

Marty Dargel

From: Amalie Ottley
Sent: Wednesday, June 10, 2026 5:21 PM
To: Michael Bryant; Marty Dargel
Subject: FW: Comment on Mangelson Zoning Proposal

Hello,

I received the following email and public comment regarding a public hearing set for the 24th of June at Planning Commission.

Thanks!



Amalie R. Ottley, CMC / UCC

City Recorder
439 W Utah Ave
Payson UT 84651
801.465.5205
www.paysonutah.gov

From: Rita Buhler <rita.buhler@outlook.com>
Sent: Wednesday, June 10, 2026 5:14 PM
To: Amalie Ottley <amalio@paysonutah.gov>
Subject: Comment on Mangelson Zoning Proposal

Dear City Recorder,

My wife and I are writing to share our concerns about the proposed General Plan amendment and zoning changes for Utah County parcels 300300009, 300300008, 300500023, and 300500024, land sometimes referred to as the Mangelson property. (I think the 300500024 listed in your Public Notices, is a typo because that parcel number is not located in Payson's boundaries.)

There were many factors involved with our choosing to purchase our house at 1187 E 180 S in Payson, three years ago. One of our greatest desires was to live in a less densely populated area of the county. When looking for homes we were attracted by the fact that the property east of ours was zoned and used for agriculture. Although the Payson East Side Comprehensive Plan Land Use Map indicates a probable transition of the land which is currently zoned as R-1-A, there was no indication that high density housing, such as that which was being constructed to the northeast of the Mangelson property, in a section designated as the "The District", would be considered for the R-1-A parcels. In addition, the location of the house at the end of a No Through Traffic Street was a major plus for us. As we anticipated, the limited traffic makes our section of 180 South a great, safe place for our grandchildren, as well as neighborhood children, to ride their bikes and scooters and for people to walk for exercise.

Since the completion of the townhouses and apartments on the former site of South Haven Farms, located just kitty-corner to the parcels being considered for rezoning, we have seen a significant increase in traffic on 100 South. Vehicles are now often parked on both sides of that street, between 2300 W and 2100 W, despite the townhomes along that section of road all having garages and the

apartment buildings having designated off street parking. We have lived in many places in various states and we have consistently found that areas of high-density housing units do not have sufficient off-street parking for the number of vehicles used by the residents. The parking congestion within the development results in insufficient space for children to safely ride their bikes and scooters.

As a resident of the neighborhood where the Mangelson property is located, where it is currently safe to walk and enjoy the land around us, we care about how this land is developed and the long-term impact on our community.

Although we are disheartened to see these parcels being considered to be transitioned from agriculture to residential, we would support transitioning it to low-density, single-family housing (R-1-10). However, we strongly oppose the proposed RMF-15 multi-family zoning and request that the plan be revised to allow only detached single-family homes.

Our concerns include:

- Maintaining Payson's character: Payson has historically been a family-centered community with primarily single-family homes. Preserving that pattern supports long-term stability and helps families remain in the area.
- School capacity: Local schools are already experiencing crowding. Adding higher-density housing could further strain classrooms and impact students and teachers.
- Cumulative growth: Significant development is already happening in nearby areas like Arrowhead and along Highway 198 in Salem. Additional high-density projects in this location will add to traffic, infrastructure strain, and regional congestion.
- Neighborhood stability: Single-family neighborhoods tend to support long-term residents, stronger community connections, and greater investment in the area. If the City approves a medium-density designation in an area planned and developed as Rural Residential, it will also undermine the predictability and stability that property owners rely upon when making investments in their homes and neighborhoods.
- Infrastructure and livability: Increased density can lead to more traffic, parking overflow, and pressure on water and city services. The roads serving this area were designed to support the existing rural residential pattern. Residents already experience concerns related to traffic volumes, roadway capacity, pedestrian safety, and access. Increasing residential density without corresponding roadway improvements would place additional strain on infrastructure that is not currently designed to accommodate substantially higher traffic volumes.
- Inconsistency with the Payson General Plan: The Payson General Plan emphasizes the preservation and improvement of existing neighborhoods and property values, the appropriate distribution of residential density, and the protection of established neighborhood character. The Plan further states that future development should protect existing neighborhoods while directing growth to locations where it can be supported by infrastructure and where it is compatible with surrounding land uses.

The property parcels are currently located within a Rural Residential area and surrounded by development patterns that reflect that designation and R-1-10 zoning. A change to Medium Density Residential would create a significant departure from the established character of the neighborhood. Such a change would introduce a level of density that is not consistent with the existing development pattern and would create an incompatible transition between surrounding properties and the proposed development.

For these reasons, we respectfully request that the Commission:

- Deny the RMF-15 multi-family zoning
- Approve consistent R-1-10 single-family zoning for this property
- Carefully gather and review updated data on traffic, infrastructure, and school capacity before making a final decision

Thank you for your service and for your commitment to carefully considered growth in Payson.

Sincerely,

Bruce and Rita Buhler