

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

Members Present:

Raulon Van Tassell, Chairman
Micah Capener, Commission Member
Karen Ellsworth, Commission Member
Andrea Miller, 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 July 28, 2026 in the City Council Meeting Room at 102 South Tremont Street, Tremonton, Utah. Chairman Van Tassell, Commission Members Capener (left at 7:49 p.m.), Ellsworth, Greener, Miller, Planner Lance, Administrator Epling, and Deputy Recorder Lannefeld were in attendance. City Councilmember Kristie Bowcutt was also in attendance.

1. Approval of agenda:

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

2. Declaration of Conflict of Interest: None.

3. Approval of minutes—June 23, 2026

Motion by Commission Member Ellsworth to approve the minutes of June 23, 2026. Motion seconded by Commission Member Greener. Vote: Chairman Van Tassell – yes, Commission Member Capener – yes, Commission Member Ellsworth – yes, Commission Member Greener – yes, Commission Member Miller – yes. Motion approved.

City Attorney Dalton Smuin presented on training and clarification. A few things I would like to discuss is your role as the Planning Commission and the important work you do in advising the City Council in land use decisions. The Council relies deeply on you because you are able to dive in a bit deeper into land use applications and make recommendations as to how the City should or should not proceed with respect to a particular issue. You are appointed by the Council to be an advisor to them on land use decisions. You are an extension of the Council in that you are advising how they should proceed and view applications. In doing that you are an outward facing public body of the Council. In your role we follow specific guidelines and rules. Deliberations should be open and public. Text messaging between Planning Commissioners while a meeting is

proceeding is not an appropriate thing to do. You just talk openly. In your deliberation maintain decorum and respect for both the public and your fellow Commissioners. You are volunteering your time, and the public is here to express their views and wants. Everybody wants what is best for the City. As an extension of the City, you represent the City. When we have proper decorum and respect within our Commission meetings, it is more productive and helpful. We will do more in-depth training another day, but for now, we wanted to put a plug for respect and decorum, open dialogue and collaboration.

4. Public Meeting and Public Hearings - Presentations by Jeremy Lance, Planner II
 - a. **Clover Fields Phase 3 & 4 Overlay: Parcels 05-060 0088 & 05-060-0089**
(located approximately at the terminus of both 110 South and 900 West)
 - i. Staff Presentation and Commission Discussion

Planner Lance said the two property owners are Keith Russell and Russell Thornley. Their land is located about 110 South and 900 West. The current zone for both properties is R1-10. The general plan designation, which comes from the future land use map of the 2023 Integrated Land Use Plan, is existing residential to remain. The acreage is 3.94 acres combined. The request is for the adoption of Clover Fields Phase 3 and 4 overlay to create approximately 25 homes. The request would allow for higher density. The single-family residential transition overlay, SFRT0, comes from Chapter 1.16. This overlay pertains to a particular development. They do not meet the minimum acreage to use the PUD. This is a pretty peculiar situation where the applicant is asking to bring an overlay into existence. Staff, wanting to work with the applicants, saw this as caught between a rock and a hard place. We have not adopted an overlay like this in years. We are in a little bit of a limbo on what to do with these overlays. Administrator Epling said some questions for consideration are, is this request consistent with the purpose of the SFRT0 overlay and consistent with the City's zoning framework? Should the city establish a clear process for approving additional overlay requests?

Mr. Russell said the overlay zone allows for the transition between a regular size lot in the R1-10 to become a little smaller and get a little higher density but does not step into the high-density zone. I think it is appropriate in this case because of the surrounding commercial. One of the main things the City wanted was the thoroughfare, the two stub roads to go away. We worked to make that happen. Planner Lance said they have done a lot of work on this application so far and this was a way we could work with the code and applicant to find a way forward.

- ii. Public Hearing

Motion by Commissioner Miller to open the Public Hearing at 5:50 p.m. 29 people were in attendance. There were no public comments and Commissioner Ellsworth motioned to close the Public Hearing at 5:51 p.m.

