

To the Provo Planning Commission Members:

I am a longtime Provo city homeowner living in the Carterville neighborhood on 2000 N street just down from the proposed zoning change. I am very much opposed to this zoning change. At the time we purchased our property, the area was zoned R2, and we had the intention of building several duplexes. There were already a number of duplex units in the area, but we soon learned that rental property did not receive the same care and upkeep that owner-occupied houses did, so we abandoned the idea of building duplexes and focused on encouraging the improvement of existing homes in our neighborhood. The zoning in our area was changed from R2 to R1 and we were happy with that. Our area is a fairly quiet pocket of residential properties with a slight country feel to it. Even though the property in question is on the border between existing commercial property and a residential conservation area, I feel that this zoning change would encourage further encroachment into our neighborhood and ultimately change the dynamic of this area.

I realize that Provo City is bursting at the seams and would hope that careful long-term planning be considered for every area in the city. I am not against development in Provo, but I would like to see development that benefits and preserves neighborhoods and home ownership. I feel that there are many alternative options for this property other than turning it into commercial property. I would like to see more encouragement for smaller, reasonably-priced, single family, owner-occupied homes throughout the city, and especially in my neighborhood. I think we all need to concern ourselves with the resource footprints we make on this planet, and it might as well begin on our street.

Thank you for your consideration of this matter.

Regards,

Doug Soelberg
869 W 2000 N
Provo, UT 84604
aagdesign@gmail.com
801-636-1729

I have been a resident in this neighborhood for over 43 years, I have enjoyed the "country lane" atmosphere here and getting to know new neighbors along with long-time neighbors. I don't want the lot at 1009 W. 2000 N to be rezoned to Commercial. I want to keep this area residential. I realize our neighborhood has some issues, but I think having this 3-story office building will bring in too much disturbing light at night, business traffic during the day behind the duplexes on 2000 N, and allow possibly unsavory people to notice our secluded neighborhood. I prefer to let our own neighborhood take care of our issues instead of Dudley and Associates "cleaning up the area", as was stated at the last meeting.

I am also afraid if the zoning is changed to Commercial and the office building is allowed, our property values will be adversely affected. And this opens the door for more developers to request rezoning.

Sincerely,
Karen Gingras
[878 W 2000 N](#)
[Provo](#)

To whom it may concern:

I presently own a duplex at 967 and 969 W 2000 N so my property will be directly affected by this change. From what I was told the desire is to place a medical office building on the property and have the alley be an egress onto 2000 N. I also understand that the building to the south is also owned by the same organization and that property has 2 entrances onto State St that should decrease any use of that alley way.

My questions are these:

1. Has there been a study on any need to upgrade the quality of road for 2000 N as there will be an increase in the traffic volume? If not, why not? If this has not been done because it is felt that the alley will not be used that often then why do we have this egress at all and the patients can use the present exits onto State Street? Even if this alley way is not used frequently by the patients it will not be long before it becomes a thoroughfare for people who want to have a faster route to the neighborhoods to the north of us. At present 2000 N is a quiet residential dead end street where children can be seen playing in the street. Obviously it will no longer be this if the zoning is changed.
2. What is being done to insure that the property owners use of their property and yard will be insured once the office building is finished? Will there be a tree barrier that obscures the view of the building and cut down on any parking lights and noise caused by the new building? If this has not been addressed then I think it should.
3. Is there any way to determine the type of renters who will using the medical building? Will it be general practitioners, drug counselors, emergency facility, etc? Obviously, if it is going to be used for drug rehab then there will be more concern. If it is to be an emergency facility there may be noise late in the evenings or even in the early mornings. These would obviously change the dynamics of this quiet neighborhood.

Doing this zoning change will affect the property values in the neighborhood, probably for the worse. Hopefully, by addressing these questions it will help minimize this.

These questions need to be addressed before approval could be given.

Sincerely,

Glenn K Davis II, MD

The Five Myths of Property Considered for Rezone

My name is Joel Asay and I live at 937 W 2000 N, right next to the lot being considered for rezone. I want to exploit the five myths of the property being considered for rezone.

1) Myth #1 - No one will buy unless rezoned

I have lived in the Carterville neighborhood for 17 years and this property has never once been on the market, we cannot make the claim that no one will buy it if that has not been proven. In fact, I was personally interested and went under contract to purchase the lot. Even though we had to drop out due to unexpected circumstance, there is no doubt that it will sell, 1 acre is impossible to find in the middle of Provo City and, for the right price, buyers will come scrambling to make an offer.

2) Myth #2 - Property will be an eyesore if we don't rezone

We as the neighbor have access to resources that will enforce the restrictions that are currently being violated. We do not need a commercial building to come "save the day". In fact, the replacement eyesore would be an ugly always-half-emptied parking lot with parking lights literally giving us eyesore at night. The 10 feet fence will be unnatural and overbearing from the neighbor's perspective, which would potentially hurt our land value. Who wants to buy a house right next to a parking lot unless it's truly a bargain?

