

**TREMONTON CITY CORPORATION
PLANNING COMMISSION
MARCH 8, 2022**

Members Present:

Micah Capener, Chairman
Jordan Conrad, Commission Member
Penni Dennis, Commission Member
Paul Fowler, Commission Member
Layne Sorensen, Commission Member
Bret Rohde, City Councilmember
Steve Bench, Zoning Administrator
Shawn Warnke, City Manager
Cynthia Nelson, Deputy Recorder

Chairman Capener called the Planning Commission Meeting to order at 5:32 p.m. The meeting was held March 8, 2022 in the City Council Meeting Room at 102 South Tremont Street, Tremonton, Utah. Chairman Capener, Commission Members Conrad, Dennis, Fowler, Sorensen, City Councilmember Rohde, Zoning Administrator Bench, Manager Warnke, and Deputy Recorder Nelson were in attendance.

1. Approval of agenda:

Motion by Commission Member Sorensen to approve the March 8, 2022 agenda, with the amendment to move item 4. b. to the beginning. Motion seconded by Commission Member Fowler. Vote: Chairman Capener – aye, Commission Member Conrad – aye, Commission Member Dennis – aye, Commission Member Fowler – aye, Commission Member Sorensen – aye. Motion approved.

2. Declaration of Conflict of Interest: None

3. Approval of minutes—January 25, 2022

Motion by Commission Member Conrad to approve the January 25, 2022 minutes. Motion seconded by Commission Member Sorensen. Vote: Chairman Capener – aye, Commission Member Conrad – aye, Commission Member Dennis – aye, Commission Member Fowler – aye, Commission Member Sorensen – aye. Motion approved.

The following items were discussed out of order.

4. New Business:

- a. Overview of draft Integrated Land Use Plan – Landmark Design (This will be broadcast on Tremonton City’s YouTube channel) Sam Taylor from Landmark Design

Mr. Taylor, one of the planning consultants who has worked on this draft with City staff, said the Integrated Land Use plan is a project we have had in the works for a couple years. We will go over the background, its purpose, and the process we have been through. This element of the General Plan is a visionary document for growth and development over the next 10 to 20 years. It does not create regulation or requirements, but can make recommendations for changes to ordinances. It is a document required by State law. This plan is intended to be an element of the General Plan and is not a zoning ordinance. This helps establish a vision for where land use might be headed to help with future growth and development. We established an advisory committee for public scoping, as well as community outreach sessions. There is also a visual preference survey. All this time we have been collecting feedback from the public doing our own analysis of what has been going on within the community and drafting alternatives. We have arrived to this point of the draft plan, which has gone through a couple iterations with City staff. It is posted online for review. In finishing this process, we hope to refine this plan and move toward adoption.

Mr. Taylor said this plan has three chapters and several appendices. Chapter 1 is background and an introduction to the plan. This outlines a summary of public engagement we received during the pandemic. There were 650 people who joined online to leave comments or answer the questionnaire. That is a great turn out. The key issues people highlighted are outlined here. People want to see additional commercial development that is geared toward retail, with some big box stuff by the freeway. The visual preference survey indicated people are looking for restaurants and retail, as well as general merchandise. Those public comments are summarized in the appendix.

There were concerns related to the quality and density of multi-family housing within the community, which is something we have pondered through this process said Mr. Taylor. There are also transportation issues related to connectivity and safety of pedestrians and bicyclists. There were quite a few comments on having parks, open spaces, and recreational trails within the community. People desire to have new parks within developing neighborhoods. Within the existing parks, people want additional amenities. Based on these comments we have developed a set of guiding principles aimed at preserving your character as an emerging rural community. People live here because they love the open spaces and small-town nature. The guiding principals were aimed at how do we preserve that within the community, while also enhancing the quality of life. How will downtown take shape as we move forward and what range of housing stock are we providing in the community. We want to encourage businesses to locate within the community and strengthen the transportation aspect. We developed these guiding principles to create the vision for land use within the community.