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

Motion by Commission Member Ellsworth to forward a positive recommendation to City Council for the adoption of the Clover Field Phase 3 and 4 overlay based on the findings listed in the staff report. Motion seconded by Commission Member Capener. Vote: Chairman Van Tassell – yes, Commission Member Capener – yes, Commission Member Ellsworth – yes, Commission Member Greener – yes, Commission Member Miller – yes. Motion approved.

b. Heritage Country PUD Overlay: *Parcels 05-079 0006 & 05-199-0016 (located approximately northwest of the intersection of 6400 West and 10000 North Street and approximately southeast of the intersection of 6800 West and 10000 North Street)*

i. Staff Presentation and Commission Discussion

Planner Lance said for Heritage Country PUD overlay, the applicant is Brody Calder, representing Harris Enterprises and LB Land Holdings. The project is location northwest of the intersection of 6400 West and 10,000 North and southeast of the intersection of 6800 West. There are two separate, disjointed parcels. The zoning for the southwestern parcel is R1-8 and the northeastern parcel R1-10. The acreage combined is 73.67 acres. The General Plan designation is single-family residential or low density. The request is for adoption of the Heritage Country PUD overlay. Even though recently repealed, is being invoked on account of the applicant having submitted their application on May 18, 2026, prior to the repeal of the chapter. This asks for a master plan, addendum plans, the open space plan and parking plan, along with elevations and architecture. Those submittal requirements having been satisfied, including a development agreement. The request is 496 total units across 11 phases, including single-family lots. Townhomes featuring no garages and townhomes with alley loaded or front loaded with garages. The southwestern parcel (A) will have 202 units, while the northeastern (B) parcel will have 294 units.

NPI District Head Zach Whatcott provided supplementary information from their discussion on July 22. Mr. Whatcott said the neighborhood has been involved, over a year, with different discussions trying to coordinate all of this. Citizens have concerns about the high density in a rural area on the outskirts of town with lack of infrastructure. There have been historical concerns with drainage and utilities being able to properly service that area. We recognize there can be plans to mitigate that, but that does not mean there is still a reasonable path forward. It has been zoned at a level we feel is appropriate. We understand there is going to be growth and that the R1-8 and R1-10 allows for a quarter acre plus sized home. We feel that is reasonable for somebody developing in that area. When you get into high-density housing, it drives a significant number of homes into a relatively small access area. Parcel B is limited on one side to the railroad tracks and other developments. All those units will have to exit out to 10,000 North. Parcel A, along Iowa String, will only have one exit there with the rest of them also going out to 10,000 North. With 492 homes all funneling there, you will have nearly 1000 cars

coming out to that road, back and forth on a daily basis. This area is not structured or facilitated to handle that, nor is it the intention of citizens to have that kind of growth. We already have a lot of traffic on Iowa String, and this will bring in a lot more. There are plans for a park within this development, which we appreciate. However, this park is located next to Iowa String and will turn into Jeanie Stevens 2.0 with all the cars parking on the outside of the road. Citizens would like to express their concerns with this and recommend that it is not something we want to see in that area as part of future growth for Tremonton. We would appreciate something that is more in line with the current zoning rather than this overlay.

