

**TREMONTON CITY CORPORATION
DEVELOPMENT REVIEW COMMITTEE
JANUARY 26, 2022**

Members Present:

Steve Bench, Chairman/Zoning Administrator
Chris Breinholt, City Engineer
Marc Christensen, Assistant City Manager—excused
Paul Fulgham, Public Works Director
Shawn Warnke, City Manager
Cynthia Nelson, Deputy Recorder

Chairman Bench called the Development Review Committee Meeting to order at 9:09 a.m. The meeting was held January 26, 2022 in the City Council Meeting Room at 102 South Tremont Street, Tremonton, Utah. Chairman Bench, Engineer Breinholt, Director Fulgham, City Manager Warnke, and Deputy Recorder Nelson were in attendance. Assistant City Manager Christensen was excused.

1. Approval of agenda:

Motion by Manager Warnke to approve the January 26, 2022 agenda. Motion seconded by Chairman Bench. Vote: Chairman Bench – aye, Engineer Breinholt – aye, Director Fulgham – aye, Manager Warnke – aye. Motion approved.

2. Approval of minutes—October 6, 2021

Motion by Director Fulgham to approve the minutes of October 6, 2021. Motion seconded by Manager Warnke. Vote: Chairman Bench – aye, Engineer Breinholt – aye, Director Fulgham – aye, Manager Warnke – aye. Motion approved.

3. New Business:

a. Discussion of Harvest Acres, Phase 2 & Harvest Village – Garth Day

These two developments are a combination of single-family homes and townhomes. Mr. Day said we have some urgency in getting across this canal. Rupp's Excavation has some pipes and manholes ordered, but we are waiting on others. Engineer Breinholt asked if the canal company has approved the crossing? Mr. Day said I will go in front of the board in February, but their Manager has walked the site and thinks it will work. Engineer Breinholt said I think we are good with the sewer just run it deep and run all the sewer lateral lines in here. Mr. Day said we will treat this area as one project since it is so interconnected. I want to talk to the canal company about a second canal crossing for the storm drain, but the manager does not want to do that until we are closer to completing that, which will be next year.

Mr. Day said I added these two lots to Phase 2. I will send the new plat over. Chairman Bench said show the turnarounds and stubs on the plats. The Committee discussed the sewer easement that runs along lot 26. The group then discussed the way the sidewalk should layout for a better flow of movement and so homeowners understand what

portion of the property they own. They discussed different layout options, including a hybrid that would have the sidewalk meander around and blend in. Developers would need to clearly delineate property lines and give the owners notice. Director Fulgham said we will need to mark this street as no parking since it will be narrow, especially as you get closer to the bridge. We can do the construction whenever you want, we just have to know what excavator we are working with. Chairman Bench said make the changes we have discussed and if Engineer Breinholt likes it, he will put his stamp on it. Let us get the canal permit before we do anything though.

b. Discussion of River Valley, Phase 8 – Garth Day

Mr. Day said we want to get the BR Mountain Road section done and move forward with this particular one, but do not have the plat ready yet. The Committee discussed the location of the dumpsters, fire hydrants, and streetlights, as well as the required landscaping. Manager Warnke said it would be nice to have some trees in front of the townhomes for visual breaks and to conceal the dumpster. Add curb against the lawn and flowerbeds so there is a definitive separation from the landscape types. River Valley 9 has buffering requirements that include the planting of trees and shrubs, and adding fencing. Depending on the amount of parking, landscape islands may be required.

Manager Warnke read through documents that discussed the agreement for the construction of BR Mountain Road. Your proportionate share is based on Engineer Breinholt's estimate and would be 33.8% of whatever the total cost ends up being. The only thing we do not know is the utility portion. I want to discuss this more with our finance director. We suggest you read through it too so there are no misunderstandings. Engineer Breinholt confirmed that this is for their portion of the road in front of River Valley 8 and 9. They would partner together to construct the road. Mr. Day said when it comes time to do this we will build the whole piece, but are only responsible for 33.8% of that. I will work on obtaining those bids.

c. Discussion of Bighorn Property – Paul Johnson

Mr. Johnson said we have property under contract just above Spring Hollow. It is outside City limits so it would require an annexation. It could be accessed from 1000 North. The BR on the mountain gives you an idea of where it is. We want to bring the whole piece in. Manager Warnke said that could overlap with Garland. Part of the General Plan envisions the City keeping these hillsides and views unimpeded and undeveloped so I am not sure what is developable. Mr. Johnson said the topography lends itself to residential and I would like to know your feelings about developing a master plan community there.

