



AGENDA FOR THE
SPRINGVILLE COMMUNITY BOARD
110 South Main Street
Multi-Purpose Room
Wednesday, October 05, 2022, 5:30 PM

CALL TO ORDER

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

Motion to approve minutes from both the September 07, 2022 meeting and the September 21, 2022 meeting.

PUBLIC COMMENT

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

DISCUSSION ITEMS

1. Discussion of the Transportation and Circulation Chapter of the Existing General Plan - Bryan Korth and Todd Fischio.

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, September 07, 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, Carla Wiese, Cason Acor, Deborah Hall, Jennifer Grigg, Josh Yost, Kelly Norman, Liz Crandall, Mariah Hurst, Patrick Monney, Scott Duncan, and Todd Fischio.

Absent: Dave Cook, Michael Florence, Byran Korth, Mayor Matt Packard and Thomas Jones.

Call To Order 5:36 p.m.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

Deborah moved to approve the minutes from the meeting on August 17, 2022, and Cason seconded the motion. All voted aye.

PUBLIC COMMENT

The public is invited to make comments or bring issues before the board for discussion. Mariah said these discussions have been helpful as she drove around town.

DISCUSSION ITEMS

1. 1600 South Discussion continued - Josh Yost Community Development Director

Josh brought everyone up to speed by explaining the draft of the 1600 South Corridor Regulating Plan and defining regulating planning versus scenario planning. He explained that a regulating plan is a document providing high-level design guidelines and principles for the layout of a large area. A scenario or corridor plan is a detailed plan for a small section of a community, documenting the highest and best use for the determined area. He compared scenario planning to finite element analysis, a concept used by manufacturing engineers. He continued by saying the area was divided into smaller chunks and a computer processed the information and computed the possible land uses, traffic impact, and utility impact. Possible scenarios were evaluated based on criteria established at the beginning of this project. Screening criteria determines the critical success factor or how we know we got it right. He explained that establishing a good vision or criteria in advance helps determine which scenario is best because there is a clear objective when making the decision. After completing that process and presentation to and discussion with the City Council, this is the preferred scenario.

Mariah asked about zoning. Josh said not yet, a site regulating plan is a prequel to zoning. It lists proposed land use categories, and scenario plans, including streets, trails, civic spaces, public spaces residential neighborhoods, and commercial nodes. He compared this regulating plan to the West Fields Community Plan from 20 years ago that informed the West Fields Overlay which details zoning in that community. That plan was designed to be flexible and relied on offering developers the incentive of additional financial return to get some of the most preferred features of the plan. In 20 years, most developers were not interested in following the plan. Builders complained about the West Fields Community Plan instead of being creative which could have made them more money, the developers just added a percentage of alternate material to the lower portion of the front of each house. In contrast, a regulating plan is a supercharged zoning map. Instead of just drawing shapes and naming the zones, a regulating plan shows roads, parks, civic space, and public space and assigns characteristics to those categories of development and land uses. It can be very granular, (*gran-yuh-ler adjective—highly detailed; having small and distinct parts*) even assigning enhanced facades on more visible streets or requiring ground floor commercial in mixed-use areas.

42 Josh said that our current code centers on use. Form-based code focuses on the character and shape of
44 each zone. A land use table is included and ensures each building is designed to be flexible and suits the form
46 and aesthetic of the plan. This land use table regulates the physical result of each building for that area. Mariah
48 asked about Park City. Josh said they do not use form-based code, just an abundance of bureaucratic design
50 standards. The organizing principle of form-based code starts from what a building is going to look like, not the
business it is built for. There are very few buildings that are still occupied by the tenant the building was built for.
Buildings stick around, but their uses are temporary. Form-based code focuses on the building. Generally, the
City Council believes the look and feel of Springville City is more important than the occupant of the building. He
continued by explaining the land uses and site map of the 1600 South Corridor Regulating Plan.

