

Provo City Planning Commission

Report of Action

September 10, 2025

*ITEM 2 Allen and Joanna Ludlow request an Ordinance Text Amendment to Provo City Code 14.30.020 to add a property in the R1.10 (One Family Residential) Zone to areas permitting ADUs, located at 1841 N 1550 E. Oak Hills Neighborhood. Jessica Dahneke (801) 852-6413 jdahneke@provo.gov PLOTA20250427

The following action was taken by the Planning Commission on the above described item at its regular meeting of September 10, 2025:

RECOMMENDED APPROVAL

On a vote of 4:3, the Planning Commission recommended that the Municipal Council approve the above noted application

Motion By: Daniel Gonzales

Second By: Joel Temple

Votes in Favor of Motion: Matthew Wheelwright, Daniel Gonzales, Barbara DeSoto, Joel Temple

Votes against the Motion: Melissa Kendall, Lisa Jensen, Jonathon Hill

Jonathon Hill was present as Chair.

- Includes facts of the case, analysis, conclusions and recommendations outlined in the Staff Report, with any changes noted; Planning Commission determination is generally consistent with the Staff analysis and determination.

STAFF PRESENTATION

The Staff Report to the Planning Commission provides details of the facts of the case and the Staff's analysis, conclusions, and recommendations.

CITY DEPARTMENTAL ISSUES

- The Coordinator Review Committee (CRC) has reviewed the application and given their approval.

NEIGHBORHOOD AND PUBLIC COMMENT

- The Neighborhood District Chair was not present or did not address the Planning Commission during the hearing.

CONCERNS RAISED BY PUBLIC

Any comments received prior to completion of the Staff Report are addressed in the Staff Report to the Planning Commission. Key issues raised in written comments received subsequent to the Staff Report or public comment during the public hearing included the following:

- Sarah Ashby, Oak Hills resident, stated she bought a home in this area specifically because it does not allow for ADUs. She has concerns that with an apartment that large it will be rented to more than the allowed number of tenants and that the city will not be able to enforce the code. She also stated that information some members of the neighborhood had received from the applicant was contradictory to what the city was explaining.
- Sally Clayton, Oak Hills resident, said that the ADU exception is problematic as she chose to live in an area that didn't allow for ADUs. She also stated that the process for an ADU exception is confusing and broken.
- McKay Jones, Provo resident, said that he was in favor of the ADU at the property as it would make more housing available and that all neighborhoods need to make more housing available. He also stated that apartment was original to the house, it was not added by the current owners and that he believed the applicants to be responsible homeowners that would take good care of the property.
- Kim Santiago, Provo resident, stated that she feels single-family neighborhoods are going extinct and that she has seen other neighborhoods completely torn apart by ADUs and over occupancy. She explained that she doesn't feel that it is the right of every homeowner to change the code and it is not the duty of the neighborhood to help

someone afford their home or make money off their home. She bought in this neighborhood specifically because it doesn't allow for ADUs.

