

**TREMONTON CITY CORPORATION
PLANNING COMMISSION
JUNE 28, 2022**

Members Present:

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

Chairman Capener called the Planning Commission Meeting to order at 5:37 p.m. The meeting was held June 28, 2022 in the City Council Meeting Room at 102 South Tremont Street, Tremonton, Utah. Chairman Capener, Commission Members Conrad and Fowler, City Councilmember Rohde, Manager Warnke, and Deputy Recorder Nelson were in attendance. Zoning Administrator Bench and Commission Members Dennis and Sorensen were excused.

1. Approval of agenda:

Motion by Commission Member Conrad to approve the June 28, 2022 agenda. Motion seconded by Commission Member Fowler. Vote: Chairman Capener – aye, Commission Member Conrad – aye, Commission Member Dennis – absent, Commission Member Fowler – aye, Commission Member Sorensen – absent. Motion approved.

2. Declaration of Conflict of Interest: None.

3. Approval of minutes—May 10, 2022 & May 24, 2022

Motion by Commission Member Conrad to approve the minutes stated above. Motion seconded by Commission Member Fowler. Vote: Chairman Capener – aye, Commission Member Conrad – aye, Commission Member Dennis – absent, Commission Member Fowler – aye, Commission Member Sorensen – absent. Motion approved.

4. New Business:

- a. Discussion of section 3 of Draft Integrated Land Use Plan – Sam Taylor, Landmark Design (joining electronically)

Manager Warnke said I am working with Zion's Bank Public Finance, which is a consultant the City typically uses for economic development plans. They have helped on impact fee facility plans and analyses. They will work on updating our

Affordable Housing Plan in conjunction with Landmark Design. I hope to have a contract to provide those services on the July 5 City Council meeting. The Affordable Housing Plan would come back to the Planning Commission. We want that plan to correlate and make sure it is not in conflict with our Land Use Plan. Before you make a recommendation to the City Council, we want some of those requirements to be integrated into this Land Use Plan. Some affordable housing issues need to be reflected in our Land Use Plan. The State has 25 strategies the City can choose from. As a minimum level we have to choose three. In order to get priority for transportation dollars we would choose five. Zions Bank Public Finance will do the analysis and run the numbers and then Landmark Design will help identify the strategies we need according to the requirements in the State code. We would put those policies in our Land Use Plan and consider adjusting our future maps. This will be an evolving conversation. We have until October 1 to make these changes. We will keep working through the other portions knowing we may need to circle back and revisit the land use section based upon the Affordable Housing Plan.

When asked about the level of service for parks, Mr. Taylor said Tremonton currently has a 3.2 level of service with three parks or 26 additional acres in the works. That would put you up to a level of 5.4. We have recommended a goal somewhere in the middle as the City grows, so 4.5. There will be a gradual decline as the population increases. Manager Warnke explained that impact fees are meant to continue the same level of service that we have. We can change the level of service, but we have to fund that increase through other sources. We might have more parks than our level of service represents in our impact fees because the impact fees do not count parks that have been donated to the City. With Shuman Park we are not sure how the City acquired it. We have negotiated with recent developments for more density in exchange for open space. Those do not necessarily count toward our level of service. You cannot count grants or donations in a cost calculation.

Chairman Capener said do we want the City to invest more in parks so that future residents would pay more and the City would have a better level of service and better parks? We could plan for that and save up. Manager Warnke said acquiring the dirt should be our focus. As development occurs that is the best time to get the land and for sure before annexation occurs. That is the time we have the most leverage. The land value should be cheaper when it does not have access to municipal services. Commission Member Conrad said I like the idea of having really nice park space and facilities so people can use them. We are in a good spot with the freeways. If we can figure out a way to do that and increase our level of service it would be beneficial to get people here. Chairman Capener said how much do we dare increase the level of service in a sustainable way? We need to buy the dirt now foreseeing the population and growth in the future. If we do not

shoot for a level of service at 6, we will not maintain a level of 4. Manager Warnke said another space we have is the golf course, which is about 50 acres. That is not counted as a park although that area and the fairgrounds do provide some type of recreational amenity or value even. We need to look at the gaps and make sure we have those covered (distances and amenities). A mountain bike park, bowery's and picnic tables, pickleball courts, etc., are all things we need.

