

*Please note: These minutes have been prepared with a timestamp linking the agenda items to the video discussion.*



## **PROVO MUNICIPAL COUNCIL**

### **Work Meeting Minutes**

3:30 PM | February 10, 2026

Provo Peak Room

Hybrid meeting: 445 W. Center Street, Provo, UT 84601 or

<https://www.youtube.com/provocitycouncil>

## **Agenda**

### **Roll Call**

Council Chair Katrice MacKay, conducting  
Council Vice-Chair Craig Christensen  
Councilor Gary Garrett  
Councilor Rachel Whipple  
Councilor Jeff Whitlock  
Councilor Becky Bogdin  
Councilor Travis Hoban (remote)  
Mayor Marsha Judkins

### **Approval of Minutes**

- January 27, 2026 Work Meeting Minutes
  - January 27, 2026 Council Meeting Minutes
- Approved by unanimous consent.

## **Business**

**Item 1: An ordinance amending the zone map classification of approximately 39 acres of real property, generally located at 2255 N University Parkway from the RC and SC2 zones to the VLDR, LDR, MDR, and SC3 zones. Carterville Neighborhood (PLRZ20250689)**  
[00:01:00](#)

Jessica Dahneke, Planner in Development Services, presented the proposed rezone for the 2230 North station area. She explained this item marked the beginning of the station area plan rezone process, noting that the station area plans had been adopted by the Council in September. The rezones were being brought forward one station at a time, beginning with 2230 North.

Ms. Dahneke reminded the Council of the adopted approach to the future land use map, which concentrated the most intense uses adjacent to the station and gradually transitioned to lower intensities to integrate with the surrounding neighborhood. She displayed visuals identifying the areas proposed for rezoning and the corresponding zone classifications.

Ms. Dahneke reported that during the Planning Commission meeting, two public comments were received. Beth Hedengren, representing the Northwest District, expressed concerns regarding

traffic impacts and required open space. Eric Chase spoke in favor of the proposed changes but indicated he would prefer greater intensity in the zoning adjustments.

Council Vice-Chair Christensen asked for clarification regarding Mr. Chase's comments. Ms. Dahneke explained that Mr. Chase wished there was more substantial change or greater intensity involved.

Ms. Dahneke stated that the Planning Commission recommended approval to the Municipal Council with an additional recommendation to evaluate the placement of zone boundary lines. She explained that the Commission recommended avoiding drawing rezone boundary lines across streets and instead placing them behind properties so that differing densities would not directly face one another across a street.

She further noted an additional Planning Commission recommendation to evaluate amenity points for developments within the station area plan project areas. Ms. Dahneke clarified that this recommendation did not impact the rezone under consideration but would likely be addressed in future Planning Commission discussions for the remaining station areas.

Council Chair MacKay invited questions from the Council. Councilor Whipple raised concerns regarding consistency with the station area plans previously adopted and submitted to the State. She asked whether adopting a zone change that was not fully consistent with the submitted plan would present any issues.

Ms. Dahneke responded that she was not entirely certain but indicated the proposed changes would be very close to what had been approved. She stated that an amendment to the future land use map would likely be required to ensure consistency.

Councilor Whipple expressed concern about making changes that could constitute a substantial or material modification to the approved plan, noting her understanding had been that the rezones would align with the adopted station area plans. She stated that if the Planning Commission's recommendations resulted in a material change requiring resubmittal to the State, she would not support that approach. She emphasized the importance of understanding whether such changes would necessitate additional state review.

Discussion followed regarding the flexibility to amend zoning in the future. In response to a question about the ability to rezone property differently in the future, Ms. Dahneke stated that both a future land use map amendment and a rezone would be required. When asked whether such amendments would need to be resubmitted to the State, Ms. Dahneke initially indicated she believed so but, after consulting with Bill Peperone, Director of Development Services, clarified that it would not need to go back to the State.

Councilor Whipple reiterated the importance of clarifying the state approval process and suggested that if consistency with the submitted plan was required, the Planning Commission should be made aware of the scope of any additional work their recommendations might entail. She emphasized the need to determine the answer before proceeding with subsequent station area rezonings.

At the request of Councilor Whitlock, Ms. Dahneke elaborated on the Planning Commission's recommendation regarding density transitions. She explained that the Commission sought to avoid having significantly different densities directly across from one another. While the difference between Very Low Density Residential (VLDR) and Low Density Residential (LDR) was not substantial, the difference between Medium Density Residential (MDR), which allows up to 30 units per acre, and LDR, which allows up to 12 units per acre, was more pronounced. The Commission believed aligning similar densities across streets would create a stronger sense of community.

Ms. Dahneke stated that the Planning Commission did not provide a specific boundary adjustment but suggested either extending the LDR designation to align both sides of a street or adjusting the MDR boundary accordingly so that properties directly across from each other would share the same density classification.

Councilor Whitlock raised concerns about the proximity of the MDR rezone area to the river and the potential for development that might not align with anticipated river design standards. Councilor Whipple characterized this as a significant concern but questioned whether it should delay the rezone.