- Greg Taylor, Oak Hills resident, said that the applicant knew the zoning when they bought the home and he believes that the changes from allowing the ADU will negatively impact the whole neighborhood.
- Annie Auernig, Oak Hills resident, said that she picked this neighborhood because it was a better environment for her kids and the proposed ADU doesn't benefit the neighborhood. She is opposed to the ADU.
- Mario, Oak Hills resident, explained that he was in favor of an ADU at the property. He believes that the opposition is based in fear and that code should change according to the needs of the population.
- Joseph Valentine, Oak Hill resident, expressed that he was concerned that the applicant might use the ADU as an in-home physical therapy clinic instead of an ADU.
- Heather Jones, Oak Hill resident, stated that families have grown up in this neighborhood and that neighborhoods change. She would hate anyone to feel this neighborhood has become too nice for people to live there. She doesn't feel that the what ifs & the maybes outweigh the positives.
- Craig Goodwin, Oak Hills resident, explained that he is not concerned about approving one apartment, but the fact that this sets a precedent for future approvals at other homes.
- John Payne, Oak Hills resident, explained that he grew up in the neighborhood and that the home has been used as a single-family dwelling with no apartment for all of its existence. He is against the ADU because it opens the door for more ADUs in the neighborhood.
- Stephine Haws, Oak Hills resident, asked if the applicant researched the property before buying and if they were aware that this wasn't allowed. She also wondered how much the signatures weighed into the approval of an ADU in the area when some of the additional signatures weren't property owners. She also stated that there is aging infrastructure and has concerns about adding multiple ADUs in the neighborhood making things like water pressure less reliable. Lastly, she stated that there was a lot of confusion around having a second kitchen at the property. She stated that the information the applicant was giving about second kitchens was unclear.
- Allen Ludlow, co-owner of the subject property, explained that they paid a premium to be in the neighborhood and that ADUs don't lower property values. He stated that the process has been confusing and that the information regarding second kitchens hasn't been clear. He also stated that apartments have existed in the neighborhoods for decades and clarified that there was no intention of building an in-home physical therapy clinic.
- Mike S., Oak Hills resident, said that this is a family neighborhood and he isn't sure how all these rentals happen. His main concern is that approving this ADU will encourage the establishment of more ADUs in the neighborhood.
- Byron Bennion, Oak Hills resident, stated his concern about just the Ludlow's being under investigation and wants to know what is happening to other rentals in the area.
- Emily King, Oak Hills resident, explained that she is against the ADU, she specifically picked a neighborhood that didn't allow ADUs. She also stated that this process is unclear and confusing.
- Mike Stoud, Oak Hills resident, posed a question to the commission based on the public comment for the item, what was the original intent of the ordinance and single-family zoning and has or should that intent change?
- Michael Stevens, Oak Hills resident, stated that he does not like that the applicant bought a home in this neighborhood that doesn't allow ADUs and is trying to establish one anyway. He also stated that the process for approving an ADU is a bad process.
- Jim Woodard, Oak Hills resident, stated that he is concerned about adding to the number of rentals as there are already illegal rentals in the neighborhood and doesn't think adding another rental is appropriate. He asked if the city is currently struggling to enforce current zoning laws why add more complications.
- Martha Cox Valentine, Oak Hills resident, stated that she is opposed to the ADU, the applicant signed the mortgage knowing what they were getting into. She also stated that the process has created a fight in the neighborhood.

APPLICANT RESPONSE

Key points addressed in the applicant's presentation to the Planning Commission included the following:

- The applicant highlighted that their plan is for this home to be their forever home. They will rent to long-term tenants for the near future, but the apartment will mostly be rented to family members.
- She mentioned that there have always been apartments in the neighborhood.

- She explained that the impact on traffic will be minimal and showed that she would be providing the required amount of off-street parking.
- The applicant highlighted that she went through the process of establishing an accessory apartment at her previous home.
- The applicant stated that there was no intention to use the apartment as a short-term rental.

PLANNING COMMISSION DISCUSSION

Key points discussed by the Planning Commission included the following:

