



AGENDA FOR THE
SPRINGVILLE COMMUNITY BOARD
110 South Main Street
Multi-Purpose Room
Thursday August 14, 2025 7:00 P.M.

CALL TO ORDER

Approve the minutes from the April 10, 2025 and the July 10, 2025 meetings.

PUBLIC COMMENT

The public is invited to make comments or bring issues before the board for discussion.

DISCUSSION ITEMS

1. Virtual Meeting with Houseal Lavigne

ADJOURNMENT BY CONSENSUS

THIS AGENDA IS SUBJECT TO CHANGE WITH A MINIMUM OF 24-HOURS NOTICE

This meeting was noticed in compliance with Utah Code 52-4-202 on August 05, 2025. Agendas and minutes are accessible through the Springville City website at www.springville.org/agendas-minutes. Springville Community Board meeting agendas are available through the Utah Public Meeting Notice website at www.utah.gov/pmn/index.html. Email subscriptions to Utah Public Meeting Notices are available through their website; In compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act, the city will make reasonable accommodations to ensure accessibility to this meeting. If you need special assistance to participate in this meeting, please contact the Administration Department at (801) 491-7833 at least three business days prior to the meeting.

MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE SPRINGVILLE CITY COMMUNITY BOARD HELD ON THURSDAY, APRIL 10, 2025, AT 7:00 P.M. AT THE CIVIC CENTER, 110 SOUTH MAIN STREET, SPRINGVILLE, UTAH, IN THE MULTI-PURPOSE ROOM.

Board Members and Staff in Attendance: Bryan Smith, Cason Acor, Chelsey Rosander, Dave Cook, Deborah Hall, Jennifer Grigg, Josh Yost, Riah Hurst, Mike Florence, Councilmember Mindi Wright, and Patrick Monney.

Excused: Natalie Hollingshead, Scott Duncan

Call to Order 7:03 p.m.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

Riah moved to approve the minutes from the January 09, 2025, February 13, 2025, and March 06, 2025 meetings. Cason seconded the motion and all voted aye.

PUBLIC COMMENT

There was none.

DISCUSSION ITEMS

1. General Plan Visioning Statement

Bryan started his presentation by stating our part in the general plan is important and that our role comes before the Planning Commission and two steps before the City Council sees a plan. As drafts and memos come to us, our job is to grapple with it—to understand it, and to eventually recommend it to the Planning Commission. The framework, draft, and final plan will then be officially endorsed and approved legislatively. He showed comments online and highlighted sections of the draft reviewed with Houseal Lavigne in the last meeting. He showed a PowerPoint that he promised to share with the board and started by reviewing the vision statement. He had Chat GPT analyze the feedback looking for consensus including that it's too long and too wordy. The tone is generic, lacks unique local character, and then some of the other feedback, including small-town, feel, arts, city—key ideas to emphasize. He said there are some contested areas, like the claims about the robust transit rail infrastructure.

Dave added that in business, a vision statement is just one paragraph, not three documents. Josh said this board was not gathered for technical expertise, but for insight into the community, knowledge of the community, and the ability to help staff understand what's important. Riah said this vision statement is not going to be read because it is super long. She asked who's the audience because it is not us. Bryan said the vision statement should be aspirational, concise, and, powerful. Deborah asked about the timeline to continue making comments. Josh said the contractor was behind. Bryan said documenting the Community Board comments is important and our lens is critical because it represents the community's view. The audience is your neighbor and you. If the document is too technical and the board doesn't get it, if I don't get it, if the board doesn't like it, then Housel Lavigne is not talking to us. Josh will ensure the technical parts are there.

Bryan challenged Housel Lavigne to clarify the distinction between goals and implementation which is a theme throughout—conflating goals by including an implementation idea. No one argued with the focus on placemaking above zoning types, but encouraging more diverse housing options needs to be done carefully. There's debate around allowing ADUs by right in all zones and how multi-family areas

are handled—highlighting broader questions about zoning. The need for clear, actionable reforms came up, with a push to be both aspirational and specific. In the past, implementation was lacking. Our board could step in and encourage implementation.

