

**TREMONTON CITY CORPORATION
DEVELOPMENT REVIEW COMMITTEE
AUGUST 5, 2026**

Members Present:

ChrisDean Epling, Chairman & Zoning Administrator
Andrew Beecher, Assistant Public Works Director
Chris Breinholt, City Engineer
Zach LeFevre, Parks and Recreation Director—excused
Carl Mackley, Public Works Director
Linsey Nessen, City Manager
Jeremy Lance, City Planner
Tiffany Lannefeld, Deputy Recorder

Chairman Epling called the Development Review Committee Meeting to order at 9:35 a.m. The meeting was held August 5, 2026 in the City Council Meeting Room at 102 South Tremont Street, Tremonton, Utah. Chairman Epling, Assistant Director Beecher, Engineer Breinholt, Director LeFevre, Director Mackley, Manager Nessen (left at 10:26 a.m.), City Planner Lance and Deputy Recorder Lannefeld were in attendance.

1. Approval of agenda:

Motion by Director Mackley to approve the August 5, 2026 agenda. Motion seconded by Manager Nessen. Vote: Chairman Epling – yes, Assistant Director Beecher – yes, Engineer Breinholt – yes, Planner Lance – yes, Director LeFevre – absent, Director Mackley – yes, Manager Nessen – yes. Motion approved.

2. New Business:

- a. Discussion and consideration of Price Group Concept Plan—Eric Gaoiran and Garrett Price

Mr. Price said we work with Price Real Estate, a family-owned organization that owns and operates about five million square feet of industrial real estate along the Wasatch Front. We have a couple buildings outside of Utah, but our core focus is along the Wasatch Front. We have owned this 80-acre site for about eight years and it is currently being farmed. It does have the industrial overlay in your zoning. There is really good access along 10th North. We believe there is potential for industrial growth with this being a gateway to northern Utah. There will be a retail component on the front. This is a long-term game plan, and we want to be a good partner with the City to bring and keep businesses here. Our conceptual design would include a retail component, convenience store and hotel, along with other retail pads. Behind it there would be warehouses with smaller flex spaces. Behind that we would have bigger spaces as companies grow. Our tenants have a 98% renewal rate. They might start in a small space and then as their business grows, they may take up more space later on. This would be phased and built over time. On this 80-acre site, we have the ability for ingress and egress and would look at City documents for future planning. We have the City's transportation master plan and will try to incorporate your plans for this future frontage road, city collector road that connects from this existing road. We have tried to incorporate that in our plan based on the City's designs and

future plans. The front two-thirds of the site on 1000 North can be served with potential utilities here, but there might need to be some sewer pumps and other things to help with issues that this bottom two-thirds of the site would need in order to connect utilities to the south. We would love to get rid of any type of lift stations.

The Committee then discussed the property to the south and how they might be able to work together to make the road go all the way through both sites. They then discussed utilities. Mr. Price said we will plan on phasing it from the north to the south with these smaller buildings first. Chairman Epling said we really appreciate you looking at our master plan and putting the road in. Engineer Breinholt said every parcel needs frontage on a City street, which means you would have to build the road to get the frontage. Director Mackley said you may have to build this entire road because you are sort of landlocked. We are not looking to screw a developer over or do anything unfair. The City wants a nice road there and it is in our transportation master plan, but I do not know that it would service anybody else but your development for quite some time. Engineer Breinholt said I do not see it as a major corridor to carry traffic down to Main Street. Iowa Street is more of an arterial road. This is planned as a collector. It is important for circulation in this local area right here and is not our main route. They then discussed the adjoining property owners and how they might benefit from that road. Mr. Price said our initial concern with seeing this design is that you have residential next to an industrial park. Our concern with this being a connector road to the south is that you are now mixing truck traffic with residential traffic. When we talked to this home builder group, we said, maybe we grant a secondary egress through our site, but long-term there is a crash gate, so it is for emergency egress and not for daily use. If we do not have to build this road that saves us costs and from having to work with UDOT and this parcel owner next to us. Engineer Breinholt said this road will happen somehow, whether you are required to build it or not—at least half of it because it is in our Master Plan. You are not talking necessarily industrial here, it will be commercial leasing spaces and different types of businesses that would be well served to have that circulate. We have to plan for that road at some point, regardless of who pays for it.

The Committee then discussed the potential of a pioneering agreement, as well as potential layout and uses that would be allowed in the code. They also talked about zone changes that could make more options available to them.

Engineer Breinholt discussed stormwater detection, their layout and how that would flow. The developers would go through their checklists and start getting something put together for further discussions. They also discussed water shares. Engineer Breinholt said you have to give the City one share per irrigated acre. The irrigated acre is determined by the landscape characteristics. That does not discount for rock or xeriscape. Anything that is not building or hard pavement is considered irritable.

b. Walk-ins: There were no walk-ins.

3. Public Comments: None

4. Staff Comments/Reports: None

5. Adjournment:

Motion by Director Mackley to adjourn the meeting. Motion seconded by consensus of the Committee. The meeting adjourned at 10:39 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.