enough for that? That road is designed as a minor arterial. Director Mackley said thinking about the potential growth that could happen on the hillside, it may need to become more than a minor arterial. Engineer Breinholt said not without major cost because it would come with right-of-way purchases from landowners. That is not meant to be the major in and out. The plan is for the roads to come down off the hill and continue to BR Mountain Road, which is an 80-foot right-of-way. BR Mountain Road is really the major outlet to that whole west side. The way it is laid out now, it has two lanes and a turn lane plus room for on street parking. It could be turned into four lanes in the future. It eliminates 2300 and takes them all the way down to a future intersection that would be lighted off 2000.

Chairman Epling said the developer shall be responsible for the design and construction of water storage tank necessary to provide adequate culinary services located at the elevation of 4,600 feet. The developer and City engineer shall coordinate to determine appropriate location.

Moving forward and talking to the Council, a recommendation for financing and making the improvements on 1000 North, it seems that using the IFD along with the pioneering agreement could work. That way the cost of improving 1000 North does not fall entirely upon one subdivision. They are trying to get the development agreement and overlay to the Planning Commission so they can get their entitlements and come back for the preliminary plat. This is for discussion only, no motion to be made.

b. Discussion of Valley Vista Development Agreement

The Committee discussed the development agreement template and how things would be formalized. Chairman Epling said the code requires me to have a development agreement along with the PUD overlay. Engineer Breinholt said we will figure all this out through the plan review process. Director Mackley said in general, we would scratch out many of these special conditions because we probably will not have them, specifically for water and sewer lines. Planner Lance said maybe we can work off this, but I think the conversation should start with our attorney. We need to have a better template. The Committee then discussed water, along with its storage and distribution throughout this area.

c. Discussion of Clover Fields Development Agreement

Chairman Epling said we do not know what zoning type they can use right now. Our attorney is looking into things and will get back to me. We are not sure if he can use this zoning because he was trying to pull an overlay that was used in a different area. Where we added the PUD, I do not know if that supersedes overlays. We are trying to figure that out.

d. Walk-ins:

Jordan Conrad and Mason Conrad walked in to discuss property they own at 144 South 100 West. Mr. Conrad said it has an existing structure on it. The plan is to build a fourplex on the side of the lot and subdivide it. This is currently zoned as commercial. In the zoning ordinance it says all lot regulations and that stuff are subject to the site plan approval process with the DRC. Multi-family is permitted, but the setbacks have no regulation in the code. It says that it is up to site plan approval. We want to make sure we are heading in the right direction before we get into the engineering. This lot is 0.33 acres and twice as wide as most of the lots in that area. We have two and a quarter parking spots per unit, but do you have any concerns we might need to address? The Committee agreed that off-street parking would not be allowed in the configuration and discussed how the layout would flow with the alley in the back. Engineer Breinholt said you have to have a buffer. I do not see it working out front. Not with this layout. There is an ordinance for off-street parking in City code with sketch drawings for buffers and sizes. You have to comply with that. You will also need a landscape buffer between the property line and parking lot. We have some authority to reduce that buffer from what is listed with certain improvements. You need to start there by making the off-street parking comply with the code. Planner Lance said you can submit a site plan and final plat at the same time. Those are three separate drawings, including construction drawings. Engineer Breinholt said my thing is parking. You have to have two and a quarter stalls per unit and comply with the off-street parking requirements in the code. There are allowances in that for certain landscaping,

which can reduce some of the buffering. Fire lanes are another thing to mention. The fire chief probably would not be happy with the 20-foot. If the buildings are up front that is not an issue. Even if the buildings are back there that still should be good fire lane access. I would like to see a site plan with the building in the back and what you can figure out with parking. Then we can work with you on the site plan approval process.

3. Public Comments: None.
4. Committee Comments/Reports: None.
5. Adjournment:

Motion by Director Mackley to adjourn the meeting. Motion seconded by consensus of the Committee. The meeting adjourned at 10:31 a.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.