

IN ATTENDANCE

Commissioners Present: Chair Karen Ellingson, Genevieve Baker, Michael Farrer, Ann Anderson and Brett Nelson

Commissioners Excused: Ralph Calder, Rod Parker

City Staff: Josh Yost, Community Development Director
Carla Wiese, Planner II/Economic Development Specialist
Heather Goins, Executive Assistant

City Council: Liz Crandall

CALL TO ORDER

Chair Ellingson called the meeting to order at 7:02 p.m.

APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA

Commissioner Anderson moved to approve the agenda as written. Commissioner Farrer seconded the motion. The vote to approve the agenda was unanimous.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

November 28, 2023

Chair Ellingson pointed out that on line 286 the first 3 words are repeated. Commissioner Farrer moved to approve the November 28, 2023 meeting minutes with the change. Commissioner Baker seconded the motion. The vote to approve the meeting minutes was unanimous.

CONSENT AGENDA

No Items

ADMINISTRATIVE SESSION

No Items

LEGISLATIVE SESSION:

- 1) *Springville Community Development requests amendments to Springville Code Title 11 Chapter 2 Article 3 Board of Adjustment to comply with Title 10 Chapter 9a Part 7 UCA Appeal Authority and Variances.*

Carla Wiese, Planner/Economic Development Assistant, presented. This was continued from the last meeting. In 2017, the legislature made some changes to the appeal authority and variances that Cities had to identify an Administrative Land Use Authority for appeals. This was the Board of Adjustment and there were no other options. The State now says it can be a person, committee, or commission. Springville City has a Board of Adjustment and it works well. This designated the Board of Adjustments as the Administrative Land Use Appeal Authority. We clarified when the decisions of the board become effective. It wasn't completely clear in our previous ordinance. Also, the State codified a time frame for an applicant to file an appeal. Cities can set their own if it isn't less than 10 days. We went with the 10 days.

4:33 Chair Ellingson asked about the do not consider zone variances. But on page 3 (2) under the limitations of the board's powers, they can only make decisions applying to the zoning ordinances requests for variances. She asked if that means there are variances that the Board of Adjustments should be looking at. Ms. Wiese said yes, the State is clear on when a variance can be granted, and you can't grant a use variance.

Director Yost said variances are related to geometric or numerical parameters of the development of the site such as a setback or 30% lot coverage. You can't grant a variance that grants a use that isn't permitted in the zone. The use table in the zone is not variable. That would be a zone text amendment or zone change to get that. Commissioner Nelson asked if it is geographic space. Ms. Wiese said typically a variance is a physical aspect of a lot that impinges on someone's ability to develop it.

Director Yost said variances always result from a unique circumstance of the property itself and how that affects the applicant's ability to exercise a property right that they would otherwise be able to exercise in the neighborhood. The variance runs with the land. Commissioner Nelson asked about Westfield's Central and how variances would be handled there. Director Yost said he couldn't see how they would meet the criteria for the variance as there is no hardship there because all the lots are legal and buildable. Ms. Wiese mentioned basements where they are not allowed. That would not fall within the parameters because they are still able to use the lot to build a home and they would not be granted a variance.

Chair Ellingson asked if this clarifies between what variances we allow and use variances we don't allow. Ms. Wiese said it says that in the document. Chair Ellingson said there is a definition of a variance but it doesn't distinguish between a use variance and a non-use variance. Director Yost said it is a case where a use variance isn't a thing. But we need to clarify it. Ms. Wiese will make sure it is clarified.

Commissioner Nelson moved to open the Public Hearing. Commissioner Baker seconded. The public hearing was opened at 7:14 p.m.

Mindi Wright
853 E 1000 S

She asked who the Board of Adjustment is and if they are a State entity. Chair Ellingson said it is a City board. Ms. Wiese said the Mayor appoints them. Ms. Wiese gave Ms. Wright a copy of the staff report so she could see how it works.

Commissioner Baker moved to close the Public Hearing. Commissioner Nelson seconded. The public hearing was closed at 7:16 p.m.

14:03 Commissioner Farrer moved to approve the Springville Community Development request to amend Springville Code Title 11 Chapter 2 Article 3 Board of Adjustment to comply with the Title 10 Chapter 98 Part 7 UCA Appeal Authority and variances. Commissioner Nelson moved to amend the motion by adding 'recommend approving' to Commissioner Farrer's motion.

