

Provo City Planning Commission

Report of Action

August 12, 2026

ITEM 3 Tyson Reynolds requests Concept Plan approval for a 33-unit townhome development in a proposed LDR (Low Density Residential) Zone, located at 2000 N Canyon Road. Pleasant View Neighborhood. Dustin Wright (801) 852-6414 dwright@provo.gov PLCP20260117

The following action was taken by the Planning Commission on the above described item at its regular meeting of August 12, 2026:

DENIED

On a vote of 4:2, the Planning Commission denied the above noted application.

Motion By: Melissa Kendall

Second By: Jon Lyons

Votes in Favor of Motion: Melissa Kendall, Jon Lyons, Jonathon Hill, Matt Wheelwright

Votes against the Montion: Joel Temple, Tosh Metzger

Matt Wheelwright 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.

RELATED ACTIONS

Planning Commission, August 12, 2026, Item 2, recommended denial on rezone - PLRZ20260116

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

- There are remaining issues from the Coordinator Review Committee (CRC) review that need to be resolved.

NEIGHBORHOOD MEETING DATE

- A neighborhood meeting was held on 04/1/2026.

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:

- The units should be owner occupied by deed restriction.
- Needs open space to make it more attractive to families.
- Many of the neighbors want to see the 19 single-family homes and not what is now being proposed.
- This is a request to upzone to double the density.
- The street width is not enough to meet code requirements.
- These are not going to help with affordable housing.
- The hill was removed so that the 19 homes could go in with ADUs and they would meet housing needs better.
- Adjacent property owners have experienced damage due to the hillside removal.

APPLICANT RESPONSE

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

- The retaining wall is 80% complete.
- The neighborhood didn't like the student housing project, and the market doesn't make sense for single-family housing, and it is more applicable to meet needs for affordable housing by providing twin homes.
- This development will fit better with what is around it.
- Amenity space in the LDR zone is better designed for apartment projects. These units have their own yards and don't need additional amenity space. There is some amenity space on the north side. They can look at putting amenity space above the wall, but that is not desired.
- Each unit has more parking spaces than is required.
- There are less buildings than there was in the approved 19-unit single-family detached design.
- These will meet the 30' height requirements.
- These homes will be for sale.

PLANNING COMMISSION DISCUSSION

Key points discussed by the Planning Commission included the following:

- The existing slope is being removed. There is a new retaining wall being constructed.
- There is insufficient amenity space provided to meet code requirements. The plans do not show building heights being met.
- Parking requirements are met by having 4 spaces when 2.25 are required.
- City Council revised street width this past spring. The narrowest width was 24' and is now 30'. This would need to be extended to 30' to meet the new street width if it was after that change.
- Sidewalks only extend in some of the development on one side. Public Works explained that this is to minimize the amount of slope.
- This is more compatible to the surrounding area as transitional housing.
- Some commissioners' concerns were regarding the street width and if this application was submitted before the recent change to 30', density being increased after approval of the zone, and the lack of assurance that owner occupancy would be enforceable.



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