

Provo City Planning Commission

# Report of Action

December 7, 2022

\*ITEM #6 Development Services requests a complete revision of the Provo General Plan to guide growth and development for the next 10 to 20 years in Provo. Citywide application. Brandon Larsen (801) 852-6408 [jblarsen@provo.org](mailto:jblarsen@provo.org) PLGPA20210364

The following action was taken by the Planning Commission on the above-described item at its regular meeting of December 7, 2022:

## APPROVED

On a vote of 5:0, the Planning Commission approved the above-noted application.

Motion By: Andrew South

Second By: Robert Knudsen

Votes in Favor of Motion: Daniel Gonzales, Raleen Wahlin, Andrew South, Melissa Kendall, and Robert Knudsen

Daniel Gonzales acted 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.

### **GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT**

A link to the text of the proposed amendment is attached as Exhibit A.

### **STAFF PRESENTATION**

The Staff Report to the Planning Commission provides details of the facts related to the proposal and the staff's analysis, conclusions, and recommendations. Additionally, staff presented the following regarding the proposed General Plan:

- Process for the revising the proposed General Plan
- Similarities and differences between the December 2021 General Plan proposal and the current proposal
- Key points from the chapters and appendices of the proposed General Plan
- Review of the proposed General Plan Map update

### **CITY DEPARTMENTAL ISSUES**

The Coordinator Review Committee (CRC) and City department heads reviewed the proposed General Plan and have given their feedback.

### **NEIGHBORHOOD MEETING DATE**

- Citywide application; all Neighborhood Chairs received notification.

## **NEIGHBORHOOD AND PUBLIC COMMENT**

- **Kat Linford**, Provo resident, questioned that public input for the General Plan was skewed by the student population. She noted students do not stay in Provo long-term. The short-term students are dictating a plan for long-term residents. The Transportation Master Plan (TMP) is outdated; it wants to uproot residents and destroy neighborhoods. We will lose our homes if the TMP goes forward as planned. She addressed the speed limit of 800/820 North and the death of Isabelle Parr.
- **Rebecca Jackson**, Provo resident, lives on 820 North. She questioned whether we need another major artery. How would an additional artery add to the “Welcome Home” motto of Provo. She talked about concern for safety of the road and referred to Isabelle Parr. She prefers a bikeable, walkable, neighborhood city. Does the convenience of another artery have to disrupt the enjoyment of their neighborhood? Consider what the TMP does to normal residents of the City.
- **Margret Hernandez**, Provo resident, talked about the “Welcome Home” motto. She said that what makes Provo seem like home is local schools, neighbors, etc. We need to consider quality of life in our transportation planning. Make our roadways safer and enhance them.
- **Marianne Anderson**, Provo resident, said if the TMP is implemented she will lose her home of 42 years. We do not feel that widening the road for people to come doctor appointments is in the best interest of Provo City citizens. I think we need to focus on neighborhood unity. If put the road in (820 North) it will destroy about 40 homes. We chose to live on the (Provo) River. We do not need to widen the road and put a walkway on the other side of the river. Parks are not more important than people.
- **Van Linford**, Provo resident, also chose the River as a place to live. He has lived in the area for 25 years and does not want to start over. The River is important to local residents. He stated the City is proposing another park near 820 North. He spoke of concern for what he perceived as a proposed 120-foot right-of-way for 820 North. He spoke of excessive speeding along the road. We have been to every meeting (apparently about 820 North) and will be at every meeting. They need to work transportation plans around the neighborhood. The proposed widening is basically for BYU and the Utah Valley Hospital. The approval of this Plan will ruin our neighborhood.
- **Kelly Erickson**, Provo resident, said I do not understand why the road needs to be widened if the reason is for BYU or the hospital. She would like to see the numbers if that is the justification for widening the road. She talked about how Provo has spent so much money on encouraging the usage of public transit. To widen the road is to encourage access into a city that is priding itself on public transit. Why are we proposing to spend money to widen roads when we are trying to encourage the use of public transit. She spoke of air quality issues.
- **Aaron Skabelund**, Provo resident, said we understand that the General Plan does not specifically address the proposed widening of 820 North, but references the TMP. These people and others will be showing up to speak to the Council about the proposed widening. He helped give feedback in earlier drafts of the General Plan and hopes some of the same policies are still included in it. I hope you as a Commission will express to the Council that you heard from residents about their concerns for 820 North being widened. Do we want Provo to be like every other city in Utah County or do we want it to remain as the most urban city in the County, which encourages walkability and bikeability? The proposed road expansion will flood the 820 North area and the City with traffic. We are going to keep fighting on this issue.

## **PLANNING COMMISSION DISCUSSION**

Key points discussed by the Planning Commission included the following:

- The Planning Commission expressed general satisfaction with the proposed General Plan.
- Commissioner Kendall made staff aware of a few potential mistakes in the Public Engagement appendix.
- Commissioner Gonzales suggested the addition a sentence in the Resource Management Chapter about the protection of wetlands.
- The staff confirmed to the Planning Commission that action regarding the General Plan (adoption or not) has no bearing on the current Transportation Master Plan; that the General Plan draft does not specifically refer to 820 North and that the TMP is not on the PC agenda this evening.
- There was discussion about the weight of college students’ feedback on the Plan.



---

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**

## **Exhibit “A”**

Link to Proposed General Plan: <https://www.provo.org/departments/development/planning/general-plan>