Mr. Taylor said Chapter 2 dives into land use itself. It shows the existing land use, as well as land that exists outside the City boundary. There is a lot of Ag protection areas, which is important to the open field preservation moving forward. Within your current City boundary there is a lot of open land, which could be developed in the near term. We have examined the full annexation declaration area for how Tremonton might grow over time. Those areas not within the City limits have been examined as potential growth. In the near term, we do not anticipate a lot of annexation because a lot of land is already there for development. This is a future land use map for the next decade and we have identified a number of districts and centers within the City. This also considered the Main Street Plan and looked at your transportation system where the key entries and exits to the community are. Downtown is at the core of the community, which is the central business district. That needs to be the focus of the community in terms of your economic areas. We also recommend within the Main Street Plan an establishment of commercial nodes at the east and west end. Those are significant areas we felt should be carried forward and expanded on. Another interesting area being brought to the forefront is the commerce center. The Transportation Master Plan calls for an arterial road to bypass truck traffic off of Iowa String and take it to the freeway exit. That road would open opportunity for additional industrial and manufacturing nodes and support business along that corridor.

Mr. Taylor said what we are looking for in terms of how this transpires, is to preserve what you have on the ground right now. As things move out from the downtown corridor, the level of density becomes less. That is geared toward preserving open space and creating walkable communities. Each land use type is described in more detail for better understanding of the map. At the end of Chapter 2 is a section on community design considerations. Some of the considerations that are proposed are modifications to your current zoning ordinance. This would preserve open space and sensitive lands such as those along the Malad River and other protected agriculture areas. This shows how open space will be preserved so it is not just wall to wall housing. There are recommendations for preserving visual resources and unique features. There are certain areas of the community, which have excellent views toward open and natural areas that should be preserved so views can be maintained. There is a recommendation for gateways and nodes, and corridor treatments as well. There is also beautification along the highway and interchanges. This chapter concludes with goals and implementation measures for the Commission and City staff.

For Chapter 3 we looked at your parks, open space, and trails system said Mr. Taylor. We need to preserve those if we are to preserve the City's character and improve quality of life. Your existing level of service, which looks at the acreage

you currently have in the system for your population, is 3.4 acres per one thousand. That is a little low compared to most communities on the Wasatch Front, however, you already have three new parks coming on in the near term, which will boost that up past 5. That is a difficult number to maintain so we recommend you aim for 4.5. Another need is distribution—how are they located throughout the community and are they within walking distance. We have looked at existing parks and their amenities so we can make recommendations to what is needed. We are also recommending where future parks may be located. These park development standards make sure your parks have a high quality and give benefit to the community. Generally, as communities grow their level of service decreases because you have fewer acres for a growing population. We settled on the 4.5 because that is what most communities are doing on the Wasatch Front. The national standard is 10 acres per one thousand people, but in the west our public lands are so readily available most people are able to meet their recreational needs in a variety of ways beyond the city park system. The core part of the community is well served by parks. There are two emerging gaps happening in the newer development areas on the west and east ends. Our future parks map addresses those gaps. This chapter establishes a group of park standards and amenities of what might be expected. In this chapter we try to differentiate between parks and open space. Community input is that they like the open space and want that preserved. There will be recreational needs within the traditional park system. We have gone through the inventory of your current park system and found where there are surpluses or deficits. Generally, things look good. There could be an additional pavilion and pickleball or tennis courts, as well as another playground, but the current park standards and amenities are in good shape. Further down the road (20 to 50 years) there do become deficiencies. This helps the parks department plan and gives them a lens toward that end.

Mr. Taylor continued. Chapter 3 also talks about trails. The establishment of a trail system is a priority of the public. Trails can look a lot of different ways and be a lot of different things to people so we tried to create classification of them. Some are adjacent to streets and their main purpose is to get people from one end of the community to the other. Others are fully separated and are there for a recreational benefit and provide connections to some of your more important open spaces. This is not something to be built out all at once, it comes mile by mile. There are a series of goal policies and implementation measures to guide park staff as they look for what they should be doing and when.

