



AGENDA FOR THE
SPRINGVILLE COMMUNITY BOARD
110 South Main Street
Multi-Purpose Room
Wednesday, July 06, 2022, 5:30 PM

CALL TO ORDER

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

Motion to approve minutes from the June 15, 2022 meeting.

PUBLIC COMMENT

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

DISCUSSION ITEMS

1. Report on Identity and Placemaking from the Reframing Downtown meeting—Chair Mariah
2. Land Use Chapter of the Existing General Plan—Mike and Cason

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 March 29, 2022. 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 WEDNESDAY, JUNE 15, 2022, AT 5:30 P.M. AT THE CIVIC CENTER, 110 SOUTH MAIN STREET, SPRINGVILLE, UTAH, IN THE MULTI-PURPOSE ROOM.

Board Members and Staff in Attendance: Bryan BJ Smith, Byran Korth, Cason Acor, Deborah Hall, Jennifer Grigg, Josh Yost, Kelly Norman, Liz Crandall, Mariah Hurst, Matt Packard, Mike Florence, Patrick Monney, and Todd Fischio.

CALL TO ORDER

Chair Hurst called the meeting to order at 5:35 p.m.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Byron Korth moved to approve the minutes of the June 01, 2022 meeting. Cason Acor seconded the motion and all voted aye.

PUBLIC COMMENT

The public is invited to make comments or bring issues before the board for discussion. The board discussed a survey about meeting times and days.

DISCUSSION ITEMS

1. Review the first chapter in the textbook and the first chapter of the City Plan.

Mariah combined items one and two and opened the discussion. Deborah stated the words sustainability, equity, and resiliency stood out in the introduction. As the discussion progressed, board members mentioned parts of the introduction and chapter one that were noteworthy. Cason noted the bullet points on page 12 and complimented the board for identifying the direction and taking ideas from surrounding communities. Mariah agreed with including a review of the checkpoints and objectives. Cason asked about the process. Matt answered the review process ought to be course-corrected annually and the new General Plan should become a live document. Cason mentioned that 1600 South has changed since the current plan. Mariah said some projects in the past plan did not come to fruition and suggested follow-up. Josh said it is not just a regulatory document but a document that is telling us to do things. He pointed out that the textbook acknowledges that most general plans have a mixed track record with implementation. This board owns the segments of a general plan that get lost in implementation. Staff and departments should base capital improvements on the General Plan and implement their parts of the General Plan. There needs to be external and internal accountability and this document should guide our actions.

Cason asked what duties fall on this committee. Matt added this committee is not finished when the General Plan is accomplished. This board is making and implementing the plan as part of the engine that makes sure something happens. He also said this board has ownership in the budget process by pushing agenda items and action items and suggesting allocating budget dollars to projects in the new General Plan. When this board suggests action items, the City Council votes, and then Staff creates the budget. Josh agreed stating that post-project this committee owns and encourages the City Council to implement the action items. The board provides external accountability to Staff and the City Council. Mariah said when the pieces are in place the board will assign chapters to board members.

Josh explained the introduction in the textbook and suggested the General Plan should be a living document accessible through a web page. Mariah said imagine if the plan were more transparent and exciting so the residents could know the direction the City is going in. It would encourage buy-in from new and old residents and improve volunteerism. Community members are resourceful. She suggested a contest for landscaping trails that utilizes community members as a resource. Cason referenced his real estate career and how municipality websites are frustrating when he is looking for information. The user experience design is not intuitive. Springville should make information accessible

46 and the General Plan could be a living document which residents can interact with. Mariah added that
48 two general plans ago, community engagement was a priority. She asked what our plan to engage the
50 community is in this new General Plan. She asked about surveys and feedback and suggested part of
52 the plan allocate money toward community engagement. Matt said what if a group wants to close all the
streets and make them bike streets. This board spends that time and effort listening to the citizens and
makes a recommendation to the City Council. Cason asked how to let the public know. Liz referred to
the Downtown Main Street Reframing Plan. Josh answered it is a small group of stakeholders, and he
invited one of the board members to attend.

54 Mariah concluded this discussion by saying we have ideas of what we want to change in the
General Plan. Byron asked about enforcement. Matt referred to our enforcement officer. Josh answered
56 this board holds the City accountable for doing the things in the General Plan. It is a resource for
recommendations to the Council and will hold the Staff and the Council accountable. In addition, this
58 board can remind the Council, send reports, and ask for updates on projects that are complete. Certain
General Plan elements fall under the purview of this board. The responsibility also comes back to the
60 public, to hold the City Council to the adopted General Plan. He added that his job is to check the
General Plan while writing staff reports recommending a change or a project. Matt agreed stating City
62 Staff refers to the General Plan regularly. A general plan adds structure and continuity for the next
councils. Mariah said it acts as a check and balance connecting the future to the past.

64 Kelly asked about the Salisbury development with containers and whether or not it followed the
General Plan and where was the enforcement. He continued by stating this is not the type of community
66 that he wants. He asked about the governance, and where is the document that sets certain standards
in this City. Josh asked the board what development diverges most from the General Plan and said the
68 Smith's was originally zoned Village Center focused on pedestrian access, mixed-use, and place-
making instead of a suburban big box with pads, which was a substantial diversion that went through
70 the process of changing the General Plan.

