



AGENDA FOR THE
SPRINGVILLE COMMUNITY BOARD
110 South Main Street
Multi-Purpose Room
Thursday, October 09, 2025, 7:00 P.M.

CALL TO ORDER

Approve the minutes from the August 14, 2025, meeting.

PUBLIC COMMENT

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

DISCUSSION ITEMS

1. Emily Larsen, Museum Director-Arts Master Plan project updates

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 October 08, 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
2 THURSDAY, AUGUST 14, 2025, AT 7:00 P.M. AT THE CIVIC CENTER, 110 SOUTH MAIN STREET,
SPRINGVILLE, UTAH, IN THE MULTI-PURPOSE ROOM.

4 Board Members and Staff in Attendance: Bryan Smith, Carla Wiese, Chelsey Rosander, Deborah Hall,
6 Councilmember Jake Smith, Jennifer Grigg, Josh Yost, Kelly Jensen, Kelly Norman, Riah Hurst, Mike
Florence, Councilmember Mindi Wright, and Patrick Monney.

Call to Order 7:03 p.m.

8 **APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES**

Riah moved to approve the minutes from the April 10, 2025, and the July 10, 2025, meetings. Deborah
10 seconded the motion, and all voted aye.

PUBLIC COMMENT

12 There was none.

DISCUSSION ITEMS

14 1. **Virtual Meeting with Houseal Lavigne**

Bryan introduced Cody Ferguson and Miles Rawlins and turned the time over to them. Cody
16 explained that the purpose of this meeting is to review the vision and goals, future land use, and the draft
18 outline of the plan. The PowerPoint is 45 slides long and included as a public document on the state
20 website. He read the draft of the *Vision Statement*, and Councilmember Wright said it was repetitive.
22 Patrick said the last sentence could be eliminated. Bryan asked if the online document is available for
comment. Cody said he would add this version online. He continued by defining *Guiding Themes* (*The
Art of Living, A Place for Business, Resilient Springville, A Connected Community*) as principles gleaned
from public outreach that will guide land use.

He moved on to the list of 17 concise goals spanning these categories (Land Use, Growth and
24 Development; Housing and Neighborhoods; Transportation and Mobility; Water Use and Preservation;
26 Community Appearance and Feel; Economic Development; Public Facilities and Services; Arts and
Culture; and finally Natural Environment, Parks and Open Space). The board set forth to wordsmithing.
28 Josh explained that some goals seem similar but have nuances. Bryan said the goals are siloed into
values and asked why goal 17 is quantitative. Deborah questioned *evenly distributed parks* in goal two.
30 Riah said 14 & 15 are redundant, and several goals need to be combined. Bryan suggested that it is
awkward to force the old-style general plan into a system-based approach and asked if it would be better
32 to create goals within values instead of referencing the same goals multiple times. Cody said there are
not many examples of systems-based general plans.

Councilmember Wright asked if guiding principles are the same as objectives. Cody said they are
34 more like guiding themes or principles that extend from the vision, the *Art of Living*, and what makes
36 Springville a livable place, based on community values, and how to guide our goals and actions to achieve
38 that. She clarified that the plan would include time frames. Cody said it will also include funding sources,
anything applicable to implement that task. Bryan rhetorically asked if this is more like sorting a deck of
40 cards by suit instead of by number, and he is concerned that the draft is using the original form of general
plans, and the final updated plan will just be reshuffled to look like the systems approach. Josh said that,
done correctly, it is not just window dressing and agreed that it is very hard to take the same stuff and not

42 just put it in a new package. Cody said it will be an adventure and aspirational to adapt to the systems
43 approach of creating a general plan. Councilmember Wright asked about goals repeating in different
44 themes. Cody explained that it is not clear-cut, and goals can apply to different areas at the same time.
45 Bryan suggested different wording for the water restriction's goal. Councilmember Wright added that staff
46 can evaluate that goal. Deborah said there is wisdom in water efficiency being a goal.

47 Cody explained the details of the proposed future land use map. He read pages 24-33 of the
48 PowerPoint. Councilmember Wright asked if units per acre were incorporated into the land use
49 definitions. Bryan clarified the *Employment Hub* and whether it included the existing Springville Industrial
50 Park. Michael asked about the wisdom of the *Community Commercial* areas near the Dry Creek area,
51 including residential. Josh said this draft of the land use map does not include the nodes of commercial
52 use, like illustrated in the approved *Dry Creek Plan*. Bryan said each entrance to the city is *Community*
53 *Commercial* except the Dry Creek area. Josh said the point of this discussion is to decide what we want
54 in the future compared to what is current land use in the area today. Bryan said this proposed land use
55 map is an updated overview of the direction the city chooses for the future. The board expressed
56 disappointment with the *Community Commercial* land use on this draft map and decided that it needs
some work.