Councilmember Crandall asked about utility usage and regulations on carbon footprint. Josh answered
that can be controlled with building code. He said revamping of the general plan can address the sustainability
question which was ingrained in our grandparents' life. Scott clarified this plan does not apply to land west of the
freeway. Cason asked about the process of adopting the plan. Josh said it is in the last pre-adoption point of the
process, so it should be adopted by the end of the year and zoning will start in the first half of next year.
Councilmember Crandall clarified that developers can propose plans before this is adopted. Mariah asked about
buy-in on this plan from the developers. Josh said all 1600 South Corridor property owners are part of the
process. He said developers work with private property owners and tend to gravitate to the lowest common
denominator. This is a great area between 1600 South and Highway 6 and national tenants are interested in this
submarket. Alex asked about retailers. Josh said he could not be specific because nothing is decided. Cason
asked about form-based code filtering commercial tenants. Josh answered yes, in his experience; some tenants
have cited those reasons to leave and some have become a fan of form-based elements. He described
examples in Salt Lake and Cache counties where tenants reluctantly adhered to form-based code but learned to
appreciate the standards and now they give tours of the form-based code developments to potential franchisees.
Josh said sometimes form-based code can filter tenants, but if it makes financial sense, design elements rarely
tip the domino.

Scott asked about protecting agriculture. He said in the past the state protected agriculture and every
small town needs agriculture including Springville to project a *small town feel*. He asked why this 1600 South
Regulating Plan does not list agriculture as a use. Josh said the area included in the study has no current land in
cultivation. Scott said if the city does not designate an area for agriculture there will be no land for the
entrepreneurs who attend the state agricultural school. Josh said agriculture can work in certain parcels in town
because organizations like Harward can use flood irrigation instead of pressurized irrigation (center pivots), but
not the alkaline flats in the south end of Springville. The more effective place for agriculture is Palmyra and West
Mountain. Some parcels in town should be protected for the character and experience of Springville which is
another discussion for the general plan. Some legacy property owners lack interest in maintaining agricultural
operations and sell out to developers.

Councilmember Crandall said it is sad to give up prime agricultural land, but the dilemma comes when
the landowner wants to sell and asks the city to rezone the land so they can sell for more money. In a free
society, owners can sell their land. She referred to an example where Park City formed a land trust and bought
the McPolin Farm in the Snyderville basin with donations and preservation easements. Josh said one way to
protect agriculture is with a TDR or a *Transfer of Development Rights* program like in the Spanish Fork River
Bottoms. 20 years ago, Springville City had a long-term policy in the general plan that designated agriculture
west of I-15 with no plans for agriculture east of I-15. Jaker's and the church farms have been zoned mixed-use
and commercial for 20 years since the Westfields Community Annexation (2002). He said if he had his way
Springville would annex all the way out to Lincoln Beach and set an urban growth boundary, keeping sharp
boundaries around development to preserve the character of a place. It is hard for municipalities to exert control
over land because of the way land use is set up in this state. The property owner must request annexation.

He continued by stating these are big general plan level dilemmas—*what is important to us, how do we
accomplish our goals* and Councilmember Crandall added *how much control the city has*. She also asked about
methods. Cason asked about economic incentives or regulatory concessions to dissuade property owners from
developing prime land into tilt-up industrial buildings. Josh answered the decisions come down to economics. He
described examples of TDRs or *Transfer of Development Rights*. Mariah clarified that developed agriculture has
access to a lower greenbelt tax and Josh explained paying back the rollback tax when that greenbelt property

owner decides to develop. I asked about attracting corporate campuses that allow agriculture like Wavetronics. Josh said one way to attract owner/user companies is to offer concessions to protect agricultural acreage.

