

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

Members Present:

Raulon Van Tassell, Chairman
Micah Capener, Commission Member—excused
Karen Ellsworth, Commission Member
Andrea Miller, Commission Member—excused
Jack Stickney, Commission Member—alternate
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 July 14, 2026 in the City Council Meeting Room at 102 South Tremont Street, Tremonton, Utah. Chairman Van Tassell, Commission Members Ellsworth, Greener, Stickney, Planner Lance, Administrator Epling, and Deputy Recorder Lannefeld were in attendance. City Councilmember Kristie Bowcutt was also in attendance. Commission Members Capener and Miller were excused.

1. Approval of agenda:

Motion by Commission Member Greener to amend the agenda and add a public comment section after item 3. Motion seconded by Commission Member Ellsworth. Vote: Chairman Van Tassell – yes, Commission Member Capener – absent, Commission Member Ellsworth – yes, Commission Member Greener – yes, Commission Member Miller – absent, Commission Member Stickney – yes. Motion approved.

Motion by Commission Member Stickney to approve the July 14, 2026 agenda. Motion seconded by Commission Member Greener. Vote: Chairman Van Tassell – yes, Commission Member Capener – absent, Commission Member Ellsworth – yes, Commission Member Greener – yes, Commission Member Miller – absent, Commission Member Stickney – yes. Motion approved.

2. Declaration of Conflict of Interest: None.

3. Approval of minutes—June 9, 2026

Motion by Commission Member Ellsworth to approve the June 9, 2026 minutes. Motion seconded by Commission Member Greener. Vote: Chairman Van Tassell – yes, Commission Member Capener – absent, Commission Member Ellsworth – yes, Commission Member Greener – yes, Commission Member Miller – absent, Commission Member Stickney – yes. Motion approved.

3. a. Public Comment:

Layne Wilding explained that City staff is good at public noticing but probably ought to change the wording, so it does not say 24 hours. I looked at 24 hours and expected to see something relative to this Commissioner meeting today but did not. Also, what is relevant information? He then read through the definition. I believe the staff reports that are prepared relative to each of the things that are going to be presented today and, in the future, have that data. They contain the important facts and details on what the change is going to be. I would propose that those staff reports be included in that 10-day notice. When we have an opportunity to review things we have good public comment and debate. We have the opportunity to interchange and discussion. I would make a recommendation that in future Planning Commission meetings that all discussions that require public comment meet the above requirements and the staff report be included in that 10-day notification. If not, then we push it off and wait for the next meeting. I believe it would help improve the dialogue and communication as we gather information and work together as a community to come up with solutions. Administrator Epling said currently, our trajectory is we want the staff report done seven days before, which is close to the 10 days noticing. The seven days before is when we give the staff report the week before. We also give it to the NPI. We are willing to discuss that, but currently staff does not have the timeframe to get those reports done in a quicker window. It is laborious for staff, but as we grow our staff and capabilities, that would be a great practice. For now, we feel we were doing well getting the staff reports out at the seven-day mark. Planner Lance said a public information handout is just a one-pager that gets sent out to all the neighbors and is posted at the City. The next step is a staff report, which is a detailed report in preparation for the Planning Commission meeting. Hopefully this can generate new discussion based on preparation as the intent of this document. Those who are watching every step of the process will get a lot of information. The intent of the process is to cast the net pretty wide. Once the new website it launched, we can add the report there as well. Administrator Epling said anything publicly noticed here at the Planning Commission, is being discussed the week before at NPI.

William Pickett said with your new website and adding all the things the City does to that would certainly help those of us that are at the bottom of the food chain to have a chance of looking up the items and do a little bit of research before the meeting. This is a point you should go forward on right away. It is not terribly easy for me to come to these meetings with my terminal illness. It is an effort. I would like to see what you are doing in these meetings because I live in town.

4. Public Meetings and Public Hearings – Presentations by Jeremy Lance, City Planner

- a. **Tremonton Parks, Trails, and Open Space Master Plan:** Request for adoption of the 2026 Tremonton Parks, Trails, and Open Space Master Plan.
 - i. Staff Presentation and Commission Discussion

Motion by Commission Member Ellsworth to open the public meeting at 5:51 p.m.