He continued by stating that Container Corner has many differing opinions. Staff views it as
72 creative and curated a set of businesses that created a unique space and destination. Not everyone
agrees with it aesthetically, but it expresses our values as an Art City, and it is not just another strip
74 mall. There are no regulations telling developers how it should look. Matt agreed stating there is nothing
in code saying that could not happen. He said this board can go as deep as they want. Kelly continued
76 by noting his experience with the City controlling the requirements of the home he built in 2010. He was
shocked at how much control the City had over the way his house looked. He understands most of the
78 standards. He stated he was speaking openly when he said Smith's is the type of community he wants.
Container Corner and everything that it promotes with the pub next to it promotes an environment he
80 would rather not have. It promotes everything that he stands against; an environment that can be
damaging to a community and society. He would rather see a Smith's and those types of family-friendly
82 places that are wholesome and healthy and hopefully have some kind of control over the way we live in
our City.

84 Matt said you got it in this committee; that is the power you have. If the committee through public
outreach says we do not want any liquor establishments in this city that can be your recommendation to
86 the City Council. Once they buy off on it, that becomes part of the plan, ordinances, and enforcement is
when somebody wants to put it in the answer is no. You can't go against the City plan without
88 repercussions. He questioned why there is a cannabis pharmacy in this city. It is not up to individuals,
but the group can add anything they choose to the General Plan. Liz wondered about the planning
90 commission referring to the General Plan and the process.

Josh taught that the General Plan is a regulatory structure or framework influencing the planning
92 strategy and daily implementation. By referring back to the originating documents the Planning
Commission follows the process and state statute. He referred to an example of a development in the
94 West Fields and said a review by this board can be in the General Plan and items listed in the code. He
added that by reviewing specific zone text and zone change applications, this board has its influence in
96 crafting the General Plan as policy. After the General Plan is approved, stepping back to change the

General Plan is the purview of this board to come back and participate in the higher-level planning process. Byron asked if this committee is like an HOA ensuring aesthetics that could stop containers in the future. He asked about the process. Josh answered by explaining administrative approval. The code must be objective and clear, or lawsuits ensue and the state ombudsman gets involved. The code cannot say be creative, but not this kind of creative.

Byron continued asking how to ensure the vision of the General Plan is carried out. He asked what needs to be in place to not allow that to happen again. He said not many community members would approve containers. He asked how this committee can have a voice moving forward. Josh said this board steers and recommends on the General Plan. *Community Character* can be a section in the General Plan, a phrase that is often misappropriated. That section can list aesthetic qualities. The General Plan is neither regulatory in Utah nor required to be consistent with ordinances underneath. This board could request design standards, hold Staff accountable and recommend the standards to the City Council. Once something is in code when an application meets the code, by law, the Staff must approve. The power of this board is establishing policy and assuring code is written implementing that policy. Byron asked what needed to be in place to limit that type of creativity. Josh answered commercial design standards could say shipping or Conex (Container Express) containers are not permitted as a building material. Byron concluded there was no clue or way to anticipate the future, but this document must be anticipatory. Josh said vision positive statements are more effective but hard to codify and must be objective, for instance, the words *traditional building materials* are different in Springville than in a mining town. The tie goes to the runner. If the code is prescriptive and an application looks great but does not comply, it is not approvable unless the City Council changes the code. There is a balance between being super prescriptive and defending what you want, and risk being less prescriptive and losing the chance to reject an application that is not palatable. It is a fine balance, but the clearer the statement of intent in the General Plan the easier it is for Staff and the City Council to codify the vision of the General Plan.

2. Review of General Plan Draft RFP

Included in the above discussion.

3. Sign up to review General Plan Elements and prepare to present.

Mariah wrapped up the meeting by reviewing who has signed up for a chapter of the General Plan and repeating her request for each board member to sign up for a chapter in the Google Drive document. Byron asked for a review of the introduction and instructions to find the minutes on the City website. Cason asked about presentation style. Josh noted each member can just lead the discussion. Mariah added the assigned chapter includes follow-through and implementation in the future. Josh noted each chapter has background information. Mike noted that after all this work creating a general plan, the state legislature can mandate something against that plan. Josh said we are unfortunately a political subdivision of the state. Matt said enforcement is critical and empowering this committee is instrumental. Kelly said I don't think 90% of the citizens of this community care if I have a guardrail, but 100% of the citizens care what businesses, traffic, and activities we allow in the City. He stated there should be two or three goals in the General Plan, not specifics like guard rails. Mariah thanked the board and adjourned the meeting by consensus.

ADJOURNMENT BY CONSENSUS AT 7:39 P.M.

This document constitutes the official minutes for the Springville City Community Board Meeting held on Wednesday, June 15, 2022.

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 and accurate, and complete record of this meeting held on Wednesday, June 15, 2022.

DATE APPROVED: _____

Jennifer Grigg
Deputy Recorder