- Commissioner Jensen stated that the Commission has discussed the same problems that reoccur, one of which is people misrepresenting themselves when enforcement goes out. Commissioner Jensen also asked if there was a second kitchen agreement signed at the property. Staff clarified that this property was built well before the second kitchen agreement was created.
- Commissioner Kendal explained that if there is a second kitchen the occupancy can be family members or if the property owners are over 60 they can apply for an elderly persons extra living space
- Commissioner Jensen asked if there are so many illegal rentals why do we care so much when someone is trying to go through the process legally. She stated that this is something that they discuss every time an ordinance text amendment of an ADU is brought before them to review. She stated that a property that has an ADU recognize has more restrictions around it giving the neighborhood more of a safety net even though it's not perfect. She also stated that based on the public comments it seems like there was a lot of misunderstandings about the process and she doesn't like the process either, but this is what is currently on the books. She felt that this is the type of property that is a good fit for the ADU, so she does not know how to address it when it meets the intent of the ordinance but does not have neighborhood support.
- Commissioner Kendall reiterated the question asked previously “what is the intent of a single-family zoning” because it was a good question and hopes that City Council can give more clarity to that matter. She stated that she doesn't feel comfortable making a recommendation when the process creates as much confusion as it currently does when it's not fair to anyone. She also pointed out that they are making a decision for the property not for the people.
- Commissioner DeSoto highlighted that there are points of contradiction that the General Plan wants to preserve single-family housing and provide different housing options throughout the city. She also pointed out that everyone has the opportunity to apply for an ordinance text amendment or a rezone, but applying doesn't mean approval. She agreed with Commissioner Jensen that this property meets the intent of the ordinance but understands the concern since this change is a text amendment and will not only apply to the current property owners. She believes this process should be a conditional use process. Her other concern is that enforcement still creates a point of conflict because it does require neighbors to report on each other.
- Commissioner Kendall agreed with the idea of making this a conditional use. She highlights the concern that the public raised of allowing one ADU will encourage many other property owners to establish ADUs could be what happens and since they will now run with the property that will hypothetically create a bunch of permanent ADUs in this area.
- Commissioner DeSoto referenced the history to the changing of how ADUs are approved, and she would like to see this process more stabilized going forward.
- Commissioner Wheelwright stated that he was sad about the contention that this has caused and hopes that will be evaluated going forward. He then asked a few questions regarding ADUs first was regarding the size staff explained that the only size requirement for detached ADUs to stay smaller than the main dwelling. He's second question was about HOAs/CC&R being a method for controlling ADUs as well which is correct. His third question was regarding the process for future owners. Staff explained the rental dwelling license process. His fourth question was regarding infrastructure and if the impact of ADUs could be measured in this area. Staff explained that this is an older neighborhood so the infrastructure might not be as good at supplying water pressure; however, most of these homes are now occupied by less people than they historically have been so getting an accurate comparison on that would be tough. His final question was whether there was parking enforcement in this area. Staff explained that they are public streets so people can park there, but parking enforcement can issue tickets for code violations like inoperable or abandoned vehicles.
- Commissioner Temple asked staff about the impact a single-family dwelling with an ADU vs. without as far as utilities. Staff explained that it's considered to not have any greater impact than a standard single-family dwelling.

- Commissioner Gonzales expressed his concerns about this issue stating that Planning Commission has wrestled with ADUs and where they are permitted many times over his time on the commission. He stated that his focus is on the property and the code and not on the finances of the situation. He highlighted that some of the comments about parking and overcrowding in the neighborhood contradict what is shown seeing that the property in question is large and has a lot of space to provide parking.
- Commissioner Temple stated that an ADU is an attempt to formalize the natural path for many families who have a mother-in-law move in or another family member. He stated that one of the possible reasons that so many properties have second kitchens and illegal ADUs is because this is how the home was used before, but now it's unrelated individuals not just family members.
- Commissioner Hill stated that ADUs are a hard problem to tackle because you hear that it will make your home worth more but that it makes homes affordable, which is contradictory in nature. He also pointed out that the Commission spends hours on a single ADU when in many cases they can approve a 60-unit apartment complex that would provide homes for a lot more people than one ADU. He stated his personal experience is that an ADU doesn't impact a neighborhood that much but could see a threshold where a certain number could create a noticeable impact. He felt that the ADU discussion has distracted from focusing on other approaches to help increase affordable housing that have a far more measurable impact.
- Commissioner Kendall highlighted that she loves that the city has provisions where many uses are already allowed such as the Elderly Persons Extra Living Space or having elderly parents move in.
- Commissioner Hill stated it is important to acknowledge that different neighborhoods do have different values.
- Commissioner Jensen restated that she hates the process, but she still believes that this property meets the intent of the code.
- Commissioner DeSoto agreed and stated that she hopes council will review the process so that the Commission and Council don't have to spend this much time on every single ADU to be applied for as it is not sustainable.

Planning Commission Chair

Director of Development Services

See Key Land Use Policies of the Provo City General Plan, applicable Titles of the Provo City Code, and the Staff Report to the Planning Commission for further detailed information. The Staff Report is a part of the record of the decision of this item. Where findings of the Planning Commission differ from findings of Staff, those will be noted in this Report of Action.