Bryan said the comments indicate that Springville is still car-centric and transit claims are premature and exaggerated. The debate to end parking minimums went back and forth. In the current reality, multimodal transportation is a future aspiration. Josh said Houseal Lavigne did not consult the newly adopted Active Transportation Plan. Bryan added that Emily (Larsen, Director of the Springville Art Museum) provided a massive rewrite of the parks and arts section. The document is a work in progress and he said that as they implement feedback, the board needs to be ready.

He moved on to water and the word *conservation* is triggering. Comments leaned to the consensus to avoid ordinances that require drought-resistant landscaping. Deborah prefers drought-resistant landscaping ordinances to be included and clarifies that continued counter-consensus commenting on the document is still needed. Bryan agreed that it's fair and reasonable to include any type of comment except specific implementations—like time-of-day watering ordinances—rather than high-level principles. Bryan said that there is general agreement on water conservation, but consensus doesn't mean it will stay that way. Josh said he can't receive rebates for drought-friendly landscaping because their city hasn't adopted the necessary ordinance. However, the ordinance requirements established by the South Regional Water Conservation District are substantial and could be viewed as too restrictive. Springville City Council has chosen not to adopt those restrictions. On the flip side, I can't get any money for my landscaping. There are multiple facets to water conservation. Dave established that Springville does not use water restrictions as often as other communities. Bryan said there will be residents who water their lawns and residents who want the incentives for drought-resistant landscaping. Mike said some incentives apply to removing grass and some apply to new construction, but the Council must adopt that as an ordinance. Bryan encouraged the board to continue to comment, even against the consensus, without getting into a specific implementation. Riah said there were so many comments on the specific implementation and it is difficult to state broad ideas in the vision statement even though we are ready to see results after all this time this board has spent working on the new general plan. She remembered meeting with the mayor who said the reason this board was chosen is because he trusts us to open our mouths when we disagree with people. That's why we are here, to contest and challenge consensus comments. We don't need to agree or bully. He told her he trusts this board to rock the boat and have their own opinions and ideas that might conflate with someone's and that's what we meant so we can flesh this out. She encouraged board members to say something even when it was a little bit different from what everyone else was feeling.

Bryan moved on to comments on the Urban Design portion including adding specificity, design elements, define historical charm. Unchallenged critiques included adding a coordinated tree plan and defining parking to preserve charm. The next section includes an economic development plan and sales tax leakage study. Riah asked if Springville can maintain a *small-town feel* and avoid sales tax leakage. Cason added the study can show what Springville lacks and there is potential for more revenue. Josh said a sales tax leakage study is really good data to make eyes open policy decisions. Bryan said economic development and small-town feel can be balanced. Mike said Springville can keep our community character and have lots of retail or car dealerships, Lindon for example. It all depends on where it's located, which is the land use plan or where you want your things. That is how a city can force those types of things. Dave said the town already feels a whole lot different than when he was a 10-year-old boy and downtown has been suffering for survival with no parking. Jennifer said we don't want to have an East and a West. Chelsey said development is happening on the west side including Lakeside Landing

which will feel split. Patrick explained state sales tax distribution and communities share half of what is collected and suggested relaxing the focus on sales tax collection because it is shared. The board agreed that the new general plan needs to look at all the existing master plans. Cason said he would be curious to see large areas of sales tax leakage. The sales tax discussion continued. Riah said the sales tax leakage report provides very specific data that is valuable.

Bryan moved on to public facilities, public-facing, and infrastructure services. So far at-large elections have been the consensus in the comments. Park service level was discussed including improved quality, not more parks. Riah said there should be a balance. Dave said there is always competition between golf, art recreation, and parks. Bryan said we would rather get it right than hurry through.

ADJOURNMENT BY CONSENSUS 9:24 p.m.

This document constitutes the official minutes for the Springville City Community Board Meeting held on Thursday, April 10, 2025.

I, Jennifer Grigg, do hereby certify that I am the duly appointed, qualified, and acting Deputy Recorder for Springville City, of Utah County, State of Utah. I do hereby certify that the foregoing minutes represent a true, accurate, and complete record of this meeting held on Thursday, April 10, 2025.

DATE APPROVED: _____

Jennifer Grigg
Deputy Recorder

MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE SPRINGVILLE CITY COMMUNITY BOARD HELD ON THURSDAY, JULY 10, 2025, AT 7:00 P.M. AT THE CIVIC CENTER, 110 SOUTH MAIN STREET, SPRINGVILLE, UTAH, IN THE MULTI-PURPOSE ROOM.