Commissioner Baker seconded the amended motion. The vote to approve the amended motion was unanimous. Commissioner Anderson seconded the original motion. The vote to approve the original motion was unanimous.

15:29

2) ***Springville Community Development seeking a recommendation to adopt the 1600 South Area Plan.***
Josh Yost, Community Development Director, presented. Kelly Gilman and Cooper Parson from CRSA, lead consultant on this project, will help present. He read the intent statement of the 1600 S Corridor Plan. He presented the process taken to this point.

The team is led by CRSA, they are a firm from Salt Lake. They were the lead architect on this campus. Their sub-consultants are Avenue Consultants and Downtown Development Services. Recent updates include the numbers being resolved and the maximum development yield on a sheet in the plan. There are about 650 acres usable. There are 4,676 total housing units and 6-18 units per acre, the possibility of yielding 5,248,959 square feet of commercial and at that yield would bring 6,189 jobs. The regulating plan acreage is 947.5 and the regulating plan population of 9598.5 with a margin of error of +/-20%.

On Thursday evening there was a public meeting for primarily current residents and property owners in the area. There is a concern if the existing property owners have agricultural uses with their land, could they be pushed out of their use by the encroachment of other uses. We assured them generally the City can't and won't come in and change their use that they have a legal right to. They asked us to communicate to the Council and the Planning Commission that concern and ask that we include a policy statement in the plan that the city would support existing land uses as the area transitions and allow them to continue doing the activities on their property that are important to them while they are there until they're ready to not do that anymore. We discussed that briefly with the City Council tonight and they all were in support of including a statement like that so that would be one question I'd put to you tonight.

Commissioner Nelson asked if that statement is written. Director Yost said no, we haven't put that statement in the plan. We just heard last Thursday that that's what they would like. We have committed to them and committed to the Council in the previous meeting to find a place for that statement.

Chair Ellingson asked about some of the uses in the area that are not friendly to having residential right next to them. Director Yost feels that some of the uses will see that their property is worth more than the use, so the market will take care of those. Sometimes it can take time. Chair Ellingson asked if it is legal and ethical to force a change based on non-compliance. Director Yost said that is something to consider moving forward.

27:15 Mr. Gilman talked about the structure of the plan. This is one of the early steps of getting the city ready to develop in the area. This is a policy document that has certain recommendations in it, but not all the details needed for development to occur logically. The early chapters document what the City already looks like as we start the process, walks through the demographics in Utah in the last few years and has a synopsis of public input. The implementation of this is to be completed as a form-based code. Alternatively, you can adopt different zoning codes or use design guidelines. It is a large area of land, and most of it is vacant, as an overlay of current zoning or as a replacement to current zoning. There is flexibility to how the development would look.

The Wasatch Front Regional Council and MAG have a template for form-based code, and we chose to make this document in chapters that mirror the chapters that are in that code.

31:12 Chair Ellingson asked him to explain form-based code. Mr. Gilman said typical zoning is a code that generally describes uses that are allowed in certain areas of the city that are separated by zone geographically. In form-based code, we are less concerned about the use and more about what the use looks like.

33:00 Initially, the focus was on the orange-shaded area on the 1600 S Corridor.

33:56 The traffic volumes shown in the transportation section come from the EIS that UDOT completed a couple of years ago for the new corridor. These numbers go into the planning of the study area. The blue roads are from the UDOT study and they don't exactly match our recommendations. Public input has been noted, several meetings have been held, and great

input has been given to generate the recommendations. The first set of recommendations can be seen with this first regulating plan. The regulating plan will be the basis of the form-based code in your next implementation step. This is a general layout of land uses that are envisioned for the corridor. The land uses follow the existing zoning code in our city code.

36:05 Mr. Gilman spoke about the main corridor. The South corridor didn't go through the full detailed number crunching that the main corridor did, due to availability of funds. But we used recommendations that came from that to set up the land uses South of the corridor. The city boundary shown is not exact and will take some negotiation with Spanish Fork to work it out.

36:50 Page 37 discusses general recommended uses by district type. General Neighborhood Services would be allowed in most of those zones. They may look different and not as traditional as you picture a Maverick gas station. It could be a single pump station.

37:34 Commissioner Nelson said when the decision was made not to put any more gas stations on Main Street, that didn't eliminate all services. Director Yost said these land use categories are very broad. And it would be handled with the coding process. This plan doesn't create any land use entitlement or change any zoning. It expresses the vision and intent of the city as we move forward into developing and creating zoning for the area. Commissioner Nelson said this is more strategic level planning. Director Yost said yes.