Legislative items are noted with an asterisk (*) and require legislative action by the Municipal Council following a public hearing; the Planning Commission provides an advisory recommendation to the Municipal Council following a public hearing.

Administrative decisions of the Planning Commission (items not marked with an asterisk) **may be appealed** by submitting an application/notice of appeal, with the required application and noticing fees to the Development Services Department, 445 W Center Street, Provo, Utah, **within fourteen (14) calendar days of the Planning Commission's decision** (Provo City office hours are Monday through Thursday, 7:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m.).

BUILDING PERMITS MUST BE OBTAINED BEFORE CONSTRUCTION BEGINS

EXHIBIT A

Bailey Wood | September 10, 2025

ADU Oak Hills

To Whom it May Concern,

I'm writing this email to oppose the upcoming ADU approval for a home in my neighborhood of Oak Hills. Specifically address 1841 N 1550 E. I do not agree that ADU's should be allowed or exceptions should be made for anyone. We all purchased homes in this area for a reason and ADU's threaten to change that. We are concerned about more vehicles, traffic and our kid's safety. I do not believe the owners have gotten neighbor's support in the best way, but have avoided answering certain questions and used guilt tactics to sway opinions. Ultimately, I strongly oppose ADU approval for anyone in the neighborhood and urge you to require more specific resident input in the future approval process. Some of their support comes from residents who won't be directly affected by this decision. Thank you for your time.

Bailey Wood

Sarah Ashby | September 10, 2025

Opposition to ADU Amendment at 1841 N 1550 E

Letter to Planning Commission opposing Ordinance Text Amendment to Provo City Code 14.30.020 to add a property in the R1.10 (One Family Residential) Zone to areas permitting ADUs, located at 1841 N 1550 E. Oak Hills Neighborhood.

September 7, 2025

Dear Planning Commission,

I am writing in response to the application that Allen and Joanna Ludlow have made to request an Ordinance Text Amendment to Provo City Code 14.30.020 to add a property in the R1.10 (One Family Residential) Zone to areas permitting ADUs, located at 1841 N 1550 E. Oak Hills Neighborhood.

I am writing as a long-time resident of the Oak Hills Neighborhood to express my opposition to the proposed ordinance amendment that would allow an accessory dwelling unit (ADU) in our neighborhood. While I understand the city's interest in expanding housing options, I am concerned about the long-term consequences of this change on our community.

Our neighborhood was intentionally zoned for single-family residences to preserve its character, safety and livability. Allowing ADUs would undermine this balance in several ways:

1. **Parking and Traffic:** Increased residential density will directly contribute to road congestion and on-street parking shortages. Many of us have children who bike, walk and skateboard every day in our neighborhood. Increased traffic will make our roads less safe for our kids.
2. **Land Use and Zoning Intent:** Homeowners purchased here with the understanding that zoning would maintain a single-family environment. Introducing multi-unit arrangements changes the density and feel of the neighborhood, diminishing the qualities that drew residents here in the first place. This erodes the predictability and fairness that zoning is designed to provide.

3. **Property Values:** This is a two-part problem. 1) Having a legal ADU increases the value of the affected property, making it more difficult for a single family to ever be able to afford it. 2) Higher density development often leads to declining property values - especially in homes around the rental unit. This risks destabilizing what has been a long-standing stable community.

4. **Infrastructure:** Our utilities, water, sewer, and stormwater systems are scaled to current zoning limits.

I encourage the Planning Commission to carefully consider the unintended consequences of this ordinance amendment. Allowing a legal ADU will set a precedent for other home owners to request an exception. If this ordinance amendment passes, it will then be more difficult to deny future homeowners ordinance exceptions.

I encourage the Planning Commission to carefully consider the unintended consequences of this ordinance amendment. Allowing a legal ADU will set a precedent for other home owners to request an exception. If this ordinance amendment passes, it will then be more difficult to deny other home owners ordinance exceptions. This has happened in other Provo neighborhoods. In addition, even with the current ordinance in place, we have seen that enforcement is a challenge. Approving an exception to the ordinance will only make this problem worse.