The Council discussed the existing 100-foot setback requirement from the river. Director Peperone and Economic Development Director Cody Hill discussed current property lines and estimated their proximity to the river at approximately 40 feet in certain areas. In response to a question from Councilor Bogdin, clarification was provided that while interior remodels of existing structures within the setback are permitted, new construction or building expansions are not allowed within 100 feet of the river. Council Executive Director Justin Harrison clarified that remodeling is permitted but expansion is not.

**Item 2: An ordinance amending the zone map classification of real property, generally located at 1560 South 1100 West, from the A1.5 and RA zones to the General Commercial (CG) and Very Low Density (VLDR) zones. Lakewood Neighborhood. (PLRZ20250028)**  
[00:11:57](#)

Aaron Ardmore, Planning Supervisor in Development Services, reviewed slides depicting the subject property, the General Plan designation, the current zoning map, and the proposed zoning classifications. He also referenced a concept plan that had been presented to the Planning Commission in conjunction with the rezone request and indicated that additional presentation details would be provided during the Council Meeting.

Councilor Garrett and Hoban were noted as joining the meeting.

Councilor Bogdin expressed significant concerns regarding the proposal. She stated that when the Southwest Area Plan was adopted, the area had been designated for residential uses rather than commercial uses and noted that commercial property had recently been approved across the street. She also expressed concern that the property was being marketed for commercial sale without a specific end user identified.

Councilor Bogdin referenced concerns raised during the neighborhood meeting regarding potential uses, including a hotel or gas station, and questioned the compatibility of such uses with the surrounding neighborhood. She also raised concerns about proposed driveways on 1560 South and 1100 West, both identified as collector roads, and questioned how driveway access would comply with engineering standards and why the site was not more internally integrated.

Mr. Ardmore responded that the application was a concept plan accompanying a rezone request intended to align zoning with the General Plan, which designates the area as mixed use. Councilor Bogdin stated that this differed from her understanding of the Southwest Area Plan and reiterated her dissatisfaction with the proposal.

Councilor Bogdin further expressed concern regarding the lack of a buffering transition between the proposed commercial zone and adjacent residential areas, particularly noting the absence of a Low Density Residential (LDR) transition between existing housing and the proposed development. She questioned whether the proposed General Commercial (CG) zone would support neighborhood-serving commercial uses or larger-scale uses intended to serve the sports park or airport. She emphasized the proximity of nearby schools and stated that a hotel would not be supportive of neighborhood needs.

She indicated that if the rezone were to move forward, it should include stronger transitional elements and better integration with surrounding housing. She stated a preference for uses that would function as neighborhood commercial rather than regional commercial.

In response to a question regarding appropriate zoning for neighborhood commercial, Mr. Ardmore suggested the General Commercial (CG) zone; however, Bill Peperone, Director of Development Services, clarified that the SC1 zone is commonly referred to as neighborhood commercial and is more limited in scope than CG. He described SC1 as a community shopping center designation with lighter-intensity tenants.

Director Peperone reviewed conditional uses permitted within the SC1 zone, which include communications facilities, restaurants, drive-through services, auto washing and polishing, day care facilities, and veterinarian services. The inclusion of auto washing and polishing prompted additional concern from Councilor Bogdin.

Councilor Garrett asked whether the SC1 zone would better reflect the type of neighborhood-serving commercial uses the Council had in mind, noting that hotels or gas stations did not appear consistent with that intent.

Councilor Bogdin expressed concern about automated car wash facilities and questioned whether there was support to remove that use from the SC1 zone. Melia Dayley, Council Analyst, suggested that as part of the ongoing zoning code rewrite, staff could review the conditional and permitted uses related to auto washing and polishing and evaluate whether such uses should be limited to appropriate commercial zones.

Councilor Garrett agreed that such uses did not belong in neighborhood settings and supported reviewing them during the zoning rewrite.

Councilor Bogdin moved that staff be requested to remove auto washing and polishing as conditional uses from the SC1 zone during the zoning rewrite. The motion was seconded by Council Vice-Chair Christensen.

The motion passed 7-0.

Councilor Whitlock asked staff to clarify whether the proposal was driven primarily by staff planning objectives or by the applicant. Mr. Ardmore stated that the proposal was driven by the applicant but supported by the General Plan's mixed-use designation.

Councilor Whitlock questioned the development pattern of placing higher-impact uses adjacent to collectors followed by lower-impact uses and then residential, rather than integrating uses more fully. Mr. Ardmore responded that vertical mixed-use development is more typical in downtown contexts and that market conditions on the west side did not currently support that type of development.

Councilor Bogdin provided historical context regarding prior rezonings in the area and explained that earlier mixed-use rezonings were intended to ensure that commercial components would be developed rather than exclusively residential units. She expressed concern that the west side could become over-concentrated with commercial uses along the Parkway corridor, leaving northern neighborhoods underserved.

Director Peperone sought clarification regarding Council direction, noting that staff had recently advised another developer in the Lakeview area to incorporate a commercial node in response to longstanding community requests for additional commercial amenities on the west side. He asked for guidance if the Council's preference differed.