Applicant Brody Calder then presented. I have gone from the beginning of this project with former Manager Shawn Warnke now to Linsey Nessen. There have been different managers and planning zoners, along with different councilmembers. At the end of 2023, we purchased the northeast property. It was unzoned and in the County. We planned to put in a storage unit facility. We did not realize that if your property was within a mile of the city you had to request annexation. We did and Manager Warnke said we really want your property as part of our plan. We want you to come in and do single family at the R1-10. I told him we have a lot of infrastructure that has to happen and how do we make this work? We came up with a game plan to use the PUD. This would allow us to throw some townhomes along the side of the train tracks with single-family throughout. The cost and infrastructure were still too much to make numbers pencil. That is when we purchased the southwestern parcel. Manager Bill Cobabe then told us to annex this whole area. That is when there became heartburn from Freeman Farms and everybody involved. When asked what dream zone we wanted, we said RM-8, but the citizens did not want that. We came back with R1-8. We plan to do townhomes in front of the cement plant and single-family behind it. My two parcels will be the densest in that area. We are now asking for the PUD to work with the City. With those 496 units, we will add two parks. City Engineer Chris Breinholt helped us identified this area for a regional park. It is almost the same size as Jennie Stevens (9.83 acres). The biggest concern was parking. We did have concerns about Iowa String and could potentially fence this off. The northeastern parcel will have a couple playgrounds (3.67 acres) with places for people to be together with a couple pavilions. In the right-hand corner is a trail that can go past the railroad tracks north to the City. We do have a trail way open to Freeman Farms if they want that to connect through. We will leave that open space so they can use the facilities there at the park if they want. With the bonus density, the current code allows up to 7.35 units per acre, and we are currently at 6.7 units. Without the PUD overlay, we could have up to 360 units on the properties. Engineer Breinholt is requesting we do detention and send that out to the Malad River. There is a lot of infrastructure that has to go in. This will also allow current homes to tie into sewer and City water. This obviously allows for new infrastructure and growth to happen on the west side of the freeway. Part of our agreement is that we would do the whole 10,000 North road.

Planner Lance said the staff report contains not only an initial review from planning staff, but it also contains engineering, public works, fire department, parks and rec, and a few

reviews. It does contain their observations and feelings on the item before you tonight. Hopefully the staff report represents a snapshot of this project to this point and the iterations. A lot of time and money has been spent.

ii. Public Hearing

Chairperson Van Tassell called the Public Hearing to order at 6:24 p.m. There were 30 people in attendance.

Cindy Shipley said I have some questions about Iowa string. Since Procter & Gamble came in, we have had so many big semis coming up that road. My understanding is that those trucks are going to continue right up through that neighborhood. I think it is up to the City to say that is not a good idea to have them riding up right through the middle of all that. If you are going to put a roundabout in there, trucks and big semis do not do well in those. That is something for the City to consider. It would be lovely if the trucks could go somewhere else.

Jamie Crowther said I live on Iowa String. I appreciate your time. My request and ask is that you reject the PUD overlay as proposed and keep the designated zoning as the R1-8 and R1-10. It is important to give homebuyers options. This is higher density housing than what is in that area right now. According to the Integrated Land Use Plan, higher density housing makes more sense in the City. You are adding a walking trail, but where is the ending point? It looks like the railroad tracks, a cement plant and an irrigated field or Iowa String. Those are all a distance from the City center. Why not give homebuyers options for bigger lots instead of having these PUD overlays with more dense housing, let us truly give people options. It is important to look at the City's observations that there are concerns with fire access. This area lies south of the freeway and is not the best location for higher density. My ask is that we keep south of the freeway, a more rural residential feel that matches the area. Keep the current occupancy as it is. The developer took a risk by buying unzoned, County land when he bought it and no matter what was said before any of the changes with previous City members, I think they are under no obligation to honor those. As a resident in that area, I ask you to reject the PUD overlay and keep the current zoning as is (R1-8 and R1-10). I appreciate your time. As you vote, if it is in favor, I would ask maybe as a courtesy to us, why you voted in favor of that? I really appreciate you listening.

Krista Spraycar said I also live on Iowa String. Thank you for letting us speak and representing all of us in Freeman Farms and along Iowa String. I do not know how many of you have been down Iowa String in the morning or evening, but as others have commented, sometimes it is impossible to get out of our driveway and dang right scary. I have an 18-year-old son and that scares me every morning when he tries to get out of my driveway. Adding additional vehicles down this road is only going to make that worse. Not to mention, how is it going to impact our police adding this many more citizens? When we moved here, we chose this neighborhood for what it was and what it offered to

our family. In changing this zoning, it changes that whole area. It is no longer going to be welcoming for our horses, cows, and pigs and the rapid growth will outpace city services, including police, fire and staffing. We ask that you deny this.