Cason clarified the new 1600 South interchange begins construction this spring. Josh described commercial nodes which create lasting value in the long term to avoid a commercial wasteland like Orem State Street. Mariah said commercial nodes create enjoyment and stickability and encourage customers to linger in an area which increases residential property value. Josh described the vision of the 1600 South as a more *Springville-like* growth pattern where a resident could walk out their front door to a sidewalk café for their morning beverage. Director Monney said improvement of the 1600 South Corridor will not relieve traffic on 400 South until it connects to Highway 89. Without the connection, Mapleton will continue using the 400 South exit on I-15. If we want the quaintness of Springville Main Street to return, traffic needs to be slowed. With UDOT in charge, 1600 South will not be an arterial road without that connection to Mapleton.

Josh said we should remember to balance the traffic function of the street and the place-making function of the street. He referred to a road that is poorly designed in Draper and becomes a well-designed road as it crossed into South Jordan. In South Jordan, the example road has mixed development and carries the same amount of traffic. He said this committee can exert this type of control over the development of 1600 South. Todd added details to the South Jordan development. He explained that Kennecott gave up 30,000 acres and set a time frame to complete the development in 15 years. He said if this 1600 South Corridor Regulating Plan does not have a time frame, future leaders and developers will build what makes sense economically in the future (lowest common denominator). Josh agreed and said in this example Kennecott was a large institutional land owner with a gigantic master development agreement and they brought in the best and the brightest minds in planning and urbanism. This Community Board will hold elected officials accountable for the long-term vision. He gave credit to Springville's current city administration and said our council/mayor form of government leads to consistency over time. The Council is well informed and has the knowledge to tell developers no. Todd questioned whether the next stage of the Draper development will continue with the same master plan and road setbacks. Director Monney thanked Josh for this information.

Josh said UDOT is helping with funding a study to improve Springville Main Street. Mariah said the 1600 South interchange will give drivers another access point to the freeway. Josh said research shows that with fewer stops, a slower speed limit improves traffic flow overall. BJ asked about the plan for the 1600 South at SR51. Josh said the state legislature approved \$40 million for rail consolidation so 1600 South will connect to highway 89 in the future. BJ asked about development there. Josh answered that area is not within the city boundaries but is part of our general plan (annexation policy declaration boundary). Deborah said the Springville community does not know that the 1600 South I-15 interchange will not connect to Highway 89 and that any improvement in Springville traffic is years away. Josh said transparency is always the goal and there were meetings in 2019 with few in attendance. I said the neighborhood between SR51 and Highway 89 is very organized and not in favor of the connection. Mariah ended the meeting by noting annexation is the next topic and will be on the agenda. Cason will be presenting.

ADJOURNMENT BY CONSENSUS 6:53

This document constitutes the official minutes for the Springville City Community Board Meeting held on Wednesday, September 07, 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, September 07, 2022.

DATE APPROVED: _____

Jennifer Grigg
Deputy Recorder

Springville City Community Board Meeting - September 21, 2022

MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE SPRINGVILLE CITY COMMUNITY BOARD HELD ON WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 21, 2022, AT 6:30 A.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, Dave Cook, Deborah Hall, Jennifer Grigg, Josh Yost, Kelly Norman, Liz Crandall, Mariah Hurst, Mike Florence, Patrick Monney, and Thomas Jones.

Excused: Carla Wiese, Scott Duncan, Mayor Matt Packard, and Todd Fischio

Mariah called the meeting to order at 6:30 a.m.

PUBLIC COMMENT

The public is invited to make comments or bring issues before the board for discussion. There was none.

DISCUSSION ITEMS

1. Annexation chapter - Cason Acor

Cason started his presentation by asking the board if they had read the annexation portion of the general plan. The state requires each municipality to have an annexation policy plan. He said that makes sense because the municipality needs to determine if services are accessible to the annexation.

