

Provo City Planning Commission
Report of Action

December 10, 2025

ITEM 1 Ryan Salmon requests Project Plan approval for a new 14-unit residential project in the MDR (Medium Density Residential) Zone, located at 2044 N Canyon Road. Pleasant View Neighborhood. Aaron Ardmore (801) 852-6404 aardmore@provo.org PLPPA20240288

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

APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS

On a vote of 8:0, the Planning Commission approved the above noted application, with the following conditions:

Conditions of Approval:

1. That a subdivision plat with CC&R's requiring all 14 units be sold to owner-occupants is approved and recorded prior to building permit approval;
2. That two landscape islands are removed to provide two more parking spaces; and
3. That the parking lot landscaping removed be placed elsewhere on the property.

Motion By: Lisa Jensen

Second By: Melissa Kendall

Votes in Favor of Motion: Jonathon Hill, Barbara DeSoto, Melissa Kendall, Lisa Jensen, Joel Temple, Matt Wheelwright, Jon Lyons, Daniel Gonzales

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.
- New findings stated as the basis of conditions added by the Planning Commission.

APPROVED/RECOMMENDED OCCUPANCY

- 14 Total Units
- Type of occupancy approved: Family

APPROVED/RECOMMENDED PARKING

- 31 Total parking stalls required
- 31 Total parking stalls to be provided
- 2.25 Required parking stalls per unit

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. Staff made corrections to the staff report, indicating the wrong site plan was attached and presented the project site plan showing 29 parking stalls, and reviewed specific details on parking, setbacks, height, and requirements of the development agreement on the property.

CITY DEPARTMENTAL ISSUES

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

NEIGHBORHOOD MEETING DATE

- A neighborhood meeting was held on the zone change for the project in 2022.

NEIGHBORHOOD AND PUBLIC COMMENT

- The Neighborhood District Chair was present /addressed the Planning Commission during the public hearing.
- Neighbors or other interested parties were present or addressed the Planning Commission.

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:

- Multiple emails were sent to the Planning Commission prior to the hearing indicating concerns over parking, setbacks, building height, and occupancy for the project, these are attached to this report of action.
- Lynn Sorenson spoke to concerns on the one-bedroom units, parking, setbacks, and management of the CC&R's.
- Sharon Memmott shared concerns about the setback for the project, insufficient parking, safety concerns, and lack of open space.
- Ryan White shared concerns about maintaining owner-occupancy rules, safety, and noise related to the project.
- Lilly Mott stated her belief that the setback code is not met on the project, that parking is a concern, and that more parking should be provided. She also is not sure how owner-occupancy will be enforced.
- Rebecca Shoemacke shared her concerns on safety with ingress/egress on 2100 North and Canyon Road and does not think the setbacks and height are not compatible with the neighborhood.
- Ethan indicated he would love to hear a solution on how to maintain owner-occupancy.
- Warner Woodworth shared his feelings on the state of Provo and asked the Commission to deny the project.
- Rich Ziegler noted that there are concerns with the project.
- Adam Shin spoke to a bigger issue of traffic and parking in Provo, noting that providing housing near campus and amenities is important.

APPLICANT RESPONSE

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

- Zach Hunter (General Contractor for the project) addressed planning commission questions related to parking, indicating that it will be up to the management of the property and is confident that it will be managed well. He stated that the goal is to provide more ownership of housing in Provo, and that this project will help towards that goal.

PLANNING COMMISSION DISCUSSION

Key points discussed by the Planning Commission included the following:

- Matt Wheelwright inquired on access to the units, sidewalk width, setbacks, and parking management.
- Jonathon Hill started a discussion on how to evaluate a spare room not being counted as a bedroom, which relates to the number of parking spaces required.
- Joel Temple noted that the owner-occupancy requirement will make it difficult to occupy any unit with three singles and noted that more details will come on how the bike parking will be covered. He also inquired about how owner-occupancy is enforced, to which staff responded.
- Planning Commission confirmed that the owner-occupancy will always be required and enforced by the CC&Rs and the city.
- Barbara DeSoto spoke about concerns over parking cars but still building an environment that demands them; and that it would not be fair to stop this project because of issues from previous developments nearby. She also noted that tighter building setbacks help to create a comfortable space for people on the sidewalk.
- Lisa Jensen spoke to the limited discretion the Planning Commission has on these types of decisions, that so long as a project meets the current codes it would have to be approved. She did share concerns about parking availability and management. She stated that the fear of illegal occupancy should not stop development, but that over-occupancy and related parking problems is a bigger issue that needs to be addressed. Ms. Jensen also shared some ideas to address some of the neighbors' concerns.
- Jonathon Hill asked Bill Peperone to speak to the standards for the Planning Commission to review the project; Bill noted that many of the decisions on the project were made at the rezone and that the project will have to meet code requirements for sight triangle. Mr. Peperone also noted that owner-occupancy is a continued issue that is difficult to enforce, but the city continues its efforts to do so.
- Melissa Kendall inquired about the bedroom/office questions that the Commission has discussed and the setbacks for the project compared to others in the city. She stated that cars will also be here and that we need to be thoughtful