Mr. Taylor then reviewed the different appendixes. We have this future land use map we are proposing in Chapter 2 that is intended to provide a vision for how things might progress over the next 10 to 20 years. It is not fully aligned with what might be on the zoning map today. We have tried to be thorough in analyzing every area and making sure there is a check for how we might make

this vision become a reality.

Mr. Taylor said the findings of this analysis summary show that your existing zoning addresses land uses well, but does not have a lot of controls for design and details such as open space requirements, landscaping, or architectural controls. The current ordinance also has an extensive use of overlays and development agreements, which have pros and cons. Many discrepancies within the zoning ordinance can be adjusted with small, short-term changes. However, there could be larger, long-term or different models to govern them. Typically, mixed-use areas tend to struggle under a conventional zoning model, which is what people are familiar with. There is a lot of benefit to having certain areas mixed-use because it encourages walkability and helps combat sprawl. The other existing zoning model that is prevalent in Tremonton are development agreements, which create a separate contract from the zoning. The parties negotiate requirements that are different from the standard ordinance and helps them tailor an agreement that works for both parties. These are difficult to make alterations to once they have been established. The public can also perceive them as under the table deals. A model we are proposing that might be beneficial is the notion of the foreign base code. This code has emerged in recent years and been adopted by a number of communities. The focus is less on the use and more the form of the development. It really is about the relationship between the buildings and public spaces, how they are shaped and scaled, and what materials are used. That provides a lot of flexibility over the use, but great control over how things look. The outcome is that we know what is going to be built and the developer has a clear sense of what they are getting into. This model could help establish special districts and provide transition between areas. This is not something you apply to the whole City, but perhaps to sections of it. We recommend you achieve a hybrid of all these models.

Chairman Capener said are you aware of a city our size that has our same goals that has successfully implemented something of this scope? I find it hard to use Ogden and Woods Cross as good examples of what we want to do to preserve our agriculture. Mr. Taylor said locally I am not aware of any, but that does not mean they do not exist. The principals of the foreign based code can be adapted so I am confident it can be done for a community your size. This code is geared around design over use. The use will follow the design. Chairman Capener said there has got to be a town that started rural, grew a bit, but stayed rural and implemented some cool policies and figured out how to manage all this stuff. If we could figure out what they did right and their challenges then that would be better than trying to implement something that worked down south. Mr. Taylor said the communities we provided example for are not geared toward open space. They are geared toward establishing places within their community—places you want to be to spend your time and money. There are communities who have successfully preserved a significant amount of open space by implementing a

conservation subdivision. That is listed in Chapter 2 as a recommendation. We are trying to establish a vision and these are considerations for you to achieve that.

Commission Member Dennis said I am curious as to what percentage of people's comments you put into this plan. Are we taking that into consideration? The number one thing people want is to limit new growth and I do not see that anywhere. Councilmember Rohde said people want more restaurants, but no growth. Mr. Taylor said yes, there are competing interests. We cannot just put a moratorium on development. Commission Member Dennis said so how can we balance that so we have restaurants, but limit growth. Chairman Capener said there are a hundred ways to do it, but a funding mechanism is to bond and buy dirt to preserve it. We could have higher density in one spot to bring open space to another.

Mr. Taylor said this draft plan is available online at www.lds-ut.com/tremonton and we encourage you all to look at it. Manager Warnke said the plan going forward is to hold that draft constant, meaning as you review it and make suggestions or changes, they will write those down and forward that same draft, along with the recommendation to the City Council for their consideration. Changes will be implemented at the conclusion of the process. Chairman Capener said we ought to set up a work meeting to go through it together to understand what we want and where we feel it needs work. The Commission agreed they would need a few meetings to go through this information. They would appreciate having Mr. Taylor available by Zoom to answer any questions they may have and understand what is being presented before they make recommendations to the Council. Manager Warnke said you will have a public hearing at some point to see what people have to say. It is a legislative decision, but you could include those thoughts into the final version that is forwarded to the Council. When asked about the timeline, Mr. Taylor said there is no timeline. Perfection is not the goal. This is a living document that can be modified and should be updated regularly.