Board members and staff in attendance: Bryan Smith, Cason Acor, Dave Cook, Deborah Hall, Jennifer Grigg, Josh Yost, Councilmember Smith, Kelly Jensen, Mariah Hurst, and Councilmember Wright.

Excused: Kelly Norman, Chelsey Rosander, Michael Florence, and Carla Wiese.

Call to Order 7:05 p.m. Chair Bryan Smith acknowledged the large public attendance and moved the Dry Creek Community Plan discussion to the beginning of the meeting. He explained that this board represents the public to the council and not the other way around.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

There were no minutes to approve.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Steve Waters raised awareness about Springville maintaining autonomy and identity in the face of the state legislature and specifically the Governor's Office of Economic Opportunity as it pertains to authority districts. He is concerned and wants to prevent the creation of more of these authorities because they act like private corporations that can levy taxes and assess fees. Dave asked if this applies to Springville City. Josh answered it is a real possibility that the state could create a new district to levy new taxes. Springville City uses our membership in the Utah League of Cities and Towns (ULCT), a contracted lobbyist and the mayor's influence to voice the needs of Springville to the Utah State Legislature. The Governor's Office of Economic Opportunity is all about economic development. Dave asked if the state could take Springville land for economic development. Cason said in a regulatory way, yes. Mr. Waters said our freedom depends on fragmentation, not a centralization of power in the executive branch of government.

DISCUSSION ITEMS

1. Dry Creek Community Plan

Because of the attending public interested in the Dry Creek Community Plan, Bryan moved item two up to the beginning of the discussion items.

Spencer Petersen asked whether the new general plan supersedes the Dry Creek Plan. Bryan responded that the General Plan serves as overarching guidance—more principle-based—and is meant to inform other, more specific plans. He explained that other plans should align with the principles in the General Plan, and if they don't, they should be reevaluated.

Riah added that the Dry Creek Plan was based on the previous General Plan. Mr. Petersen said he was speaking on behalf of the visitors in the room who were there because they have concerns with the Dry Creek Plan. They want the new general plan to reflect what residents in the Dry Creek area want, so they can continue doing business.

Deborah asked what the problems were with the Dry Creek Plan. Mr. Petersen explained that the plan designates the area as multi-use, which makes existing businesses "legal non-conforming." This means he cannot expand his business on his own land. Cason noted that the Dry Creek Plan represents a significant shift from the current land use. Dave said such changes are not unusual. Skip Dunn added

40 that this kind of transition is happening across the state. Bryan explained that the redraft of the general
42 plan is still in progress and aims to determine future land use. Josh added that a general plan is a top-
level policy document intended to guide the city's vision for the next 20 years. He said that new plans
44 would be created under the new general plan, and existing plans will need to be adjusted to align with its
vision and policy. Dave emphasized that the city does not have unlimited resources, and while some
people want the land to remain open, it is privately owned.

46 Skip Dunn asked whether anyone in attendance represented the developer in the Dry Creek Plan.
Josh explained there is no developer because this is a plan directing future development. Spencer
48 Petersen clarified that he was not asking to eliminate the entire Dry Creek Plan. Instead, he proposed
preserving a light industrial/manufacturing zone that has existed for 50 years. He said he does not want
50 the city dictating how he can use his land.

Cason asked about legal boundaries and whether business operations could continue. Josh
52 clarified that no zoning changes have taken place and that current zoning does not reflect the Dry Creek
Plan. Under the current legal non-conforming status, businesses may continue operating as long as they
54 do not structurally alter the building or expand the use on the site. He added that the Dry Creek Plan has
not yet been legislatively implemented. Therefore, existing businesses can continue to operate during a
56 transition period. The implementation, if adopted, could include gradual management of that transition
over time. He noted that implementation could allow for broadened expansion of the individual
58 businesses. Councilmember Wright asked whether the update to the general plan or the Dry Creek Plan
should be amended. Josh responded that the existing Dry Creek Plan lacks an implementation
60 component, but the updated general plan will include implementation and will create vertical integration
across all other planning documents.