Layne Wilding said I do not live in this area, but I live on the hill and have a couple of concerns. I have looked at the staff report and there are several things staff discusses that say this current plan does not meet their requirements. I have not heard any statements on how to meet it. Until they come up with a plan on how to meet what the staff is saying, I am not sure how you can actually approve this until we come up with a plan. Another concern I have would be property values. The legislative guide talks about protecting property values and as you increase density in the area, I am not sure that is going to increase the property value for the current homeowners. It might reduce the property values. I would recommend you keep the current zoning and work with the developer to figure out a way to get utilities and make that happen. I do not know if residents would be excited to exchange their property and stuff like that for parks. I know that is what Tremonton wants, but if the residents do not want the parks and are willing to forgo that relative to keeping the density lower.

Ashley Anderson said I wondered if I could get some clarification on the potential roundabout on Iowa String. My home is right in front of where that would go. I am concerned about a roundabout in front of my home. As stated by my neighbors, we would love it to be lower density. We understand that there is going to be growth. This is a great place to live, but that would be my wish as a resident.

Max Messerli said I also live on Iowa String right next to the cement plant on that corner with 10,000 North. There is another trucking business on the other end right where the plan is going to exit. There is a lot going on that road already. I know there are going to be improvements, but there is another business on the other end. It is something I am concerned about.

Courtney Wood said as far as the infrastructure goes for this development, is the developer responsible without reimbursement for the utilities? Or is the City reimbursing the developer for those utilities once they are in place and then the City takes them over? In the case that they are reimbursing the developer once in place then numbers become a moot point as far as making things pencil. I would like clarification if the City is actually paying for all the improvements and not really the developer. That is something to consider. If the City is reimbursing for all those utilities, then that becomes an avenue for excessive growth. I would recommend denying the PUD. Not solely on that, but on other things that have been stated.

Zach Whatcott said I wanted to highlight the precedence with what the zoning in that area would establish for future developments on the southwest side of town. This is just the start of the annexation zone that is planned in that area. A lot of the future land use does say there are sections of industrial and low density, but what does the precedent set with

having this development with that density established there? For reference on that density look at the other recent developments in town with Visionary across from the hospital. We are already seeing high density housing with those lots. A lot of these lots here, are even smaller than what they have there. So, it will be a very high dense area. I appreciate Mr. Calder laying out the math for how many units per acre. That is great, but it does not address what that is for those areas where they are closer together those strips of townhomes and for the access in and out of that.

Motion by Commission Member Ellsworth to close the public hearing at 6:39 p.m.

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

Commission Member Ellsworth said I personally have a lot of issues I feel are not being met in this situation. I am sad at the amount of money that has been put into this process already and personally a bit frustrated with what has happened because I feel it could have saved a lot of money with the people who do not see this going in. I do not think it meets what we are asking as far as things the code is wanting. I am really worried about infrastructure costs that will be put on the City regardless of whether it is built.

The Commission then had discussion on road improvements and accesses that would be necessary in this area to facility added traffic. How that report would be done and who would be responsible for improvements and where. They also discussed impact fees and potential reimbursements.