Manager Warnke said in surveys residents generally appreciate the quality of our parks. If they had a choice, they would like to see some of our existing parks improved to a higher level. Most of the population is within good proximity, but that may change as the City grows. Mr. Taylor said there was not much request for additional parks. The only places lacking parks are on the fringes of the City. Chairman Capener said we have a higher quality than the measure measures, but how do we make sure that future residents pay for the investment we cannot quantify in the level of service calculation? Manager Warnke said we cannot do that through impact fees so it comes down to everyone participating with General Fund revenues or taxes. Chairman Capener said there is no way to do it on a cost basis where you say we want to have an indoor swimming pool and want XYZ of future residents to pay an impact fee based on that? Manager Warnke said you can, but the City would have to provide funds from some other source besides impact fees to bring that level of service up within six years.

Chairman Capener said to go from a 3.2 level to a 5.4 the City would need to buy 22 acres for parks. Mr. Taylor said with the three parks that are in the works that will push the level of service to 5.4. We anticipate it will drop as growth continues though so that is why we say 4. Manager Warnke said we could continue negotiating for open space with developers. Some cities have open space requirements within their subdivisions. It works well with a master plan, but not on a small subdivision like the City typically has processed. If you know you want higher standards, we can spend time thinking about what land use tools or ordinances you can make that would create that end objective for more parks. Chairman Capener said we ought to keep the level of service at 5.4 as we grow. Commission Member Fowler said I agree. This is the part of the plan that has been on my mind the most. One of the best things we can do for the City is create parks and open space. Manager Warnke said land use ordinances could help incentivize developers to dedicate open space and regional ponds. Having smaller storm drain basins on a subdivision level did not make sense because it required the City to maintain smaller areas with no opportunity for multipurpose. We are missing a regional park. It would be nice to have no less than 20 acres. Ideally it would be centrally located in the City. There are not a lot of good spots left. Mr. Taylor said a regional park would draw people from within and outside the City. It would have special features and be a destination playground.

Chairman Capener said we need to save up and get land bought so 20 years from now our kids can improve that and keep that level of service. Nine months out of the year Tremonton's weather is not park friendly. Why not do an indoor facility. Could that be included in the vision? What if we went to surrounding areas and asked them to contribute so we could build a really cool regional park that has amenities that none of us could provide individually. What if we did a special improvement district and got it so great, we could get everyone on board? We could dream it bigger, put together a vision, and then sell it. Manager Warnke said I am more pessimistic on voters voting for an optional tax. Are they really going to vote for something like this? When it goes to the ballot the City has to take a neutral position on how they promote it. We also cannot get people to help fund the Senior Center, I am not sure they would for a park. Chairman Capener said the City could buy 40 acres and then get the amenities through private donations to improve it so it could still be used as the level of service since it was bought with City funds.

Manager Warnke said what would the Planning Commission suggest as a land use regulation to achieve the objective of more parks? We have discussed open space requirements in those ordinances through rezoning and annexations. It would be nice to figure that out a bit. Chairman Capener suggested that an R1-10 zone could move to R1-8 if the developer donates a portion of their land to parks and open space. That could be put in the ordinance rather than just an agreement. Manager Warnke said yes, as we increase the density, we increase the need for parks so there is a nexus. A conservation easement with a cluster of people in an area and then open space could potentially have a lot of people next to the park. What would move the needle is getting a 30-acre park that everyone could enjoy, not just a neighborhood park. We need to structure our ordinances to get more open space. Spanish Fork has a nice sports complex. I asked how they accomplished that and they said they were negotiating open space as part of zoning, but in the end the city decided to make parks a priority and fund those. That came down to a political decision.

Chairman Capener said a neighboring city purchased a large swath of land and zoned it industrial. They put in an industrial park and are selling the dirt for an inexpensive number if businesses build within a year. That is encouraging businesses to rapidly come. That could be a mechanism. The City could buy a few hundred acres to sell for businesses and keep a chunk of that acreage for a nice park. That is what we need in a plan. We need to use City resources to put together a project that encourages that business growth that will give us sales, property, and personal taxes.

The Commission will continue this discussion at a future meeting. Manager Warnke said Landmark Design will help us continue to put some of these draft

ordinances in play. Once we get through this process we can move onto implementation.

5. Planning Commission Comments/Reports: None.
6. Adjournment

Motion by Commission Member Fowler to adjourn the meeting. Motion seconded by consensus of the Board. The meeting adjourned at 7:08 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 30th day of August, 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.