39:09 The Commissioners talked about the color differences shown on the map and said it would be a good idea to make them more discernable.

41:30 Mr. Gilman spoke about the Boulevard Community Place and the Town Center Place type. He talked of two case studies that they did, one in Washington and one in Holladay. The southern end of the city is envisioned to look like that. The green eyes in the blob on the map are where public spaces are recommended as part of the gathering area. Commissioner Nelson asked if it could be used for a food truck roundup. Mr. Gilman said yes.

43:57 Once the place type is defined in the code, we then define the land use districts. The land use district table shows what a building should look like in terms of heights and floors. The range is open for interpretation. As you build in the code, you may put certain colors and materials to be used.

46:37 He explained mixed-use areas and transitions to more dense residential areas. The plan has the different types of housing with guidance and photos to help with the understanding of the uses.

49:24 The intent with streets is not to change what we have in our city guidelines, but to enhance the pedestrian environment with it.

51:07 Trails are on the transportation plan and the open space plan. We want to recommend that open spaces be connected by the Active Transportation Network so they are included on both plans.

51:32 Mr. Gilman mentioned the recommendations for the park plans with pocket parks, neighborhood parks, community parks and a regional park.

That is the bulk of the implementation of the document. Then there are the appendices that list data that backs up the numbers, Appendix D is a template for the form-based code.

53:38 Commissioner Nelson said from a strategic perspective it is great. Commissioner Anderson said it is a lot of work and well done. Commissioner Nelson also said great job on working with the public.

Commissioner Farrer moved to open the Public Hearing. Commissioner Anderson seconded. The public hearing was opened at 7:57 p.m.

Mindy Wright 853 E 1000 S

Thanked CRSA for the plan. On page 5 of the definitions, it says higher density around the town centers, and then it moves slowly to lower density. Looking at the bottom of the plan it should be changed to meet that. Where the town center is set to be placed is not central, accessible or convenient. The land on the West side is owned by Spanish Fork. Canyon Creek Parkway is an industrial zone owned by Spanish Fork. She wonders if that is a good placement for our town center. Otherwise, looks well laid out.

56:40 Chad Tripp 843 W 1450 S

He thanked Director Yost for his presentation last Thursday. Page 48 is what he wanted to address. Be mindful of placing uses next to homes and avoid potential confrontation issues. He is concerned about accommodating the concrete plant and apartments by cow farms and flies, which were brought up last Thursday. Look after those who reside here now. In the Westfields, higher-density housing went right behind them, when they anticipated it would be Single Family. They were upset.

His ask is the placement of the medium and medium-low housing. He knows you can't choose what comes in around you unless you are coming in after it is developed. They purchased their home years ago. We have to support growth. He asked for the city to be considerate of the residents that are currently here. On page 48, you can see the different information that is provided for the different housing types. Medium-low would be in his backyard. Right now, it is set for housing medium which is 2-3 stories and 36 feet high. Go more medium-low, please. Do not put such a tall building next to single-family homes. And secondly, they have the potential to be rentals. Rentals can be a concern, though less of a concern than the structures themselves. The park placement and the pocket parks, which end up being a park for those that are coming in. We want a park by the existing development. He is fighting for those that live here the best he can. Arrange parks to benefit those who are here rather than those who are coming. Chair Ellingson asked if that park be shifted to the pale-yellow area rather than where it is now. Commissioner Nelson clarified he wants easier access to parks. Mr. Tripp said yes. Be aware of the placement.

1:05:50 Hunter Huffman 154 C Street

He is excited that form base code is coming to Springville. Something to address further is the transect plan and avoiding what happened in the Westfields Neighborhood Plan. Form-based code allows the market to guide the needs of Springville. Generally, he thinks he wouldn't have to move too far from home to get the housing type he needs. Let the market provide different housing types that we need to address in Utah and Springville. This is a great start and gives a bird's eye view of what to look at closer.

Commissioner Baker moved to close the Public Hearing. Commissioner Nelson seconded. The public hearing was closed at 8:10 p.m.