b. Discussion of zone change – Leslie Fridal

Ms. Fridal said I own a building lot that sits adjacent to Best Realty. The lot is currently landlocked, but my sister, Teresa Sandall, lives in front so I can access it through a small lane down the side of her property. That access was approved for the property for a single-family dwelling. Unfortunately, with the costs associated to bring utilities to the lot, as well as the size of the lot (half an acre) since I am only one person, I do not want to build a home that is going to fit that lot. I am proposing this particular piece of property be approved for a four-plex. I will live in one of the units and they would be one level. I would hope to attract those with disabilities or older couples for the other three units. This lot has sat vacant and every time I propose something I run into a block. Administrator Bench has said

if I wanted to do a multi-level house and use one level as a rental I could. However, half an acre is a lot all by myself. I am not able to afford something like that. I imagine you are thinking to just sell the lot, but since it is landlocked, there would not be much interest. Although it sits right next to Holmgren Estates East this half an acre lot appraised for \$25,000 due to being landlocked. I want to make the best of a bad situation.

When asked about the access, Ms. Fridal said it does not meet the width requirements, but because of the situation it was previously approved for access. The lane runs along the side of my sister's property. My sister's land is zoned commercial residential, but the lot behind is the R1-10. When asked about the layout, Ms. Fridal said it would set toward the back of the lot and run lengthwise. There would be enough room to where it is not disturbing those behind us and then also keep the peace with my sister. Commission Member Fowler said you would have to have a lane and zoning change. I have no clue on the access, but we have to have information before we could even consider it. Administrator Bench said it looks like there is a 12-foot easement there (12 feet short). Ms. Fridal said it is not paved currently, but we know it would have to be. Councilmember Rohde said could you get an easement with Best Realty on their parking lot? Ms. Fridal said I have tried that. I have tried so many things. My sister could move her fence, but she has planted trees all the way down that lane so there is no way to get it any wider. I am willing to do whatever is needed, but if it is not feasible, I would like you to tell me. Manager Warnke said I would be happy to help, but I do not know the answer until we sit down and go through the process and better understand the code. Commission Member Fowler said as it is written now it cannot be done without a zoning and ordinance change.

Motion by Commission Member Fowler to not carry this any further per the ordinance. Motion seconded by Commission Member Dennis. Vote: Chairman Capener – aye, Commission Member Conrad – aye, Commission Member Dennis – aye, Commission Member Fowler – aye, Commission Member Sorensen – nay. Motion approved by a 4-1 vote.

Motion by Commission Member Fowler to set aside time for public comment. Motion seconded by Commission Member Conrad. Vote: Chairman Capener – aye, Commission Member Conrad – aye, Commission Member Dennis – aye, Commission Member Fowler – aye, Commission Member Sorensen – aye. Motion approved.

Public Comment Period:

Resident Julie Beagley said you asked about cities that have a similar look and feel to Tremonton that have made this work and I would recommend Clinton.

Growing up there we had a few stop signs, but no stop lights or gas stations. It was growing house wise, but there were no other businesses coming in. For 20 years Walmart tried to buy this family's land and I remember being so angry about it, everyone was. Fast forward all this time and our park at the heart of the city is now enormous and beautiful. All around that park they have increased. There is a new fire station, a state-of-the-art medical facility, Walmart, Kohl's, and Starbucks, while still having the small-town businesses. All of that really is the center of Clinton and there is still agriculture all around it. There is a beautiful walking trail that goes along the railroad. I was there a few weeks ago and said to my friend, who lives there, how much we wish we had grown up in this Clinton and how much she enjoys raising her children there. They do not have to leave to do anything. Everything is right there in town and they still go to the farm stands. There is still agriculture around the outskirts of it. It can happen and I have seen it. I wish I had grown up in that Clinton. I love Tremonton and think the ideas they are showing have a lot of potential. I hope we can preserve the look and feel of Tremonton. There is a lot of open land without homes.