- about accommodating space for cars.
- Jon Lyons asked staff to clarify the setback reduction allowance, Bill Peperone addressed the need to accommodate a smaller setback to allow parking for the project during the rezone phase.
- Daniel Gonzales noted his concerns about the project density but appreciated the project is providing more for-sale housing, and that there will always be parking problems, but the project seems to meet the standards to be approved.
- Matt Wheelwright pointed out that the plan meeting the development agreement should be approved, but that there should be more discussion on parking standards for the city. He wondered if removal of landscaping in the parking lot to provide more parking for the one-bedroom units could be achieved. Staff noted that the Planning Commission should make a determination on whether the one-bedroom units should be parked with the two-bedroom rate, and that there would be an opportunity to remove some parking lot landscaping to provide additional parking and still meet code.
- The Planning Commission discussed parking standards, looking for staff to possibly increase residential standards and lower commercial standards. The commission concluded that the one-bedroom units should be treated as a two-bedroom unit and parked as such.
- Overall, the Planning Commission likes the project and finds that it meets the codes and development agreement standards. They spoke to concerns from the public about Provo deteriorating and disagree with that notion. The Commission discussed with staff about the ability to move landscaping from the parking lot to other areas of the project, hoping that the trees would be moved to the west or south face of the site.

FINDINGS / BASIS OF PLANNING COMMISSION DETERMINATION

The Planning Commission identified the following findings as the basis of this decision or recommendation: That the one-bedroom units are showing a den/office space that will be used as a second bedroom, so they need to be parked at that rate; that concession can be made to provide the for-sale units and parking associated with them.



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

R. Paul Evans | December 9, 2025

Item 1. Provo City Planning Commission Agenda. 10 December 2025

9 December 2025

TO: Provo City Planning Commission

FROM: Paul Evans

RE: An assessment of the 2046 N Canyon Road “Long Glass Lofts” condominiums proposed final project plan

The continuing changes proposed by this development over the past three years is confusing to neighbors. This confusion is further demonstrated in the Planning Commission Staff Report for Item 1 of the 10 December 2025 Provo City Planning Commission Meeting Agenda. The staff report shows a nearly two year old site plan when there were 12 one-bedroom units in a two-story building with 21 parking stalls. This is the site plan that was reviewed at a neighborhood meeting and reviewed by the Planning Commission.

That was then. Now, the proposed final project plan is for 4 “one-bedroom” (1 bedroom and 1 “office”) units and 10 two-bedroom units in a three-story building with 29 parking stalls. The concept rendering in the staff report, however, is from a June 2025 final project plan submitted to Provo City.

Here are some issues to resolve.

1. Parking

Parking issues related to this development have been consistently and repeatedly communicated to the developer, Planning Commission, and Municipal Council. Spill over parking from Stadium 150 Apartments, Timp Towers Apartments already exists on surrounding neighborhood and private streets. The spill over parking has been increasing as these properties require an additional fee on top of rent in order to use parking stalls on their property that are required by Provo City Code.

This development is attempting to meet minimum parking requirements by designating a room as an office and not a bedroom. This office room is repeatedly shown in the June 2025 Final Project Plan submitted by the developer as a room with a bed. Yes. There is no closet. For Provo City, a closet is not a required feature of a bedroom. This “office” is merely a bedroom and the “office” designation is an attempt to include more bedrooms without the needed parking.

Five additional parking stalls should be required for the 4 units on the ground floor which should be correctly identified as two-bedroom units. The planned parking in

this proposed final project plan proposal does not meet minimum parking requirements and is not consistent with the preliminary project plan.

2. Height and Setback

The initial determination by Provo City Development Services to exercise discretion for setbacks in the Medium Density Residential (MDR) zone was made when the proposed development was for a two-story complex. At that time, a 14 foot setback was discussed instead of the required 20 foot setback on the front and the side. Now the proposed final project plan is a 35 feet high (includes a 5 foot parapet) structure parallel with Canyon Road with an 8.5 foot setback. The actual building height has increased whilst the setback has decreased.