Cason said protecting wetlands near Utah Lake while annexing will be important. He clarified the city does not plan to annex more property in Hobbie Creek Canyon. Dave asked about the problem with annexing Hobbie Creek Canyon. Josh said there is no benefit to the city. Canyon residents already get water and power. BJ clarified the city limit is before the debris basin. Mariah said they count as members of our community and asked what services they receive. Josh answered they pay non-resident rates because they do not pay property tax to Springville City. BJ emphasized they are also only paying greenbelt tax rates. Councilmember Crandall said canyon residents were frustrated. Dave Cook asked about another municipality annexing the canyon. Josh said there is no contiguous municipality except Springville. Mariah said they are a resource and a part of the community. Dave said Mapleton asked for the same services and ended the conversation when Springville asked Mapleton to pay their share. Cason clarified this board will set policy and direction including the canyon in the annexation policy. Josh added the city cannot initiate an annexation and cannot leapfrog parcels. The annexation request must be contiguous private property with buy-in from other political subdivisions including federal lands. Cason suggested there is value in a discussion if canyon property owners express interest. Deborah asked how much their property tax would increase. Director Monney said canyon land is greenbelt and not paying a high enough rate. Dave said development was limited to owning 50 acres in the past. Josh said that can be addressed in the general plan if there is interest. BJs asked about initiating the procedure when landowners want to be annexed. Dave said Spanish Fork annexed so much land in the 80s. Josh said the state code has changed in the past 30 years. Councilmember Crandall explained a recent development asked for annexation so the city is analyzing the cost and liability of adding utility and services. Cason noted the general plan details the difficulty of providing gravity-fed sewer services west of I-15.

He continued by stating the city policy in the current general plan requires municipal boundary lines to follow natural property lines, railroads, and natural features like slopes, benches, ridges lines, and streams not

streets or roads to keep right-of-ways within a single municipality. Mariah asked if the general plan was guiding the lack of annexation near the airport. Josh answered Spanish Fork can serve the land better. Cason continued to the general plan synopsis:

The primary purpose of annexation is to provide municipal services to uses typically associated with urban and suburban life. As areas adjacent to city boundaries become ripe for urban or suburban development, they need urban services. It is important that City decision-makers consider the impacts of providing those services for the existing City and the area proposed for annexation.

Josh emphasized that annexation is not ownership. For instance, the U.S. Forest Service owns the land, and Springville City might be asked to annex that land, not purchase that land. Director Monney added a private property owner must initiate annexation if they are buying U.S. Forest Service land on the east boundary. Josh said when there is a forest fire; the federal government pays for fighting the fire when it is on their land.

The general plan lists strategies and then continues by listing 11 areas for proposed annexation. The details for each area are in the pdf of the current general plan. Since the publication of this general plan, some of the areas have been annexed and developed. Most listed east side areas are private land that is next to the U.S. Forest Service land. Mariah clarified that land is served by the county. Dave said the Bureau of Land Management is easier to work with than the U.S. Forest Service. The current junior high was Earl Child's land before it was annexed and developed. Mariah asked about pushback from the neighborhood. Dave said the traffic dropped down dramatically and the neighborhood has adjusted to the school and the land would have developed into homes. Mariah asked about public input. Director Monney said the public can voice their opinions and the city tries to avoid islands of unannexed property. BJ clarified annexation is a legislative vote by the City Council. Director Monney said a current annexation proposal would be a 30 million dollar investment by the city to provide services. Cason clarified that the huge investment for annexation sometimes doesn't make sense for what the return would be. The staff does a fiscal impact analysis and presents it to the City council. Director Monney added connecting to the city sewer system costs the individual property owner several thousand dollars. Cason showed the Springville City Annexation by Decade Map and the Declaration Boundary Map.

Mariah closed the meeting by assigning the next agenda item as a discussion of transportation by Bryan and Todd. Director Monney said since the adjustment to the boards, he appreciates the fact that this board is really diving in and understands the power of this committee and members are investing the time to understand the why and the how and to learn all that goes into these processes. Mariah thanked the board and staff for all their work.

ADJOURNMENT BY CONSENSUS 7:37

This document constitutes the official minutes for the Springville City Community Board Meeting held on Wednesday, September 21, 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, September 21, 2022.

DATE APPROVED: _____
Jennifer Grigg
Deputy Recorder