While I understand there are housing needs in our city, there are more appropriate areas for ADU development with better infrastructure, transit access, and planning capacity. Thank you for your time and consideration.

Respectfully,

Sarah Ashby
1685 N 1500 E
Provo, UT 84604

Additional Concerned Residents Who Support this Letter and Oppose this Amendment:

Gary and Mildred Watts	1763 N 1500 E
Mike and Ruth Stouder	1785 N 1500 E
Judy and Heidi Shimmin	2002 N 1450 E
Michael Stevens	1685 N 1500 E
Michele and Jim Woodard	1922 N 1550 E
Gregg and Terri Taylor	1932 N 1450 E
Linda Sullivan and Gary Stott	1744 N 1500 E
Pat and Mike Esplin	1915 N 1450 E
Richard and Penny Lohner	1720 N 1450 E
Sam and Kristina Parkinson	1888 N 1450 E
Bailey and Brock Wood	1680 N 1450 E
Seth and Stephanie Hawes	1717 N 1450 E
Sally and Samuel Clayton	1811 N 1450 E
Emily and Eddie King	1880 N 1450 E
Aaron and Pam Speirs	2292 N 1430 E
Sharon Gibson	1911 N 1500 E
Randy and Cathy Wade	1910 N 1450 E
Frank and Ella Santiago	1919 N 1550 E
Greg Goodwin	1460 E 2050 N
Martha and Joe Ballantyne	1815 N 1450 E

Owen Jacobson	2009 N 1450 E
Kristin and Craig Nuttall	2050 N 1500 E
Tamara and Kim Thompson	1985 N 1500 E
Martha and Joe Ballantyne	2277 N 1450 E
Helen and Lloyd Patterson	1480 E 2050 N
Frank and Marianne Hayne	1812 N 1450 E
Carolina Nunez and Kendall Hulet	2109 N 1450 E
Racquel and Josh Esplin	1764 N 1450 E
Dan and Kelli Tuttle	2175 N 1450 E

Rian Krommenhoek | September 10, 2025

Item 2 for Public Hearing Sept 10th Allen and Joanna Ludlow, Oak Hills Neighborhood

Provo Municipal Council,

We are writing in as neighborhood members concerning the amendment request by Allen and Joanna Ludlow. We oppose the granting of their request on the grounds that zoning laws should be respected and followed. We bought our home in this neighborhood specifically to avoid the overcrowding of multiple family occupancy houses. If they are allowed to rent out a portion of their home then all homes should be afforded the same and that is not the neighborhood that we have all 1) made the decision to purchase a home in 2) spent years and decades building. Everyone one should be able to buy their homes in good faith that the city will uphold the zoning laws that they committed to when purchasing their homes. The city cannot play favorites or encourage bullying of neighbors by those seeking to break the rules that were in place long before their arrival. Joanna acted in bad faith by stopping neighbors as they were pulling out of their driveway, insisting they sign a paper "to allow us to keep our downstairs kitchen," and has since upset many as they discovered her intentionally deceitful communication. Similarly, and preceding their move into this neighborhood, they made the decision to purchase knowing the rules. We encourage the City Council to deny the request of the Ludlows and are prepared to legally take action against the city if governance proves incapable of upholding zoning laws. The zoning laws are clearly stated by the city and should stand for something. We believe that if the Ludlows request is granted the city will be encouraging others to break zoning laws and showing that by deceit and online harassment neighbors can defy ordinances and city governance. We ask that you do not encourage this behavior.

Sincerely,

Sid and Rian Krommenhoek
1721 N 1500 E
Oak Hills Neighborhood
Provo, Utah 84604

Kristina Parkinson | September 9, 2025

Amendment to city code 14.30.020

Hi Jessica, my name is Kristina Parkinson and I live at 1888 N. 1550 E., Provo. My neighbors the Ludlow's are trying to get

the city to permit ADU's at their residence. About a month ago Joanna Ludlow asked if she could add my name to a list of people in support of the amendment, and I said yes. I have since done more research and actually don't want to support that. I feel bad because I like the Ludlow's and don't want to cause them any problems, but I wanted to let you know that I'm against my neighbors having ADU's. I will not be able to attend the meeting on Wednesday, because of a prior commitment.