Planner Lance said community development staff is assisting with bringing this adoption of the Tremonton Parks, Trails and Open Space Master Plan. Here is a simple summary of the last meeting. On June 23, the Planning Commission heard an extensive presentation from staff. The Planning Commission touched on a few items. There was discussion about levels of service, at different levels presented in the plan. There was discussion around the need for an indoor recreation center in addition to outdoor parks. There was clarification from City staff, particularly Director Zach LeFevre, discussing that the City's level of service cannot be increased until existing park projects are completed, as previously allocated funding must first be spent for current improvements. Staff also clarified that impact fees are tied to growth-related capital improvements and have limitations on how they may be used. Staff further noted that providing both outdoor park amenities and indoor park recreation facilities reflects industry best practices by accommodating a wider variety of recreational activities and sports. The plan identifies the approach while discussing potential funding strategies for future facilities. The discussion encapsulated in a directive from the Planning Commission for Parks and Rec staff to bring forward a priority list for what parks are going to be coming. That takes the form of the capital improvement plan. Director LeFevre said after the last meeting, Sam Taylor from Landmark Design, addressed a lot of the comments. The priority list is in the back of the document now. The presentation and document do have top priorities for every section (parks, trails, open space). A lot of those include policies. We will leave it up to the Council to make those decisions on top priorities. We do have a capital improvement plan and capital projects listed. We will work with the Council to update those, year by year, as the finances allow. Mr. Taylor said there was discussion last time regarding population projection and City staff agrees to carry on with the numbers as they are currently represented as the most accurate population projection data we have. All comments have been responded to in the returned draft copy. Director LeFevre said this is a general overview and a high-level, guiding document that is supposed to be a living document. As needs arise and population increases or we get better data, we would amend and update the plan.

The Commission agreed that when reiterations are made, they use a different title so that when documents are download, they know which one is the most recent. Commission Member Stickney said my suggestion is when we upload those that they have a unique name that includes a date and version number. We want to ensure we are looking at the most recent one.

Commission Member Greener closed the Public Hearing at 5:55 p.m.

ii. Public Comments

Layne Wilding said we spent a lot of money for this update to the Master Plan. Why did we not go ahead and just update the Tremonton Integrated Land Use Plan? It seems like a lot of the document that came into this new master plan came from that. If we accept this one and move forward, what are we going to do with Section 3 and Appendix D and E of the Tremonton Integrated Land Use Plan? Do you need paperwork or something in place that stops the use of those? Do we need a statement at the beginning of the new Master Plan that says this supersedes what has been done? I think personally you need to have two pieces of paper running concurrently. If you have a new Master Plan you are going to approve, you need to have something in place to change or stop the use of the other or delete the sections from the other documents so there is no confusion. A statement at the beginning of the new Master Plan could say this supersedes what was done in the Tremonton Integrated Land Use Plan.

William Pickett said I ran into this a lot in NASA. We kept the name of the document along with the version and that this version supersedes all others. Then you have to make sure the pieces in the old document that you want in the new document are put in. Any time you have a minor revision to the document that does not change the intent or the basic underlying functions, then that name stays the same.

Motion by Commissioner Ellsworth to close the public comments.

iii. Consideration and Decision: Board deliberation, motion and vote

Motion by Commission Member Ellsworth recommend this for approval to the City Council for the adoption of the Master Plan on the findings listed in the memorandum. Motion seconded by Commission Member Stickney. Vote: Chairman Van Tassell – yes, Commission Member Capener – absent, Commission Member Ellsworth – yes, Commission Member Greener – yes, Commission Member Miller – absent, Commission Member Stickney – yes. Motion approved.

- b. **Rezone Code Text Amendment:** A request to amend chapter 1.31.020 - Form and Contents of Required Documents of the Tremonton City Code to clarify the application requirements for obtaining a rezone in Tremonton City.
 - i. Staff Presentation and Commission Discussion

Planner Lance said this amendment aims to simplify. There are a few provisions that if not struck from our code may put the City in a bit of trouble with the State. We want to make sure that processes are clear for applicant, and we are not requiring things we should not and we are requiring things we should. There are

three strikethroughs. First, is in section B, which talks about the written statement, includes a strikethrough from the word included in the second sentence to the end of that section. A written statement should be required, but their narrative should include things like, looking on the future land use map to see if it gels with that document. They should be looking at the General Plan and making the argument based on that. They should be looking at the zoning map and seeing if the zoning they are requesting is adjacent, establishes a flow and follows good planning principles. If they want to say more, they can, but I would not recommend having language in our code that ties them down to things that may or may not change. Administrator Epling said zoning changes should not be made off the intent of the landowner because the land could change hands. We definitely want a written narration based on good planning principles, not off intent because intent can be modified and used to manipulate the Council. There are many reasons why we do not want to have code asking for intent. They are looking at our Land Use Plan and code, along with good planning principles. Staff will determine if this a good thing for our area, regardless of intent, because we need to be zoning and planning as a City on good planning principles.