62 Bryan reaffirmed that the updated general plan will oversee every subordinate plan. Mr. Petersen
expressed concern about implementation, saying the Dry Creek Plan imposes a time limit on running his
64 business. Bryan clarified that a landowner could continue using the land for as long as desired; the plan
would only be implemented if the land were sold. Mr. Petersen said this devalues his land, especially
66 because it is built on fill. He thinks it is unsuitable for residential development and therefore hard to sell if
not zoned for industrial use.

68 Skip Dunn, who has been a landowner for about a year, asked whether any developers were
present at the meeting. He suggested better communication with long-time landowners and emphasized
70 that existing users cannot simply be displaced. He noted that mixed-use zoning is common throughout
the valley. Councilmember Smith invited members of the community to attend board meetings regularly.
72 Mr. Dunn said he understands Springville will grow but insists there must be no time limit on maintaining
and building existing businesses. Cason said allowing existing owners to expand on their sites might be
74 a workable solution.

Dan Sumsion introduced himself and said he and his brother bought their land in 2007 because it
76 was ideal for light industrial manufacturing. He went on the record to say they purchased the land under
the LIM (Light Industrial Manufacturing) zone and want it to remain that way—without conditions. He
78 expressed his desire to work with the community and added that Springville was once the road
construction capital of the U.S., a point of pride for him. He voiced concern about operating under non-
80 conforming status indefinitely. Bryan noted that Utah is now the solar capital of the world and described
how his own industry was eliminated due to legislation not fully understood by its sponsor. He said the
82 Dry Creek area is changing, with housing, retail, and a new freeway exit planned. He asked Mr. Dunn
and other property owners how to maintain a LIM "island" as houses are built nearby. Mr. Dunn responded
84 that LIM zoning is not inherently harmful. He believes that the water table is too high and that the area is
built on fill from a landfill. Dave shared his experience with a gravel pit surrounded by houses. Mr. Dunn

86 elaborated on sand supply, trucking, and the price of concrete. Mr. Sumsion discussed his business further and expressed doubt that residential development would be viable in the area.

88 Kim Jensen introduced herself and suggested that there should be a place for an LIM island in the community and proposed using a trail system as a buffer to improve quality of life. Cason confirmed
90 that the properties in question are accessed via State Street.

92 Ray Crandall, owner of Intermountain Lift Company, said he has operated there for 56 years and employs 60 people. He emphasized that the LIM zone is well-established, but his land is landlocked and would become useless if zoning changed. He urged for collaboration between the community and city
94 leadership.

96 Cason added that the high-water table and geotechnical reports raise concerns when considering mixed-use development. Riah thanked the community for their thoughtful and productive contributions to the meeting. Bryan echoed her appreciation.

98 Sue Cox raised concerns about increased traffic at 1600 South and 1750 West, describing the intersection as difficult to navigate. She suggested installing a crosswalk with a light at 1120 South on
100 1750 West.

102 Bryan emphasized that infrastructure should not be treated as an afterthought. Deborah encouraged members of the Dry Creek community to volunteer for the board. Bryan noted that the Community Board meets every second Thursday of the month and invited people to subscribe to meeting reminders at utah.gov. Mr. Dunn asked about utilities on 1600 South. Josh replied that utility connections will be available at 900 West, 400 West, and Wallace. He also noted that the city's master plans are
106 available on the website.

2. Springville General Plan

Revised Draft Vision, Goals, and Preliminary-Future Land Use Map

108 Bryan started his presentation on the memo by explaining the goal is to compare the original to the revised version without wordsmithing and keep the discussion at a high level. He suggested focusing
110 on the map and emphasized the board needs to provide feedback within two weeks via the shared document link. Bryan reminded the board of the term *systems approach*. This memo is significantly
112 shorter with sections like *Vision Statement, Goals, and Feedback*. The Vision Statement is condensed and organized into four guiding themes more rooted in Springville's identity. Each category will be
114 organized under these themes.

- 116 • *Art of Living*
- *Place for Business*
- 118 • *Place for All*
- *Place of Beauty*

120 Bryan said the goal section in the original memo was more overlapping and ambiguous and recommendations will be in the next document. The updated memo has 16 more concise goals with
122 categories listed under each goal. Councilmember Wright asked about categories under the goals. Bryan listed land use development, housing, transportation, water use, community/economic development,
124 public works, arts and culture. There were over 200 comments on the first draft and that feedback is incorporated into this revised memo.