Planner Lance said if the PUD is approved, code is adopted in the overlay section and that guides this project, which can be amended subsequently by legislative action. When this comes to plat, staff will have clear guidelines adopted by code and can review plats. Commission Member Capener said we have to update the development agreement to include all the details that will follow the property even if he sells it. The purpose of the PUD is to give some flexibility so we can demand things in there that we cannot demand otherwise. Administrator Epling said when it comes to infrastructure, the City can require what they need for that infrastructure. They have to provide the infrastructure for their development and are required to pay for that. However, the City cannot extract from them more than their impact. That is where reimbursable could come in. Density should not be used as the bargaining chip because if the City is already reimbursing them for the upsize, then it does not matter what you zone it because the infrastructure will come either way. He has to pay for everything related to his project. Reimbursement only happens for regional things or improvements that are larger than his impact. When you take impact fees and reimburse them, you are taking away from the General Fund to update our sewer treatment plant. There are going to be some negotiations we have to work out with staff and the current status of our sewer treatment plant. I would like to deliberate and find more clarity on what the timeframe is for the City to actually get utilities to the residents. I need to look at what our future annexation plan is.

The Commission further discussed the layout of homes, parks and parking. Planner Lance said as you do your discussions, if there is anything you want in the development agreement, make sure that is known so we know that as we are putting that together. What do we need in this development agreement? Let us make sure that is very clear so when staff starts that, we have what you want. You are not bound by the General Plan, but the General Plan is there for a reason. The Council can go with the General Plan or go against it. However, as a general rule trying to follow the General Plan is good practice, that is why we have it. The General Plan is a vision of the City. When you do not follow it, it does throw a wrench in. For example, infrastructure improvements are often tailored to what the General Plan indicates. Following the General Plan is by far better because you can plan the City. It is advisory in the sense of you do not have to do it, but it causes a cohesive plan when you follow it. Creating a General Plan does take extensive work so generally Commissions do not go against them since a lot of work went into that. Administrator Epling said the last plan we took the staff report off of was done in 2023. Staff will always frame the reports to reflect the General Plan. Attorney Smuin said the PUD is entirely discretionary and the City Council has discretion on whether or not to adopt the PUD overlay. The Commission also has discretion to make the recommendation to approve or deny or approve with modifications based on what you determined in your meetings.

After much discussion on development details, Administrator Epling said I would like to thank the Planning Commission for the deliberation and discussion but want to bring it back to the land use. We have had good discussion on what could happen, but need to consider the land use of this area. That is what the Commission is supposed to be deciding. All the details of the development agreement will be looked at by City staff. Your job is to determine if this fits what the City plans are for this area.

Commission Member Capener said I would entertain a motion to approve and make a positive recommendation to City Council with those requirements added to the development agreement, including the traffic study, total number of units quantified, exact product types, acreage for the park, architectural standards, the lift station and easement, parking for the added 0.25 for guests, safety for fire and the bond for the parks. I say we cap the density at what he has proposed at 496. He has to pay for it, and there is no reimbursement except for impact fees on his project.

Motion by Commission Member Capener to make a positive recommendation to the Council with the reasons state above. Motion seconded by Commission Member Miller. Vote: Chairman Van Tassell – yes, Commission Member Capener – yes, Commission Member Ellsworth – no, Commission Member Greener – no, Commission Member Miller – yes. Motion approved by a 3-2 vote.

Chairman Van Tassell said here is why I voted yes. I do not think it is the City's business to influence a developer one way or another. The City would do well to approach their desires and intents in the right timeline and under the right assumptions before they

anticipate actions from private citizens. I do not think it is the purpose of government to influence a negotiation for private money. That is a right for this developer to continue doing as they have. There was an assumption by us as a City given to them in the beginning. I do not think it is right that it happened, but because it did, I think this is a certain way to make that person whole. Talking about risk and annexation actions and the force of government. It goes back to the same concern with septic tanks versus getting hooked up. I do not think we should force them to get rid of their water shares. You did not agree to be annexed. I think this is a private transaction that I would apply to every private citizen. Commission Member Miller said this neighborhood is just like my parents' neighborhood in Smithfield. There is a massive park and it is amazing. There is so much diversity. It feels like the right amount of density for that area. Having the park and those amenities will build more community in Tremonton and bring more people here. Commission Member Capener said what I do not want to have happen is what is going to happen if we do not do stuff like this because right now there are hundreds of people who need a place to live. I feel like we have to allow the developers to create units that are cheap and small enough that people can afford them. Commission Member Greener said once again, it all stems from the new plan and until we, as a City, stick to a plan and develop from that plan, we are just going to have these things way out here and way out there. You can build this, but kids will not be able to walk to town. There are no sidewalks. They will be walking in the road. That is where I get flustered about this town. We build these islands with limited roadways. This is a crazy busy area with Iowa String and the railroad tracks. I like the concept. I just wish it was in town and closer to our resources. Commission Member Ellsworth said I agree with and support a lot of these ideas, but I am not a solid yes. I do wish it was in town. There are a lot of things City staff is going to have to make sure happen.