Planner Lance said next is the strike through for C. There is nothing malicious here, just the fact that C is unnecessary. Staff can draw up a map using the official zoning map. Asking applicants to do that is a little strange. In D, we are asking for a concept plan for a rezone. That is engineering and real money spent. I view that as highly problematic. We should not be asking applicants to provide physical characteristics of the site. Administrator Epling said code language is something we have to make sure we are following State guidelines with. Planner Lance said this code language is requiring extra than what we feel we should require. It leaves the door wide open for an applicant to come up with a really strong argument on their own, not based on the things we are asking for. They can get creative rather than being tied down in specific ways. We want to allow the process to happen organically. The Commission agreed this would help applicants determine if their plan fits the community's needs before even presenting a plan and will not waste resource, both for the applicant or City staff. Planner Lance said reasons should always be case-by-cases, but there is a review built into the process that happens organically with staff, and we can bring up those things. Administrator Epling said a rezone is different than a PUD overlay. The overlay will require more and is up to the applicant to decide which route they want to go.

Planner Lance said after some digging, we determined the General Plan is a discretionary one. It is a policy guide, guiding decisions, but is not binding. The Council does not have to follow it so that leaves wiggle room for developers to shoot their shot. We do have a UDOT grant to update our General Plan and will yield a brand new one after 25 years. Commission Member Greener said the problem I have seen over the years is a developer buys a piece of ground knowing what it is zone, but then immediately comes in and wants to change it. The

Council does not stick to our Master Plan. Commission Member Ellsworth said in the past few years we probably have given in a little bit more than most of the community would have liked without the General Plan being what we really wanted and hopefully as we set precedents going forward, we will also not have the same types of problems with developers potentially pushing us into what we do not want. Chairman Van Tassell said we want it to be a discretionary plan that focuses on the General Plan. Commission Member Stickney said on a case-by-case basis it can be considered to make it different. We are updating the General Plan with a grant that will help give us a better guideline.

ii. Public Hearing

Motion by Commission Member Ellsworth to open the public meeting at 6:32 p.m. There were two people in attendance.

Layne Wildling asked about the May 19 minutes, which he could not find online (staff has determined they are there). I have a couple comments relative to this rezone. I agree with statement but think we ought to keep some of that because it is important to know why a person wants to rezone and what evidence they have that rezoning is the right thing to do. If they are given a higher density, what will be the benefits in return? I think we should be able to have some knowledge and they should be willing to share with us what benefits we can expect as citizens. I think the maps should stay. Frequently when we get a staff report they discuss a rezone of property and give a number you cannot find on the website. It would be much easier if they included a map with this rezoning operation, so we do not have to try to figure out where to find it. I agree on the last part and not making the developer show us unnecessary stuff. I think without having some justification and reasons why a rezone has to take place the answer should always be no.

William Pickett said on rezoning anywhere in the corporate boundaries for higher density housing should be in the flatlands. What happened in the Palisades they had zoning on the hillside that was R-4, which are little properties right next to each other. They all burned. When putting higher density housing on any of the hillsides you run the risk of fire. That is a problem. Staying within the boundaries of your map for zoning is always a good fallback for you from being pressured by somebody else.

Commission Member Greener closed the public hearing at 6:39 p.m.

iii. Consideration and Decision: Board deliberation, motion and vote

Administrator Epling said I agreed with the comment about wanting to know why the developer wants to rezone and what we get in exchange, but that is what we call contractual zoning. Making that contract is the only way the City is able to

engage in that kind of dialogue with a developer, which is done through a PUD or PC zone and overlay. With hard zoning, the City cannot require them to tell us what we are going to get or enter into any kind of contractual zoning. Those are the tools we would bring forth that do require a development agreement and much more, which we are working on. Commission Member Greener said I really like how this focuses on the City's General Plan and documents approved by the City Council since they are the elected officials.

Motion by Commission Member Ellsworth to recommend approval to the City Council of the rezone code text amending the sections discussed. Motion seconded by Commission Member Stickney. Vote: Chairman Van Tassell – yes, Commission Member Capener – absent, Commission Member Ellsworth – yes, Commission Member Greener – yes, Commission Member Miller – absent, Commission Member Stickney – yes. Motion approved.