126 Deborah asked about blurring the lines. Bryan questioned the graphics illustrating land use. Josh explained the goal is to have more fluid transitions between land use like a gradient not a hard line or
128 street. He added the transportation consultant reviewed the draft and suggested a matrix. He said the

goals are outcome-based across the categories of land use, housing, transportation, etc. The updated land use map with blurry lines is to create areas with different densities, as well as visual or development character. The 16 goals align more with community feedback. and recommendations will be in the next document for review.

Josh reiterated that the map is now form/context-based—thus the flexible areas instead of hard boundaries. Bryan questioned some of the area labels. The board expressed the land use transitions need improvement and zoning needs to be sensitive to context. They wondered about the entrances to the city all having a consistent look and what the fiscal impacts to the city different land uses would be, balancing employment to housing and type of employment. Recommendations need to be objective and quantified with data so they do not seem arbitrary.

Josh said there is no gap between the Spanish Fork and Springville city limits in the Dry Creek area. Bryan asked about the fiscal impact of supplying utilities to the area. Josh explained rejecting a development because the cost does not make sense for the land use. Bryan asked if infrastructure costs for a new development get passed on to the entire community. Josh said impact fees only pay for that development. Bryan repeated the assignment to the board is provide feedback on the shared document link to complete the feedback section of the document—deadline August 21, 2025.

3. Station Area Plan Update

Josh updated the board on the Station Area Plan, seeking a recommendation to move forward with the approval process. He explained that the plan covers the area within a designated distance from the future Frontrunner Station, located just north of 700 South on the east side of the current rail line, with access west of the CRC and Smith's. He shared his unofficial confidence that trains will be operating in southern Utah County before the 2034 Winter Olympics.

The project team has submitted environmental documents to the federal government for review. The Station Area Plan involves one major property owner and two smaller property owners. Riah asked about zoning, and Josh responded that the zoning is not a substantial change from the 20-year-old Westfields Community Plan, which designated the area as a village center when it was adopted in 2003.

While the property owners are aware of the zoning, many nearby residents mistakenly believe the area will develop similarly to their own neighborhoods. However, that was never the plan. Communicating this has been a challenge, especially as new residents move in and the original vision—always intended to include a village center—is now over 20 years old. Josh presented the land use around the rail station, including residential and mixed-use residential zones, which remain consistent with the plan from the past two decades.

There is no change between the current plan and what the landowners want, and they support it because developers want to maximize development. Councilmember Wright asked about high-density requirements. Josh clarified that the plan does not mandate high-density development or specify outcomes. Rather, it allows for analysis of high-density opportunities and includes incentives for such development.

Among the proposed stations in Payson, Spanish Fork, and Springville, Springville has the best projected ridership. Riah confirmed the project is not phased. Josh agreed, noting all three stations will be built simultaneously, with Payson being the final stop. He added that the bridge crossing the UPRR in Provo is the most expensive part of the project. Springville will not be the end of the line.

Councilmember Wright asked for a comparison to development around the Lehi Frontrunner Station and confirmed MAG funding approval. Josh noted that development will begin before the station is built. Riah confirmed that development will start once the Station Area Plan is approved. Cason added that the plan is currently being reviewed by staff and a few landowners.

174 Josh presented a concept design featuring a fine-grained, pedestrian-first transportation network
176 consisting of a series of blocks near the train station with identity and character. Cason inquired about at-
178 grade crossings, and Josh confirmed there would be none, despite what the concept shows. Eventually,
900 South will be bridged over the rail line. UPRR typically does not allow new at-grade crossings. The
concept also illustrates residential, arterial, and minor collector roads.

Kelly Jensen confirmed there is no connection to 1750 West. Councilmember Wright asked about
180 density again. Josh explained the initial train platform will be shorter at first. He emphasized that the
Station Area Plan doesn't define exact road locations. Instead, its main purpose is to communicate
182 principles such as a fine-grained road network, a people-first approach, development entitlements, and
general densities. It's a 30,000-foot view, not a detailed site plan.