5. Public Comments

Chairperson Van Tassell opened the public comments at 7:47 p.m.

Zach Whatcott said where we have the freeway coming through there, it is a very distinct line within the town with everything centered on the north side. We are going to end up with islands out here, but we already have islands. My parents live in Lehi, and it is situated very much the same, where Lehi is split by I-15. The north side was very late in developing and almost came from American Fork back down to the freeway. We are trying to force this development across the freeway. I do not think that by trying to move this type of development and taking that precedent out that way is going to keep Tremonton the way the land use planning and everything that is a vision for those areas. However, I do appreciate your respect, he is a landowner and deserves to do what he wants as long as it follows code, but is it right for how we as a community develop that area? I respectfully disagree with that decision.

Phil Crowther said I live on Iowa String and was in the meeting when this whole thing took place, whether it was going to be annexed into the City or not. This exact thing was

what our concerns were that once it is annexed into the City, we lose control. We were lied to by everyone sitting up here, not you guys, but by the City Council. It is frustrating because it should not have been annexed into the City and should still be County.

Jamie Crowther said I have to disagree with your vote, too. South of the freeway, I do not know why we cannot maintain that residential rural feel. You are getting pushed by a developer who is pushing this. Why would we not want this? That is a developer's opinion. It is not respect. It is not what everybody else in that area wants and to compare this to Smithfield? This is not Smithfield, and I do not like it when you keep comparing things that are not even the same. Also, when you say, where even is that road, it is kind of frustrating when you are making a decision of this size to affect this many people, and you do not know where all the roads go, that is frustrating. I appreciate your time and comments and answering why you did that, but I do disagree with the decision. I feel like south of the freeway should maintain a residential rural feel. This is a great spot, but this type of development needs to be closer to the City center. I 100% agree with what Commissioner Ben Greener says. I just hope the City Council can listen to the voices of the people and put faith and trust back into listening to what the people say and what they want, and not what a developer on the Planning Commission wants.

Krista Spraycar said many families chose to live here because of the open space, quiet streets and the sense of community. Replacing those features with large or medium density packed developments can permanently alter what makes our City unique and attractive.

Layne Wilding said again, I looked at the staff report and appendix L had a whole lot, I do not recommend that we go forward until we get the questions answered. I have not seen any answers or heard any discussion here relative to the staff report in that appendix and this does not meet the requirements as addressed by staff.

Brenda said we have a business of trucks and park in our property. What is going to happen with that and with the school buses? If you guys put a sidewalk, the bus is not going to stop there. What are you guys going to do about that? I have horses, cows and chicken so what is going to happen with that if you bring other people, who are going to complain about the sounds and smells.

Chairperson VanTassell closed the Public Hearing at 7:55 p.m.

6. Business/Staff Questions

Planner Lance said both State statute and our code require training for the Planning Commission—one hour on open meetings laws and three hours on land use topics. Staff is formulating ways we can help you meet those requirements. There are really only two relevant conferences in the planning world, and one is coming up—the Utah Land Use Institute on October 22-23. Also, the County planning office is putting on an event at the

Utah State Campus in Brigham City. I will send an email with those details for September.

7. Adjournment

Motion by Commission Member Ellsworth to adjourn the meeting. Motion seconded by consensus of the Board. The meeting adjourned at 7:59 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.