1:08:22 Commissioner Nelson asked Director Yost or Mr. Gilman about Mindi's comment about where the city center is placed and if they have any comments about that. Director Yost said Mr. Gilman went back to difference in character. The big retail node we are looking for regional demand to support is located at the intersection of Canyon Creek Parkway and 1600 S and the freeway interchange at the intersection of HWY 51 and 1600 S is 1200 W. Those are the areas

that are meant to have larger trade areas. The Southern area is to be more of an amenity to the neighborhood. We're relying more on its gravity than driving a lot of trips through it. It is on two significant thoroughfares on 950 W and the future connection across 51 into Mapleton that will align eventually with Maple (their Center Street). The West side on the Spanish Fork side, they have entertained higher-density housing. Medium-low directly adjacent to the mixed-use lifestyle center is the case study in Holladay is instructive and it quickly moves to a larger lot single family. The code will allow us to calibrate those in such a way that it meets all of our goals.

11:11:34 Commissioner Nelson asked regarding Mr. Tripp's comment, if there is a way to address the park placement so it isn't just for one area. Chair Ellingson said you can avoid some of that with street design. 1:13:16 Director Yost said the 49 acres called out on the plan are publicly owned and maintained. Commissioner Nelson said the plan just gives an idea of where it could be. It doesn't have to be there or that size. Director Yost said yes.

Chair Ellingson said Director Yost said this is not where we get into small details. Maybe we could put in some things later that say when you are abutting a different use, we put in larger setbacks. Director Yost said to Mr. Tripp's comment, in the Westfields, it would have been better if we had the 100-foot Townhomes on the West border instead of the loft homes. He thinks the medium designation is right there because it does provide an appropriate transition between more multi-family and the existing neighborhoods and is in character with the type of development you could already see in the Westfields overlay. 1:15:19 Director Yost said while the permitted residential types are single-family, townhome and twin-home types, we would make sure that those setbacks are compatible, so we are not building them right in the backyard. That calibration will all happen as we do the zoning.

We can make them compatible and work with the existing development. Calibration process of detailing the zoning out.

Chair Ellingson wishes there was a way to create a buffer on 1600 S where there is no buffer.

Chair Ellingson asked if we should put a statement in here that transitions are taken into consideration. Director Yost said you can make any intent statements you want, but to make everyone more comfortable that is new to it, and make sure those intents are communicated. There may be some statements about transitions already in the document. But put some in to guide future regulation drafting. Chair Ellingson said it is for the future and people change, it could help.

Chair Ellingson asked the Commissioners if they were ready to move on this tonight or take more time with it. Director Yost said we would like to have accelerated. In the last couple of weeks, the Mayor asked us to do all we can to get it across the finish line with the currently seated council. It is our intent to take it to Council next week.

Commissioner Farrer is ready to move forward with it. The issue of the transition of existing single-family dwellings needs to be seriously considered. He isn't sure how we do that. Maybe amend this to state that the City Council should seriously consider some language. Commissioner Nelson asked if it comes when we get into the tactical side of it. Director Yost said it helps that it is the intent to go from. And it helps to have the intent statement at the strategic level as it is hard to forget to do that when we get to the tactical level. Commissioner Anderson said she would feel more comfortable with that.

1:21:32 Chair Ellingson asked about infrastructure, utilities and growth impacts and if we can keep up with the growth. Director Yost said there has been a significant amount of work done to assess this. There may be a tipping point that some development in this area may trigger some bigger upgrades, like the sewer, which is generally the biggest impacted part of development.

1:22:57 Chair Ellingson asked if the numbers include the impact of Lakeside Landing. Director Yost said they are mutually exclusive except for the water treatment plant. The sewer plant is the one variable. The sewer plant is undergoing a plant study that hasn't been done in a long time to determine current and future capacity. It may trigger some upgrades in the sewer plant. Chair Ellingson said that takes long-range planning and asked if we need to do anything timing-wise to improve them to allow it to fall into place. Director Yost said the great thing about this plan is the transportation plan has already looked at this and is ready to be adopted. Wheels are already turning in terms of adapting and updating our long-term capital plans to accommodate these projections.

1:25:26 Commissioner Nelson moved to recommend approval of the 1600 South Corridor Plan with the note that consideration will be given to existing homeowners to create an appropriate transition that will not negatively affect those homeowners or the area they live in. As well as an adjustment to make sure parks are accessible to all. Commissioner Farrer seconded the motion. The vote to approve the Legislative Session item was unanimous.

Director Yost said that this is our last meeting for 2023. Thank you for another year of service.

With nothing further to discuss, Commissioner Farrer moved to adjourn the meeting. Commissioner Baker seconded the motion. Chair Ellingson adjourned the meeting at 8:29 p.m.