- c. **Fencing Code Text Amendment:** A request to amend chapters 1.03.005 - Definitions and 1.18.040 - General Fencing Provisions of the Tremonton City Code to clarify the standards for erecting fences within the Tremonton City limits.
 - i. Staff Presentation and Commission Discussion

Planner Lance said this is the request to amend sub-chapters to clarify standards for erecting fences within City limits. We have received a couple of fencing permits and in trying to follow the layout, found inconsistent terminology. Hence the suggestion for definitions and some of the provisions that did not align with this. You always want a definition for something you are regulating so we are adding those key definitions. This amendment refines language related to fencing placement to emphasize installation related to verified property boundaries. Additional language clarifies property owner responsibility for boundary verification and allows for survey confirmation where property lines are uncertain prior to installation. Subsection B, corner lots and clear vision triangles clarified. This amendment removes references to double frontage lots, which is awkward. They are corner lots. It applies clear vision triangle standards directly to corner lots consistent with the existing definitions. The section is further clarified to require maintenance of clear vision triangles. Subsection E is easement clarification conflict clarification. This amendment adds language clarifying that where a conflict exists with the recorded utility easement the greater easement width shall apply to preserve utility access and legal rights-of-way. Subsection F, utility access and fencing modification clarifies that fencing within utility easements may be removed or modified as necessary for utility access and that restoration or replacement of fencing is the responsibility of the property owner not the utility provider. Subsection K, private covenants clarified this amendment replaces broad language regarding CC&Rs with neutral language directing property owners to review applicable recorded covenants for their neighborhoods for fence installation. These amendments were done in hopes to streamline and

improve consistency, reduce ambiguity and enforcement and align standards for fencing with established planning and engineering practices.

ii. Public Hearing

Commission Member Ellsworth opened the public hearing at 6:57 p.m. There were two people in attendance.

Layne Wilding said I have comments relative to the easements. My property currently has two Tremonton water main lines running through it and I strongly disagree that I should be the one responsible to repair my fence and yard if Tremonton were to dig it up. I am a bit concern that the City now has a blank check to come into my place and tear down my fence and destroy my landscaping to replace their water mains. They are not on the hooked to do anything about trying to fix it. I would recommend that we make a motion to postpone this until we can figure out what makes the most sense. This makes me wonder if Tremonton is trying to be a good neighbor. You should have to bring it back to the state it was before.

William Pickett said we have been annexed into Tremonton but are still paying taxes on the Garland Cemetery because our area is in their district. Also, with the utility boxes in the ground, the installers had no idea there was one on the south end of my property, so they went from the north end, drilling through my grass to bring it to the back of the house. The right hand does not know what the left hand is doing.

Commission Member Ellsworth closed the public hearing at 7:05 p.m.

iii. Consideration and Decision: Board deliberation, motion and vote

After more discussion and explanations of definitions, Commission Member Greener said I think the City has an obligation to restore the property. Administrator Epling would have a discussion with the City attorney to get this better clarified.

Motion by Commission Member Stickney to recommend approval to the City Council of the amendments discussed. Adding new definitions based on the findings listed in the memorandum with corrections from a consultation with legal for restoration of property as a duty of the City or utility and suggesting additional materials acceptable for fences. Motion seconded by Commission Member Greener. Vote: Chairman Van Tassell – yes, Commission Member Capener – absent, Commission Member Ellsworth – yes, Commission Member Greener – yes, Commission Member Miller – absent, Commission Member Stickney – yes. Motion approved.

5. Business/Staff Questions

Administrator Epling said at the next Planning Commission meeting we are going to present two overlays. Heritage Country is requesting a PUD. There is also Clover Fields. Planner Lance said they have an overlay they are bringing since they do not meet the minimum acreage threshold for a PUD overlay. They are going to ask for an adoption of an overlay called the single-family residential transition overlay zone.

Administrator Epling said it was suggested that before each meeting, we have a table with our business cards so we can be more accessible to the public. We are working with Les Olson to get a forwarding email that would allow citizens to contact the Planning Commission without giving out your personal emails. This would help the NPI get in contact with you. The Commission agreed.

6. Adjournment

Motion by Commission Member Ellsworth to adjourn the meeting. Motion seconded by consensus of the Board. The meeting adjourned at 6:56 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.