Thanks for all you do!

Kristina Parkinson

Kara Stowers | September 9, 2025
ADU public hearing for 1841 N 1550 E

Hello,

I cannot be at the public hearing but was told that someone could read the paragraphs below on my behalf:

Our neighborhood has been established for decades as a single-family community, with many families having lived here for over 50 years. Many of them even have bought the houses that they grew up in and are raising their own children there. The stability of this zoning has preserved the character of the area and provided a safe environment for *generations*. Granting this exception would undermine that stability and set a precedent that could encourage many similar requests, fundamentally altering the well-established nature of the neighborhood.

While ADUs can serve young families well which would be in alignment with Provo's goals as stated by the committee, the more likely outcome in our area—given its proximity to the university—is *occupancy by multiple college students*. This has already been happening illegally in multiple houses in the neighborhood. Therefore, this ADU change would cement this zoning to the neighborhood for multiple houses, bring increased traffic, parking congestion, and *frequent turnover of residents*. Additional cars on our already narrow streets *pose a real safety concern for neighborhood children*.

Most importantly, community input should mean more than collecting signatures. Long-time residents who have invested in this neighborhood for decades deserve to have their voices heard and their concerns weighed which have not been done with proper attention in this proposal.

Thank you. Kara Stowers 1700 N. 1450 E. Provo Utah 84604

Kara Stowers | September 9, 2025
ADU Concerns regarding 1841 N 1550 E

Letter to Planning Commission opposing Ordinance Text Amendment to Provo City Code 14.30.020 to add a property in the R1.10 (One Family Residential) Zone to areas permitting ADUs, located at 1841 N 1550 E. Oak Hills Neighborhood.

Sept. 9, 2025

Dear Provo City Planner (via Ms. Jessica Dahneke),

I am writing as a resident of Oak Hills, where my family has lived for the past eight years. I am concerned about the requested Ordinance Text amendment change requested by Allen and Joanna Ludlow at 1841 N 1550 E in which they are asking for a zoning change to allow an ADU at that address.

Our neighborhood has been established for decades as a single-family community, with many families having lived here for over 50 years. Many of them even have bought the houses that they grew up in and are raising their own children there. The stability of this zoning has preserved the character of the area and provided a safe environment for *generations*. Granting this exception would undermine that stability and set a precedent that could encourage many similar requests, fundamentally altering the well-established nature of the neighborhood.

While ADUs can serve young families well which would be in alignment with Provo's goals as stated by the committee, the more likely outcome in our area—given its proximity to the university—is *occupancy by multiple college students*. This has already been happening illegally in multiple houses in the neighborhood. Therefore, this ADU change would cement this zoning to the neighborhood for multiple houses, bring increased traffic, parking congestion, and *frequent turnover of residents*. Additional cars on our already narrow streets *pose a real safety concern for neighborhood children*.

Above this, it is important that zoning decisions be consistent and fair. Many of us have accepted restrictions on how we use our homes in order to comply with single-family zoning. We also understand the legacy of the neighborhood and the character that has been cultivated here. *Granting an exception to one household while others are expected to follow the rules would be inequitable and would make enforcement even more challenging*. Especially when the rules are already difficult to enforce.

Most importantly, community input should mean more than collecting signatures. Long- time residents who have invested in this neighborhood for decades deserve to have their voices heard and their concerns weighed which have not been done with proper attention in this proposal.

For these reasons, I respectfully ask you to deny the proposed zoning change. Thank you for your service and for protecting the integrity and safety of our neighborhoods.