57 Cody continued to the *I-15 Commercial Corridor* land use, read the slide, and reiterated that the
58 area may include residential multiplexes. Councilmember Wright asked for examples of regional
59 commercial, and Cody answered big box stores like Target. Bryan asked about the difference between
60 the *I-15 Commercial Corridor* and the *Employment Hub*. Cody said the *I-15 Commercial Corridor* will have
61 retail and entertainment, and the *Employment Hub* is more office park and industrial. There will be
62 elements of commercial land use in both areas. Councilmember Smith clarified that the future land use
63 in the *Employment Hub* will be light industrial, like the Dry Creek area. Josh said light manufacturing can
64 fit in any part of the city if the type of building matches the design standards. Storage units are ugly and
65 not productive for the city. Kelly asked about the existing Clyde business on 1400 North and Main Street,
66 fitting in a light industrial land use area. Josh said that the Clyde property will change in six months.

67 Deborah noted that existing landowners near the Dry Creek area are concerned about expanding
68 their businesses on their property. Josh said land use is not the organizing principle. Carla agreed and
69 said land use, which is the higher level of regulation, is about form, not function. Patrick said that Art City
70 Auto Body is in the process of upgrading its business, and it will fit the look and feel (form) of the South
71 Gateway even though the function is collision repair. He continued by stating that the addition at Art City
72 Auto Body will be a fantastic, attractive design at one of the prime entrances to the city.

73 Chelsey said she disagrees with the land use around Dry Creek being *Emerging Neighborhood*
74 because that designation includes a mixture of residential densities. Bryan said form should be prioritized,
75 but it's not in this draft of the land use map. He continued by saying that the message to the property
76 owners in the Dry Creek area is that their businesses are not welcome. He does not mind if the land use
77 in that area stays light industrial in perpetuity. Chelsey agreed. Carla gently explained that zoning versus
78 land use sounds like a distinction without a difference to the general public. When a commercial land use
79 is established, the zoning is created to describe/define that in our code. The discussion of what is allowed
80 in an *Emerging Neighborhood* land use should be part of the next-level zoning discussion. Josh said the
81 council-approved *Dry Creek Plan* points future development in that area toward community commercial
82 and residential land uses instead of additional outdoor gravel pits. Councilmember Smith said nowhere
else in the city do 20 people show up at this meeting to complain.



Josh said the current development on SR 51 from 1600 S to the south boundary of the city is not primarily industrial, and the general plan can include a policy stating that existing businesses can keep their existing land use and zone forever because they run with the land, not the owner. The *Emerging Neighborhood* land use allows the possibility of higher-value development, not the requirement, so the landowner or future landowner has a choice to keep their undeveloped land as industrial or develop a higher-value mixed-use development. The landowner is not restricted to light industrial zoning just because that is the existing business, and the existing business is allowed in perpetuity.

92 Josh said the policy question is, do we want to change what is down there, allow what is down
there, or add more of what is down there. This board needs to make a decision based on what is best for
the whole city, not what 20 people want for the city. Carla said that currently, if Western Paving wants to
94 buy Crandall's land for a new gravel pit, Crandall has to comply because there is no flexibility. Under the
proposed land use, he can make the highest and best use of his property. Josh agreed and said Houseal
96 Lavigne needs to refine those descriptions in this draft. Deborah said the new land use can increase the
value of the land, and the owner can keep the existing use. Josh agreed and said other property owners
98 can use their property to their highest and best use. Carla said she takes calls from developers asking to
rezone existing light industrial land use every week. Bryan said adding future residential applies to the
100 industrial land use areas to the north as well. Josh disagreed, stating that an apartment complex in the
industrial park has no connection to residential amenities like schools, parks, open space, or grocery
102 stores, like a lone sad puppy in a kennel. Carla said people won't want to live there. Josh said we can
accommodate existing property owners, not just because we want every gateway to look the same.

104 Michael asked why there are light and heavy industrial land uses. Carla said the heavy industrial
105 businesses were already there, and the city wanted to limit future heavy industrial. Josh said the
106 *Employment Hub* land use area description is limiting tilt-up development. Riah clarified that there is
107 enough tilt-up development and the council does not want more. Chelsey said the Dry Creek area is land
108 that would need to be filled and would not be appropriate for residential use. Josh said mitigation applies
109 to any development on fill land.

110 Bryan brought Cody back into the discussion, who said he would work on the descriptions and
111 create a new map. He reviewed the *systems approach*, the draft of the outline, and the planning process
112 steps and calendar. He concluded by asking the board if they had questions.

Michael handed out *Day of Service* posters and asked for volunteers.

ADJOURNMENT BY CONSENSUS 9:05 p.m.

This document constitutes the official minutes for the Springville City Community Board Meeting held on Thursday, August 14, 2025.

118 I, Jennifer Grigg, do hereby certify that I am the duly appointed, qualified, and acting as a recorder
119 for Springville City, of Utah County, State of Utah. I do hereby certify that the foregoing minutes represent
120 a true, accurate, and complete record of this meeting held on Thursday, August 14, 2025.

122 DATE APPROVED: _____
124 Jennifer Grigg
Deputy Recorder