Any comparison with the Timp Towers setback is misapplied. During the Timp Towers approval process, the possible precedent that Timp Towers would have on the future development along Canyon Road was discussed. Timp Towers was NOT to be a precedent. Timp Towers was a unique project in a unique location. The setbacks for Garden Villa Condominiums, Stadium 150 Apartments and Timpanogos Gateway Condominiums are consistent with the look and feel of Canyon Road.

The property on the south of this project is being developed as a single family home subdivision. The MDR zone requires a 10 foot setback on interior side yards. The proposed final project plan shows only a 5 foot setback. Any reduction in the required 10 foot setback on the south property line adjacent to the single family home subdivision is not consistent with the integration of higher density housing with single family homes in Provo City. The proposed 5 foot setback adjacent to single family home residential property on the south side yard of the project is not visually compatible with neighboring development and likely will cause an undue burden or harm. (See Provo City Code 14.14B.050 (7)(a))

The reductions in the setback requirements to 8.5 feet from 20 feet on the front and side street and to 5 feet from 10 feet on the interior side yard with the 35 foot high (30 feet high roof with continuing 5 feet high parapet) Long Glass Loft building will create another Campus Place (900 E 700 N) look and feel. This look and feel is not consistent with the preliminary project plan.

Provo City Code. Medium Density Residential (MDR) Zone

14.14B.050 Yard Requirements.

Yards shall be provided according to the requirements listed below. (Note: All setbacks are measured from the property line.)

- (1) Front yard: twenty (20) ft.
- (2) Side yard, street: twenty (20) ft.

(3) Side Yard, Interior.

(a) One-family detached: eight (8) ft. and ten (10) ft.

(b) All other buildings: ten (10) ft.

(4) Rear yard: twenty (20) ft.

(5) Distance between buildings on the same parcel: fifteen (15) ft.

(6) Side Yard, Driveway. See Section 14.37.100, Provo City Code.

(7) The Development Services Director, or designee, may modify the setbacks of this zone subject to finding that all of the following conditions exist:

(a) The proposed setback is visually compatible with neighboring development and does not cause an undue burden or harm to the adjacent property;

(b) The proposed setback does not violate an existing or needed utility easement; and

(c) The proposed setback does not cause a violation of the International Building Code or the Fire Code.

4. Property outdoor space.

The open green space is on a slope ranging from a 5 foot change in elevation over 10 feet of property to a 6 foot change in elevation over 30 feet of property. The families who purchase their home in this condominium will not have outdoor space and the surrounding private open space in the Garden Villa Condominiums will be negatively impacted.

5. Concept Rendering Views.

The proposed final project plan does not provide concept rendering views of the project from the east, north, and south. Only the view from Canyon Road (west) is provided. The west view shows what will be seen by those passing by and neighbors on the west side of Canyon Road. What will the project look like every day to the neighbors to the north, south and east? There are walkways connecting entrances of units on the second and third floors to the stairs.

6. Sufficient covered parking for bicycles.

The proposed final project plan does not show covered parking for bicycles. The development agreement requires sufficient covered parking.

7. Outdoor lighting.

The final project plan is unclear about the intensity and direction of outdoor lighting. The outdoor lighting for the project should not shine into adjacent property. The walkway lighting on the first, second, and third floors should be oriented for downward lighting and

should not shine into adjacent properties. Lighting for the parking lot should be oriented for downward illumination and should not shine into adjacent properties.

8. Signage.

Signage for the project is permitted by a process separate from the final project plan approval. Any future signage in the proposed 8.5 foot setback would only further impact the look and feel of the residential neighborhood.

R. Paul Evans

Donna Lynn Sorenson | December 8, 2025

Planning Commission 12/10/25 meeting; Salmon development project

Provo City Planning Commission members,

Thank you for your service on behalf of our City residents. **Pleasant View neighbors** are very glad you are reviewing the **“Long Glass Lofts” development at 2044 Canyon Road** in your **December 10, 2025, Planning Commission Meeting** to approve or modify or reject the project as currently conceived by developer Ryan Salmon.

As the **Pleasant View Neighborhood** elected representative to the District 1 Executive Board, I am **Lynn Sorenson** writing here with current views and polling results regarding the proposed (Salmon) Canyon Road development. Besides numerous neighbors contacting me in person, by phone, and electronically, many of these views were expressed (and polled) at the recent **Pleasant View Neighborhood meeting held Nov. 20** at Fire Station #22, approx. 45+ people in attendance.