184 Cason asked about buses. Josh said the number of bus bays will increase over time as routes are
added or adjusted. Riah asked whether any routes would be cancelled. Councilmember Millsap
186 responded that Route 821, which runs from Provo to Payson, has high ridership, and Route 823, launched
in April, now has the highest ridership in all of UTA. Since buses feed into the rail system, they will
188 continue to serve Springville after the station is built.

190 Josh described a density tapering pattern from Center Street and 900 South—starting with single-
family homes, then increasing to townhomes, and culminating in three-story condos at the core of the
train station area. He emphasized the plan's similarity to the Westfields Overlay: it does not prescribe
192 exact locations for housing types but allows all of them across the area. What varies is the proportion of
each. The goal is a mix of housing types throughout, creating an organic, natural pattern of growth—rather
194 than segmenting the area by housing type.

Kelly clarified that the area east of the tracks will be more residential with minimal commercial
196 activity, while the west side of the tracks will see more mixed-use development. Josh agreed, noting the
southern area lacks strong pedestrian connections to the station. This weakens the concept of
198 passengers disembarking and easily accessing restaurants or shops. The station area is envisioned to
reflect a neighborhood scale—similar to Sugar House or downtown Provo—while the west side resembles
200 more of a residential setting, like Orem.

Councilmember Wright asked if schools and churches are included in the plan. Josh said civic
202 uses—like schools and churches—are included, but their exact locations will be determined by the school
district, the church, and developers. He advocated for placing such uses in prominent, accessible
204 locations—citing the chapel next to Memorial Park as an example. That chapel, he noted, anchors the
corner, gives the park a civic presence, and provides a visual termination for long street views.

206 Bryan noted that development intensity increases toward the center of the plan near the station.
He also mentioned there's an alternate path for property owners or developers to qualify for the High
208 Transit Reinvestment Zone (HTRZ) tax increment incentive, which would require a density of 50 units per
acre. However, that is not the default path in this plan.

210 Josh added that this plan sets the City Council's direction for future land use in the area. While
the current plan does not propose densities high enough to qualify for HTRZ incentives, it is considered
212 the most broadly acceptable approach. He stressed the importance of weighing tradeoffs, including
potential funding for higher-quality development through incentives like HTRZ.

214 Riah asked about crime data and non-financial tradeoffs. Josh explained that unit size and price
correlate more strongly to transit ridership than density alone—more expensive units tend to have lower
216 ridership.

Bryan asked whether the current plan aligns with the previous plan from 20 years ago. Josh
218 confirmed the new plan includes about 1,300 dwelling units, which is within a few hundred of the original

projection. Bryan then asked about aligning the plan with the new general plan. Josh said it's possible and would be driven by property owners, especially if they want to move faster than the general plan's zoning update.

There will be approximately 69 acres of primarily commercial development, representing about 43% of the Station Area Plan area. Riah confirmed that 1200 West will become a four-lane boulevard regardless of the development outcome.

Josh also mentioned that the Tintic and Sharp rail lines will be aligned by 2028. The infrastructure for the 1600 South crossing at 1200 West has been in place for 20 years. Public works is waiting for developers to show up, pay impact fees, and reimburse the city for prior infrastructure investments. Much of the heavy infrastructure is already in place, including the pressurized irrigation trunk line from the reservoir, a large sewer main, power, and culinary water.

Impact fees are based on the current fee schedule, not the time or cost of installation. However, developers can be reimbursed for certain infrastructure costs already incurred.

Deborah moved that the Station Area Plan be recommended to the City Council. Riah Hurst seconded the motion, and it passed unanimously 8-0. Voting Yes: Bryan Smith, Cason Acor, Dave Cook, Deborah Hall, Councilmember Smith, Kelly Jensen, Mariah Hurst, and Councilmember Wright. Councilmember Wright confirmed that discussed corrections would be added.

ADJOURNMENT BY CONSENSUS 9:14 p.m.

This document constitutes the official minutes for the Springville City Community Board Meeting held on Thursday, July 10, 2025.

I, Jennifer Grigg, do hereby certify that I am the duly appointed, qualified, and acting Deputy Recorder for Springville City, of Utah County, State of Utah. I do hereby certify that the foregoing minutes represent a true, accurate, and complete record of this meeting held on Thursday, July 10, 2025.

DATE APPROVED: _____

Jennifer Grigg
Deputy Recorder