Sincerely, Kara Stowers 1700
N 1450 E

Sally Clayton | September 8, 2025
Opposition to ADU code exception request in Oak Hill

Hi Planning Commission,

I would like to submit my opposition to the Ordinance Text Amendment to add an ADU to 1841N 1550E, Oak Hills neighborhood. Our neighborhood is not zoned for any additional rental income units and should be preserved as a single family home neighborhood.

Provo will be a better city if we set and stick to thoughtful zoning practices. When too many exceptions for ADU's are given in neighborhoods meant for single family homes, then we begin to lose the strong permanent residence population that Provo needs.

I moved to Oak Hills so I could raise my kids in a neighborhood where we can ride bikes and walk to neighbor houses. With ADU units in this neighborhood specifically this quickly becomes impossible.

We do not have any infrastructure for the parking needed to accommodate ADU's, and in many sections we don't have sidewalks. Permitting ADU's on an exception basis actual devalues the rest of the homes as part of a strong single family residence neighborhood.

Housing is so critical in Provo right now and we need to be able to support our student population with rental housing that makes sense for them. Our neighborhood is not practical or convenient for this. Instead of working to grant ad-hoc exceptions within specific neighborhoods, the Planning Commission and City Council should be spending more time working with BYU to plan pragmatic housing options that will solve the housing crisis facing students, young adults, and many other populations within Provo today.

Sally Clayton
1811N 1500E

Sarah Ashby | September 8, 2025
opposition to ADU at 1841 N 1500 E

I would like to submit this letter in opposition to the petition for a legal ADU to be established at 1841 N 1550 E. Thank you for your attention. Sarah Ashby

Letter to Planning Commission opposing Ordinance Text Amendment to Provo City Code 14.30.020 to add a property in the R1.10 (One Family Residential) Zone to areas permitting ADUs, located at 1841 N 1550 E. Oak Hills Neighborhood.

September 7, 2025

Dear Planning Commission,

I am writing in response to the application that Allen and Joanna Ludlow have made to request an Ordinance Text Amendment to Provo City Code 14.30.020 to add a property in the R1.10 (One Family Residential) Zone to areas permitting ADUs, located at 1841 N 1550 E. Oak Hills Neighborhood.

I am writing as a long-time resident of the Oak Hills Neighborhood to let you know of the way in which the request for this amendment has affected me, and our neighborhood in general.

Joanna Ludlow used an LDS ward text list with over 100 members of the neighborhood to ask everyone to support her application. Over the course of several weeks, she then spread incorrect information to us, claiming that the city would be coming in "with a vengeance" (her words) to rip out all the second kitchens in the neighborhood. She also stated to these 100+ residents that the ADU exception would be granted to only

their family – that it would not stay with the house. She claimed that if they moved, the new owners of the house would have to start the process over and apply for an exception themselves. My understanding from the City is that once the legal ADU is established, it remains with the house.

I am concerned that the residents of our neighborhood were misled. Although people on the thread tried to correct the misinformation on several occasions, Joanna continued to claim that what she said was correct.

I let Joanna and other neighbors know I would be writing a letter opposing the amendment because of my objection to ADUs in the neighborhood. Joanna then began messaging me personally saying that I would be responsible for the student renters in her basement becoming homeless, and that I would be responsible for damage to neighbors' homes because of all the kitchens getting ripped out. She claimed I was personally attacking their family. These texts felt threatening and retaliatory.

I know at least two of the required signatures (of the 66% of adjacent neighbors) were obtained from neighbors who felt very pressured to sign. They felt that if they didn't sign, there would be personal backlash against them.

I bring this to your attention for a few reasons. First, I don't think the current process is a good fit for a community where there is so much interaction because of LDS wards. People don't feel like they can speak their minds because it may affect them on many levels – not just as a neighbor. For example, I have one neighbor in a church leadership position who doesn't feel like he can give his opinion because of his church position.

Second, I am worried that despite efforts to give neighbors correct information, it has not been possible to contact all of them. It's possible the number of neighbors who would have opposed the amendment is an underrepresentation. I don't think support for an amendment that was obtained by misinforming individuals en masse should be considered, let alone approved.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Respectfully,

Sarah Ashby
1685 N 1500 E
Provo, UT 84604