

**TREMONTON CITY CORPORATION
PLANNING COMMISSION
APRIL 26, 2022**

Members Present:

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

Chairman Capener called the Planning Commission Meeting to order at 5:33 p.m. The meeting was held April 26, 2022 in the City Council Meeting Room at 102 South Tremont Street, Tremonton, Utah. Chairman Capener, Commission Members Conrad, Dennis, Sorensen, City Councilmember Rohde, Zoning Administrator Bench, and Deputy Recorder Nelson were in attendance. Commission Member Fowler was excused.

1. Approval of agenda:

Motion by Commission Member Sorensen to approve the April 26, 2022 agenda. Motion seconded by Commission Member Conrad. Vote: Chairman Capener – aye, Commission Member Conrad – aye, Commission Member Dennis – aye, Commission Member Fowler – absent, Commission Member Sorensen – aye. Motion approved.

2. Declaration of Conflict of Interest: None.

3. Approval of minutes—No minutes to approve at this time.

4. New Business:

- a. Discussion of sections 2 and 3 of Draft Integrated Land Use Plan—Sam Taylor, Landmark Design (joining electronically)

Mr. Taylor provided an update on the plan and said we ran into a road block with finding data that reflects the number of multi-family units in the City. The Commission suggested he talk with Director Fulgham to acquire that information. Councilmember Rohde said the core of the City has dense housing and as we move out that changes to bigger lots. Why does it matter how many we are building when the concept is to build the zoning within this structure? Most multi-family housing we are building is restricted within those zones. Why are we spending so much time on that detail when we just need to concentrate on how we

are going to zone and the concept behind it? Commission Member Dennis said it does not necessarily matter where they are, we are just wondering about the 1% of total land use from medium to high density.

Councilmember Rohde said in St. George during one of our meetings people from the Governor's office said by 2030 a medium price of a house in Utah will be \$600,000 and people will not be able to afford that. The whole structure of how we are building is changing. It is going from single-family to multi-family. We think we have to have all these single-family houses, but our mindset needs to change that we need a whole bunch of different packages for those starting off. I like how we have multi-family in the core of the City then as we go out we should have bigger acre lots on the edges. Commission Member Dennis said that is why we wanted that number. We want both tables to match up. Councilmember Rohde said we have a whole bunch of multi-housing in the City, but that is because there is a shift in how people live. Chairman Capener said the world is shifting so rapidly. We are saying we are going to dedicate 1% of our future for multi-family, but it is probably going to be more. We can fit a lot more in an acre building multi-family than we can with low to medium density. Commission Member Conrad said the mindset has always been houses, but that is changing. Townhomes are all some can afford. That is the new starter home. Commission Member Dennis said according to these charts we are going from 52 multi-family acres to 155. Chairman Capener said we are adding 103 acres for multi-family in the next 30 years. Commission Member Conrad said most of those are in the works or have been approved, but not updated.

Chairman Capener said what we want and what we can afford are two different things. We want thousands of acres of open spaces and million-dollar houses everywhere. Do we just say this is our plan for now with the understanding that as the world shifts this has to change? Councilmember Rohde said we have different categories. If density becomes important in the future the categories could change. Is there a way to do that through an ordinance where it says single-family medium to high density? Commission Member Dennis said we need to remember that people do want to live in houses and right now it is hard to find a house. I feel like we are currently suffocating our City with multi-family. That is our main focus, but there are still people who want to build. There is so much multi-family right now. Chairman Capener said maybe we shrink the lots and lower the expensive requirements so we can still bring affordable, smaller lots, smaller homes and still have them be single-family just in a more affordable way. Right now, there is nothing affordable in single-family homes that are being built anywhere. They start at \$400,000. Do we really think the long-term plan is going to follow this as far as affordability and jobs, we are going to build out something like this? Commission Member Dennis said I do not know that you can base it on Tremonton residents' incomes. In our neighborhood the last 12 families that

moved in do not work in the City. There is money and people being brought in that have jobs that can afford a home. Chairman Capener said is this plan even feasible? We are saying we are going to put a plan together that is impossible to come to fruition under the current design. We need to understand how important it is to build affordable homes so people can live here. This plan says we are only going to do the multi-family that we have and we are only going to do single-family beyond that so we price out 80 to 90% of the City so the only people who can afford it are the people moving from somewhere else. Where do our kids go?