Setback from sidewalk-to-building

Again, Mr. Salmon has submitted numerous plans regarding setback for this development. The first, I recall, was 20 feet, later 14, and most **recently 8 feet**. A development with a setback of only 8 feet will be intruding a “big-city model” on a traditionally residential neighborhood. Polling the neighbors at the 11/20 meeting showed 40+ persons opposed to this close of a setback and one in favor. I personally find a **14 feet setback to be the absolute minimum**.

Design and appearance of “Long Glass Lofts”

Mr. Salmon has submitted numerous plans for this development. The most recent one we have seen shows “decorative”(?) protrusions at the top of the building, **increasing its height** beyond previous versions. Many meeting attendees found this an unattractive addition.

Owner occupancy

Neighbors were pleased to note that the development agreement is requiring owner occupancy. However, it seems to us that there must be an **HOA and CC&Rs**; otherwise how will the provisions of the agreement be known, continued, and enforced?

Size of units and parking

We understand that Mr. Salmon is anticipating selling 14 units (a number up from previous plans). The most recent plan we have seen shows two bedrooms (see a bed in each in the architectural drawing), regardless of Mr. Salmon's claim of 1 BR and 1 office for each unit.

And experience in the neighborhood suggests that two BRs are a usual choice of residents, housing one adult in each BR and one car each. IF the units are inhabited by students, that could conceivably be 4 adults and 4 cars! And what about parking for visitors?

In the 14 May 2024 Municipal Council Meeting, the council approved a concept plan with 29 parking places. The minutes for that meeting show that developer Salmon stated that "parking was a significant concern raised by the neighborhood. The existing parking issues are exacerbated by nearby student housing where students park on the street to avoid parking fees... To address this, the new design has increased parking capacity from 22 to 29 spaces [despite adding two more units]."

Mr. Salmon emphasized that "parking has been a key focus in the revised plans, ensuring they meet required standards." He added that he would be "willing to continue to meet with neighbors to discuss any other concerns." We have received no overtures from him inviting further neighbor input. I believe that the current project plan for consideration by the Planning Commission this week shows only 21 parking places.

At the Nov. 20 PV Neighborhood meeting, polling revealed unanimous concern about the inadequate parking of 21 spaces for this development, with no one expressing "not concerned" or approving of only 21 spaces.

Again, thank you for your time and hard work on behalf of your fellow Provoans.

Sincerely, Lynn Sorenson, Pleasant View Neighborhood

Rebecca Shoemake | December 7, 2025

Development at 2044 N Canyon Rd.

This is Rebecca Shoemake. I am serving as co-chair for the Garden Villa Condominiums HOA. Our residents have many concerns about this development. There have been many different proposed plans that we've seen, but NONE of them have enough parking for the

Owner occupancy

Neighbors were pleased to note that the development agreement is requiring owner occupancy. However, it seems to us that there must be an **HOA and CC&Rs**; otherwise how will the provisions of the agreement be known, continued, and enforced?

Size of units and parking

We understand that Mr. Salmon is anticipating selling 14 units (a number up from previous plans). The most recent plan we have seen shows two bedrooms (see a bed in each in the architectural drawing), regardless of Mr. Salmon's claim of 1 BR and 1 office for each unit.

And experience in the neighborhood suggests that two BRs are a usual choice of residents, housing one adult in each BR and one car each. IF the units are inhabited by students, that could conceivably be 4 adults and 4 cars! And what about parking for visitors?

In the 14 May 2024 Municipal Council Meeting, the council approved a concept plan with 29 parking places. The minutes for that meeting show that developer Salmon stated that "parking was a significant concern raised by the neighborhood. The existing parking issues are exacerbated by nearby student housing where students park on the street to avoid parking fees... To address this, the new design has increased parking capacity from 22 to 29 spaces [despite adding two more units]."

Mr. Salmon emphasized that "parking has been a key focus in the revised plans, ensuring they meet required standards." He added that he would be "willing to continue to meet with neighbors to discuss any other concerns." We have received no overtures from him inviting further neighbor input. I believe that the current project plan for consideration by the Planning Commission this week shows only 21 parking places.

At the Nov. 20 PV Neighborhood meeting, polling revealed unanimous concern about the inadequate parking of 21 spaces for this development, with no one expressing "not concerned" or approving of only 21 spaces.

Again, thank you for your time and hard work on behalf of your fellow Provoans.