Councilor Bogdin clarified that while commercial uses were desired on the west side, they should be more centralized rather than concentrated along the Parkway. She emphasized the importance of locating commercial amenities in areas that would better serve northern and western neighborhoods rather than clustering them along arterial corridors in a way that might not meet community needs.

Councilor Whitlock asked a procedural question regarding the scheduling of the Work Meeting and Council Meeting for this item without a one-week interval. Council Executive Director Justin Harrison explained that, due to noticing requirements, rezones that are noticed for the Planning Commission are typically simultaneously noticed for the Council Meeting. He noted that the Council retains the option to continue an item if additional time is needed and referenced prior efforts to streamline development timelines.

City Attorney Brian Jones reiterated that the Council should not feel obligated to act on an item solely because it appears on the agenda and emphasized the Council's discretion to delay action if necessary.

**Item 3: A presentation regarding a City-Wide Economic Development Study (26-016)**  
**00:33:22**

Cody Hill, Economic Development Director, thanked the Council for its time and focus on economic development and expressed appreciation for the Council's collaboration on a citywide economic development study. Director Hill stated he had circulated a draft request for proposals (RFP) to Council members and requested feedback on any omissions, concerns, or elements the Council wished to revise or remove in order to finalize the RFP.

Director Hill acknowledged an email from Council Vice-Chair Christensen sent earlier that morning and reviewed Council Vice-Chair Christensen's suggested areas to sharpen and increase focus in the RFP. The suggestions discussed included clarifying the ultimate decisions the study should support, emphasizing implementation-level outputs with clearer time horizons, strengthening financial and fiscal impact analysis by considering impacts on City services, expanding competitive benchmarking and case studies, clarifying the industry selection methodology and how return on investment would be applied, broadening stakeholder engagement to include developers, capital providers, and site selectors, reviewing timeline and phasing (including a diagnostics phase), refining evaluation criteria to ensure implementable strategies, supporting capability transfer to City staff through workshops and a clean handoff, and including interim testing of recommendations.

When discussing interim testing of recommendations, Council Vice-Chair Christensen stated his intent was to ensure the study plan included milestones to test industry priorities, validate assumptions, and maintain leadership alignment, noting he was not prescribing how such testing should be conducted. Council Vice-Chair Christensen also reflected on the importance of prioritizing implementation over speed and stated that overly tight timeframes could limit the pool of qualified proposers and result in less useful deliverables.

Councilor Whitlock thanked Director Hill for the work and Council Vice-Chair Christensen for the feedback and expressed concern that the proposed scope appeared large relative to the anticipated timeline. Councilor Whitlock suggested allowing proposers flexibility to recommend timelines commensurate with scope and noted that the budget range should be defined for the RFP. Councilor Whitlock also commented on the section regarding defining success and stated there appeared to be numerous metrics; he suggested identifying a "North Star" metric with a smaller set of secondary key performance indicators. Council Vice-Chair Christensen agreed that prioritization of metrics would be helpful and offered observations regarding which metrics may be most relevant.

Councilor Whitlock recommended that the engagement model be more precise, including stage gates and steering committee reviews with the Council. He also stated that the word "attract" felt loaded and suggested emphasizing fostering and strengthening what is already present in the community. Councilor Whitlock further commented that place-based development appeared disconnected from the economic diagnosis and investment prioritization portions of the scope and suggested that thematic strategy should guide place-based recommendations rather than beginning with place.

Director Hill addressed the budget question and stated that the RFP could include an anticipated range without specifying a single figure, providing proposers a floor and ceiling for expected costs. Councilor Whipple expressed appreciation for the work and for the detailed feedback provided by Councilors Christensen and Whitlock. Council Chair MacKay commented that the RFP appropriately acknowledged Provo's unique culture and values and emphasized the importance of receiving tailored recommendations rather than a generic model. Director Hill referenced the concept of social capital included in the RFP and stated he anticipated it would emerge as a strength for Provo.

Council Vice-Chair Christensen suggested distributing a revised draft to Council members for review and indicated that a smaller working group could help answer questions and expedite completion. Councilor Whipple suggested not waiting for the next work session and expressed support for a small group meeting with Councilors Christensen and/or Whitlock to finalize edits. Councilor Whitlock stated that aligning on the definition of success and the key metric(s) was most important for ensuring the RFP met the Council's goals.

Director Hill stated he would survey all Council members regarding success metrics and then work with Councilors Whitlock and Christensen to finalize the draft. Councilor Whipple commented that Council members should respond promptly to the email request for input.

Council Vice-Chair Christensen thanked Director Hill for the priority and effort being given to the project and expressed appreciation for Director Hill's background and experience.

Justin Harrison, Council Executive Director, raised a budget timing consideration, noting the Council had initially discussed the study in the context of Fiscal Year 2027 priorities but that the process appeared to be moving more quickly. Executive Director Harrison suggested that an appropriation in the current fiscal year may be more appropriate to support the study timeline and reduce constraints on future-year budget forecasting. Director Hill stated that depending on how scope and timeline were aligned, the contract could involve incremental payments and potentially be split between fiscal years as work products were developed.

## **Adjournment**