Councilmember Rohde said we are going through rebranding right now. One thing coming from that is people are moving in and working remotely out of their homes. People will want single-family housing so they have their own office. It is just a matter of where do we put those. This yellow zone is sandwiched between industrial and commercial (below F and A). That should be changed to single-family medium to high density and the outskirts could have some nice houses out there. Mr. Taylor said the thought behind that was that we would create a small town, agricultural feel. We made that in hopes of preserving some of that character. Councilmember Rohde said that is one of the first areas that will come up that we need to rezone. I think the area below F should be medium to high density and still be single-family. Chairman Capener said I would put something higher against the freeway to be the buffer. Mr. Taylor said it could be beneficial to have more of a buffer of open space and less homes. It could remain more natural along the freeway to absorb the noise and air pollution. Having a buffer like that does help. I would do that over high density.

Chairman Capener said going forward we have to have tighter density stuff and we need to look for places that will be the least impactful to the existing residents and future residents. We should plan it in areas where it is not going to be as big of a problem to make it fit. We are going to be changing these things on the fly because we have not made enough area for where are we going to go with multi-family in the next 30 years. Beyond what we have already approved, we have nothing. Councilmember Rohde said responsible growth is having a plan and trying to stay as close to it as we can. We cannot say we have all the multi-family housing we are going to have and have already zoned it so we are done with it. Commission Member Dennis said I agree that multi-family along the freeway is a good buffer. Chairman Capener asked Mr. Taylor do you really think we do not need more high density? Mr. Taylor said we are approaching the population for that. We are looking at the whole community and working on a Transportation Master Plan that is driving a lot of this. Things need to be scaled back. We are trying to bump up some density, but are dialing back based of the population projections for the next 20 to 30 years.

Councilmember Rohde said I personally like the map I just do not like those two

yellow areas in the middle. We will end up rezoning those. We are not going to set a perfect plan and will have to make some changes. A lot of our constituents are concerned about the amount of growth we have had with multi-housing. Maybe we do not do more multi-housing at this point. The public can come and talk and go through that process. Maybe we leave it the way it is and it becomes a case-by-case basis with the Council. Commission Member Conrad said we need to make it at least a higher density single-family if we are thinking we might want to change it to multi-family. People will not want to change that otherwise. Councilmember Rohde said medium to high density is a good designation for that. The Commission talked about future annexations and how utilities will be brought to those areas, including sewer and secondary water.

Chairman Capener said are there any changes the Commission wants to suggest? How do you feel about the plan itself? What if we left the plan close to what it is, but put language in there that says depending on growth patterns and affordability, we may have to make some adjustments to allow for multi-family. We need something to clarify this for future planners. Mr. Taylor said leaving some flexibility is good.

Councilmember Rohde said on map 2.5 I think that should be medium to high density and the one right below F should be a low to medium density. As we grow our agriculture will decrease. Do we need to preserve some agriculture within our City? Commission Member Dennis said I wondered if that is why they did not put multi-family against the freeway so then as you pass by it looks like agriculture. Councilmember Rohde said we need to preserve our agriculture and I feel like that is done in the County so the City can become the center to support shopping. Chairman Capener said we could allow super high density in one spot to open up dirt in another for a park or something. Putting high density downtown preserved the agriculture stuff by not sprawling single-family homes all over. We are concentrating them to hit our population estimates and then if there is a place to affordably live, they will do that.

Councilmember Rohde said I would like to see us get away from development agreements. The public feels like we are doing things under the table. If we had more of a standardized agreement of how we want our developments to work, like a conservation development, that would help protect the City Council and Mayor from accusations. Chairman Capener said that is how the City gets developers to do the things they need. Those improvements would not be required in a blanket agreement since there would not be the density to fund it. Those give the City the ability to work with the developer for a win-win. Councilmember Rohde said we just need to be very transparent and forthright so citizens can see the benefit from what is happening. They agreed to continue their discussion of chapters 2 and 3 at the next meeting.

5. Adjournment

Motion by Commission Member Sorensen to adjourn the meeting. Motion seconded by consensus of the Board. The meeting adjourned at 6:55 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 14th day of June, 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.