Resident Michelle Martineau said I think a lot of the building coming in will be geared toward young families. I would like to see our park level of service closer to where Brigham City is or the nationwide 10 acres per thousand people so our children have a place to go and recreate. He talked about having a lot of open space here and going out. I have that ability, but not everyone has the ability or resources to go out of town and enjoy places with their family. They have to stay in town so maybe they need places to have activities and enjoy parks.

Resident and Councilmember Lyle Vance said we mentioned that 600 people showed up at the park for free hot dogs and a discussion. I am not sure how many hours we have spent on the telephone and many have been invited to committee sessions, which included land owners, realtors, and city staff. All kinds of people have been involved with the discussions. I am glad there are more people looking at it, but we have gone to the community looking for input several times. There has already been a lot of people looking at this thing. We are working on intersections and going down Main Street, but is there any way we can get the whole plan put together, showing what we are trying to do with our streets and how we are trying to grow. We want everyone to see what is going on. There are concerns out there that we are not thinking about our streets and the volume of traffic so they need to see we are and have been for years. That needs to be part of the plan so residents can see there is planning going on. That might alleviate some of those concerns. We have purchased some of these intersections already for future streets and that all needs to be a part of this.

Resident Mike Linford asked the Commission to go to page 82 of the draft and look at the pictures of what residents do not want in Tremonton. Many of you

know that a survey went out to people in the area and they were shown a whole bunch of pictures that they ranked. They voted on what they wanted to see and what they did not want Tremonton to look like. The absolute worst thing they wanted to see is in this report. That is the worse picture of what we want Tremonton to look like. I shared a picture with the City that was taken yesterday in Tremonton. It looks identical to what Tremonton does not want. According to your report, to your survey, the City Council just approved one thousand of these units for Tremonton. That is exactly what we do not want here. Your report says it. That is what Tremonton said they do not want and that is what you all just approved. I am not against apartments or multi-housing it just does not need to be so dense. Where is the open space for kids? There is no park, the other side of both these units is a street. Chairman Capener said it is an affordability problem and it is the way the world is. Most people cannot afford traditional home with lots of open space. Mr. Linford said I completely disagree. People do not need big houses and big yards. They can have multi-family setups, but just not at this density and that type of sprawl. Tremonton shared the vision of what they want and this is not what they are getting. Commission Member Fowler said I think we are missing a point. We are talking about developing that vision and moving forward. No one can go back in time and take this stuff down. You have to manage it. Tremonton is not the only place growing. We need to manage and guide it. We share a lot of your frustrations and beliefs you are expressing, but that is why we are wanting to develop this draft to get a shared vision to improve our plans. However, if something is zoned for this and you apply for building permit there is no one here who can legally say no, whether we like it or not. The best thing we can do is look at this plan we are reviewing and if there are areas in town that are zoned for high density and we do not like it then as a community we need to unzone it for that. We cannot say no to a permitted use. Mr. Linford said I agree with that completely, but it is the rezoning we keep doing. Commission Member Fowler said we need to come together as a community and find some common ground to work through this problem. That is why they have invested this money so we can have a shared vision. Mr. Linford said I agree. Let us stop the permits until we get this plan in place. Chairman Capener said we cannot do that. There are different things we can do to make it better, but we also have to understand that our children have to have a place to live. The landscape has changed. A starter home is \$500,000 and there has to be more multi-family housing.

5. Adjournment

Motion by Commission Member Conrad to adjourn the meeting. Motion seconded by consensus of the Board. The meeting adjourned at 7:26 p.m.

The undersigned duly acting and appointed Recorder for Tremonton City Corporation hereby

Planning Commission

March 8, 2022

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 12th day of April, 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.