Sincerely, Lynn Sorenson, Pleasant View Neighborhood

Rebecca Shoemake | December 7, 2025

Development at 2044 N Canyon Rd.

This is Rebecca Shoemake. I am serving as co-chair for the Garden Villa Condominiums HOA. Our residents have many concerns about this development. There have been many different proposed plans that we've seen, but NONE of them have enough parking for the

proposed number of units. With the current plan there are changes that don't even seem to conform with the development agreement approved by the city council. Even with the setbacks being narrowed, there isn't the minimum number of required parking spaces.

Our access street, 2100 N, is already often packed with parked cars to the point that you sometimes have to wait and take turns and then go single file down the street. We have quite a few students who park overnight on our street to avoid having to pay for parking at their apartments. This development will exacerbate the parking situation.

Also, I have safety concerns about the smaller setbacks. We already have to pull partially in the street to see around parked cars before pulling out fully on 2100 N. With the proposed setbacks, we will have to do the same thing when pulling onto Canyon Road.

I have other concerns, but I won't raise them until after the parking and setback issues have been addressed.

Thank you for your attention.

Cherie Tobler | November 22, 2025

Comments for requested 14-unit apartments on N. Canyon rd

Aaron,

I received your postcard notice regarding the following:

"Ryan Salmon requests Project Plan approval for a new 14-unit residential project in the MDR (Medium Density Residential) Zone, located at 2044 N Canyon Road."

As a resident of Garden Villas Condos which borders this area, I have the following concerns:

1. Lot size - very small to accommodate a 14 unit development. What easements are being considered to compensate for this issue should it be approved?
2. Parking - major issue in this area already. Will this development be required to make adequate parking available on their property? We already have students parking from other complexes between us and the stadium because they have a deficit of parking in their complexes. This will greatly exacerbate an already existing issue.

In my opinion, a smaller development would make more sense and be more in keeping with the needs of the community.

Thanks for your diligence in contacting residents.

Cherie Tobler

R. Paul Evans | November 15, 2025

Provo City Pleasant View Neighborhood Update - 15 November 2025

Long Glass Lofts at 2050 N Canyon Road. Parking. Owner Occupancy. Setback

More details on this issue in a future email. Here are some quick thoughts. (note: if these are the quick thoughts, then what will the future email look like? How many volumes...?)

10 December 2025 Planning Commission Meeting to review and approve or modify or reject final project plans.

14 units will be sold to owners. Owner occupancy will be required under the Development Agreement. But the owner occupancy requirements are not established in writing by an "HOA with CC&Rs that require continued owner-occupancy of all fourteen (14) units." The CC&R language is critical to continued owner-occupancy because the Development Agreement requiring owner-occupancy terminates when Provo City issues certificates of occupancy when the project is completed. After that point, only the HOA can enforce the owner-occupancy requirements. However, Provo City Code requires an off-street parking spot for every vehicle operated by residents. This code requirement has not been well enforced.

Each unit has two bedrooms, but, the parking for the units is planned for 1 bedroom only because each unit is "envisioned" as a one bedroom with an office. Architectural drawings (see figure) submitted by the developer show beds in both of the rooms. In the 14 May 2024 Municipal Council Meeting, the council approved a concept plan with 29 parking spots. The minutes for the meeting show that Ryan Salmon, the developer, stated, "that parking was a significant concern raised by the neighborhood. The existing parking issues are exacerbated by nearby student housing where students park on the street to avoid parking fees... To address this, the new design has increased parking capacity from 22 to 29 spaces, despite adding two more units. Mr. Salmon emphasized that parking has been a key focus in the revised plans, ensuring they meet required standards. He added that he would be willing to continue to meet with neighbors to discuss any other concerns."

Now, in the final project plan for consideration by the Planning Commission on 10 December 2025, there are only 21 parking places. If each unit is designated as a one-bedroom unit, then 21 parking spaces is the minimum required. The issue is whether the units are one-bedroom or two-bedroom.

Setback from sidewalk to building was originally 20 feet. Then the setback from sidewalk edge to building was changed to 14 feet. Then, in May 2024, the setback from sidewalk

edge to building was changed to 8 feet. This is the first time that the Planning Commission is seeing the 8 foot setback. 900 East has the “College Place Apartments” development at 700 North. We are extending the one-off, unique property location, Timp Towers look and feel further into the Pleasant View neighborhood creating another “College Place Apartments” environment on Canyon Road.

Go Cougars!

Cheers,
R. Paul Evans