

Marty Dargel

From: Nikelle Stoutsenberger <nzeeman21@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, June 10, 2026 11:52 AM
To: Marty Dargel
Subject: Comment on Mangelson Zoning Proposal

Dear Members of the Planning Commission,

I am writing to share my concerns about the proposed General Plan amendment and zoning changes for the Mangelson property.

I have lived in this area for over 30 years. As a resident of Payson I care deeply about how this land is developed and the long-term impact on our community.

I support transitioning this land to low-density, single-family housing (R-1-10). However, I strongly oppose the proposed RMF-15 multi-family zoning and ask that the plan be revised to allow only detached single-family homes.

My 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 would 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, I 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 time and for your commitment to thoughtful growth in Payson.

Sincerely,
Nikelle Stoutsenberger

622 s 1400 e Payson