Manager Warnke asked about water shares. Mr. Johnson said he does not have any, but would get what they need. The Committee discussed options for obtaining water shares from shareholders of the Bear River Canal, as well as potential wells or other sources of secondary water. When asked about culinary, Director Fulgham said you would have to

put in a tank and lift from our existing system. You would have to build the storage and pay an impact fee to buy into the system. The City would provide water for culinary use and you would have to provide shares or another source for secondary water. It works out to be about half a share per developed acre. Manager Warnke said the timing is critical. We cannot permit large amounts without having the infrastructure in place. In previous areas, the developer has built out the infrastructure so the City would have the ability to provide those building permits. We could do this phase by phase and come up with an agreement.

Mr. Johnson reviewed some of his previous developments and what he envisions for this area. He said maybe three units per acre average with the higher density toward the bottom. This could have 2,000 to 4,000 units. I know this is more than your documents are projecting in the next 50 years, but this is 1,300 acres total. If we can figure out the water and how to get the infrastructure there, what do you see the City being willing to do? There is not a master plan zone for this so how would we accommodate it? Chairman Bench said we have done overlays. There is an underlying zone with an overlay through a development agreement.

Mr. Johnson asked about treatment facility capacity. Director Fulgham said there is not enough to build this all out at one time. We do not reserve capacity until we issue building permit. We do have plans as we grow on what needs to be done. We will lose about half a million gallons a day when Garland gets on their own facility. Mr. Johnson then asked about accesses and circulation. We want to find the right location for a grand entrance. It does not have to be monumented, but we would like to. We want it wide enough and in the right place to handle 2,000 to 4,000 homes. They discussed a few potential locations and how those access and road networks would work. They also discussed the dimensions that would be required. The ideal roadway would be 80 feet wide and would widen for about 150 feet to the intersection. This would allow for travel lanes in each direction, a center lane, and shoulders on each side. The intersections would be enlarged for all turn movements. A 66-foot with no on-street parking would allow for all turn movements and still function. Manager Warnke said Horrocks did our Transportation Plan modeling so we would want to coordinate with them on this since it is significant. That road right now needs to be improved. We are working toward that, but it is a timing issue. Something of this magnitude will eventually hit 1000 North and that is an issue that needs to be solved. Mr. Johnson said the main entrance ought to be at a lane that is around the corner from the onramp and would have less impact on the City. There are already some single-family homes there. They discussed what would be needed to make the connections and where accesses could be. They also discussed power lines and canal easements.

Director Fulgham said storm water will be an issue. You could use some as of that as a park coming off the hill with retention. Engineer Breinholt said the main outfall is limited so you would need a slow-release rate. Manager Warnke said the Master Plan wants to see improved parks and open space. According to the citizen survey there is a need for a mountain bike park with trails through open space. I will send you our Master Plan when it gets done. It talks about keeping the hillsides undeveloped and

keeping that feel of the area since our hillsides are a defining feature. This topography could also lend itself to an amphitheater. Mr. Johnson said that and the hiking trails sound like a good match to me. I have a friend who is doing a huge project in Utah County that is cutting edge. It is a play park that is appealing to parents to get their kids off their devices and outside. They are begging me to let them come and do it here, too. We could make this a community draw for families and a destination. I appreciate you taking the time to help me get answers before we make a decision. I will keep you posted on how it is coming along.

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

4. Comments/Reports: None.

5. Public comments: No public comments.

6. Adjournment:

Motion by Director Fulgham to adjourn the meeting. Motion seconded by consensus of the Committee. The meeting adjourned at 12:04 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 _____, 2022

Linsey Nessen, 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.