



AGENDA FOR THE
SPRINGVILLE COMMUNITY BOARD
110 South Main Street
Multi-Purpose Room
Wednesday, August 17, 2022, 6:30 AM

CALL TO ORDER

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

Motion to approve minutes from the August 03, 2022 meeting.

PUBLIC COMMENT

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

DISCUSSION ITEMS

1. 1600 South Discussion- Josh Yost Community Development Director

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.

Springville City Community Board Meeting - August 03, 2022

MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE SPRINGVILLE CITY COMMUNITY BOARD HELD ON WEDNESDAY, AUGUST 03, 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: Alex Dahl, Bryan BJ Smith, Byran Korth, Cason Acor, David Cook, Deborah Hall, Jennifer Grigg, Josh Yost, Liz Crandall, Mike Florence, Patrick Monney, Scott Duncan, Thomas Jones, and Todd Fischio.

Excused: Matt Packard, Kelly Norman, Mariah Hurst,

Call To Order 5:36 p.m.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

Motion to approve minutes from the meeting on July 20, 2022.

Todd Fischio moved to approve the minutes and David Cook seconded the motion. All voted aye.

PUBLIC COMMENT

The public is invited to make comments or bring issues before the board for discussion. Cason asked some board members to introduce themselves.

DISCUSSION ITEMS

1. Continuation of the Discussion of the Land Use Chapter of the Existing General Plan—Mike and Cason

Cason began his presentation by explaining the past meetings and summarizing discussions of the existing general plan. He showed the Future Land Use Map and mentioned it has been 12 years since a general plan revision. He resumed the discussion of the goals and objectives. Scott asked about state-mandated affordable housing. Josh said the state has criteria requiring affordable housing plans around transit hubs and an annual inventory of affordability which is defined as no more than 30% of the median income of the community (Utah County). Dave clarified that amount and asked about controlling private land and zoning laws. Josh said housing should be like a supermarket—not artificially constrained by zoning codes that cannot adapt and respond to demand. He used a second analogy of a natural forest compared to a field of corn because a natural forest is more sustainable and organic while encouraging variety and resiliency and retains value in the long term. Cason asked Josh to elaborate on how the state defines affordable housing. Todd asked about federal grants. Josh said grants do not impact Springville much. Todd asked about affordable housing as an incentive for infrastructure funding. Josh said funding for roads and pipes is easier to get.

Dave asked about low-income housing. Josh answered Springville assesses demand in each category and lists strategies for each category in the annual report to the state. The categories include workforce housing, low-income housing, and deeply affordable housing (subsidized), but there is no mandate to provide each category of housing and the performance measures are broad. The state requires reporting and keeps track of housing type inventories. Mike added there are not a lot of low-income housing developers, and they usually work with housing authorities. The state sets aside funding in the Olene Walker Fund for low-income housing developers. Josh added it is more expensive in capital costs to develop low-income housing than market-rate housing. Every redevelopment

42 agency/tax increment area dedicates some funding to housing. Scott said it sounds like affirmative
44 action instead of letting supply and demand drive the market. Josh stated zoning prevents the market
46 from operating that way by creating market distortions. Zoning tells developers what they can and
48 cannot build, the size of the building, and the number of parking stalls. Building according to the market
just to make money could preclude certain populations from having places to live. Dave said Springville
impact fees are hefty. Josh said across the board Springville ranks in the bottom middle of the pack.
Dave asked about impact fees. Josh answered typical building permits in Springville are between
\$16,000-\$20,000 before even starting the build.

50 Cason read from Objective 4 in the General Plan. He complimented Springville on not
52 overdeveloping and establishing design standards to maintain that *small town feel*. This objective is part
of why the general plan needs updating because of changes to Main Street and 1600 South as well as
a future Frontrunner Station. Deborah asked about green field standards. Josh said it concerns
54 standards like setbacks and applies to suburban development like the area around Smith's, not Main
Street around Lemon and Sage. Byron asked about commercial centers and strip development. Josh
56 said strip development looks like Orem and all of State Street in Salt Lake County. Commercial centers
bring those products together in larger sites for more critical mass and less travel. He continued by
58 saying historic downtown used to be Springville's commercial center and strip development has
replaced that. The plan is to create more centers instead of strips. He listed examples. Dave said malls
60 are fading. Cason added Sugarhouse is a good example with a healthy balance of retail and mixed-use
properties and the intent is to drive to one spot and visit multiple locations. Byron asked if the
62 development along 400 South is a strip or center development. Josh said Smith's is a hybrid, but not a
village center which is the original intent out there. Dave said businesses want to be in busy areas.
64 Josh said that can be determined by the regulatory framework and asked if businesses in busy areas
are good or bad. That strategy can also serve the neighborhoods. He agreed it is an interesting strategy
66 in this general plan. Cason clarified that strip development can be restricted in the general plan. Byron
referred back to the question of who enforces design standards. Josh stated there are no design and
68 material standards in our commercial zones. New developments like Lakeside, current residential
projects, and the Allen's block all have design and material standards going forward. Cason said Main
70 Street needs to maintain the historic downtown look. Deborah asked if this rework of the general plan
will affect the development on 1600 South. Cason said this board will suggest the framework for a new
72 general plan and the Planning Commission and City Council will hold responsible. Josh said there are
ways to bring accountability and the general plan is not regulatory. Dave clarified after the board gives
74 suggestions, the City Council will decide. Josh said the City Council will adopt laws. Cason said the
general plan informs policy. Liz returned to the original question of affecting the development of 1600
76 South. Josh answered the Mayor wants this board to be involved with long-range planning. Dave said
this development benefits Mapleton. The board discussed the funding of the 1600 South interchange.
78 Byron asked how much this general plan affects 1600 South development. Josh answered it is
evaluated by the current general plan. Cason said the general plan is not an enforceable document but
80 an informing document. Byron clarified that the new general plan will not influence 1600 South
development. Dave asked about city limits.

82 Cason read objective five and referred to his career in industrial real estate and said he agrees
with what he sees in that objective. As far as environmental impact, Springville usually only allows light
84 industrial impact. Industrial tenants provide jobs and are essential by nature. BJ asked about the
difference between commercial and industrial development. Tilt-up construction was discussed which
86 is affordable. Josh said zoning is code based on use, not construction, and explained the Provo,
Springville, and Utah County limits. Josh listed some current businesses that are building in Springville.
88 Josh commented on the objectives and their nebulous value statements. Cason said some statements
mean something different now. Byron brought up an example of the cement plant noise being hard for



the homeowners. Scott asked about the difference between businesses that provide sales tax, businesses that provide jobs, and property tax. Dave stated retail brings in the most revenue. Cason added zoning could encourage flex development which is a combination of retail and office.

Cason concluded his presentation by reading objective six and asking the group about open space connecting all types of land uses. Josh explained connecting refers to a network of streets as well as a network of open space. Cason said the challenge is water to maintain green space. Josh answered open space can be natural with low water needs. Mike noted the parks plan includes a map that shows where new parks should go. Josh said the City Council adopted the parks plan and is almost done adopting an active transportation plan.

ADJOURNMENT BY CONSENSUS

This document constitutes the official minutes for the Springville City Community Board Meeting held on Wednesday, August 03, 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, August 03, 2022.

DATE APPROVED: _____

Jennifer Grigg
Deputy Recorder