3) Myth #3 – Owner of Grandview Medical will be accommodating with our concerns

We have multiple times called the owners to express our concerns about the lights and random strangers walking through our private backyards just to go through the gate or around the fence to get to State street. I know at least a couple neighbors have tried contacting the owner to no avail. The only change we finally saw was the turning of the business sign at 10:30 p.m., which was not the problem in the first place. This "change" happened mere weeks before the first neighborhood meeting rather than years ago. Why would his behavior change should he put new commercial property that would now be 10 feet away from us? How can we trust that he would be the "good neighbor" he promises to be when putting in another commercial building?

4) Myth #4 - If we don't make this a medical practice commercial area, we would see worse

This was an actual claim by the builder representing the buyer. That claim actually felt like a threat, that we would see a much bigger and worse commercial building if we don't comply. We as the neighbor simply do not need saving from commercial developers. This spot can be made into a residential such as four or five single family homes that will house people who will actually care about the Carterville neighborhood and wants to invest in the livable area. We used to have a reputation of being the worst area ridden with crimes and drug houses, but we have come a long way in cleaning up the property and have seen owners, including myself, personally invested in the area by moving there and remodeling their homes. Please do not rezone, as this would greatly hinder years of progress.

5) Myth #5 - This is not a spot zoning

The current owner has purposely left the current white house in a bad shape with no attempt to improve on it, there has long been the hope of the owner that this residential lot would be converted to commercial. Had he known that rezoning was never possible, he would have taken a different tactic on it and better care for it, even selling to an interested buyer that wants to put residential homes on it. I personally invite each of you to come to view the lot. One of the first thing you'll notice is that the land drop-off creates a natural barrier dividing between the residential and commercial. A rezone will create a feeling of invasion from the commercial zones that crosses the line. Again, I urge and invite you come and take a look and it will be clear to you what we mean.

Thank you.

Joel Asay

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing in response of the proposed rezoning of Carterville neighborhood from residential to commercial. I am against this proposal for several reasons. The road they would like to build on is a very narrow road with no sidewalks. Every time I'm there, there are several kids playing along the side of this road. It's easier to walk than drive on it. The equipment needed to build this building and the increased traffic is of utmost concern to me.

We moved to this area because it is a neighborhood, not some houses around a strip mall or industrial park. Letting this building come would open up the entire neighborhood to the possibility of more businesses buying up homes and land and putting more buildings in. This will cause property values to go down and ruined the environment we want there.

When the BRT was built, we as a neighborhood really had to fight to get Provo City to care about and take care of our area. John Curtis, who was mayor at the time, and David Sewell made it very clear they could not and would not help us. They wouldn't attend meetings. They said their hands were tied, etc. It was so disappointing. We were able to get a sound wall but it was evident we are not considered an important part of Provo. I feel this is another attempt to get rid of our neighborhood and sell it off to developers.

Of course the one thing Provo needs is another office building that will sit vacant after the fist six months to a year it's built! Why not build in one of many empty places already built? What's wrong with one of those empty buildings on University Parkway down the hill below the Carterville area? What about at the so called "Mix" that was supposed to built several years ago? One of my pet peeves of Provo is developers building and then the offices all sit empty.

I understand Provo has worked with other neighborhoods to improve and enhance there areas. I would like to explore those options rather than just be bought out and sold off. I say not to zoning for commercial use.

Thank you,
Julie Tracy

To the Provo City Council Members,

I am a homeowner that has lived on 2000 N street for over the past 40 years. We bought this property to develop it when the zoning was R2, as our small home sits on one of the seven 1/2 acre lots on 2000 North. When the Zoning was changed to Residential Conservation we were happy to focus on cleaning up the neighborhood (Neighborhood Watch) and single home owner development. This has paid off as many young couples have bought homes and fixed them up in our area, making it a much nicer place to live.

I believe that this area is the best kept secret in Provo and we have worked hard to maintain the quiet neighborly feel to it. Any zoning change from Residential Conservation to Commercial would change the dynamics of this area and could set a precedence to continue to open up our neighborhood to further Commercial zoning. This would be devastating to our pocket of a tight knit community that we cherish.

I am strongly opposed to any change from Residential to Commercial zoning in our neighborhood, however after talking with Gary McGinnis we would like to see thorough, long-term planning considered by the city, to explore long term options to help revitalize and protect the Carterville area. I have observed other areas in Provo that have done neighborhood plans like this that have served to protect the unique residential attributes that allow families and individuals to thrive in a close-knit environment

There are many alternative options for this property that are compatible with the fabric of the neighborhood that would fit in and enhance our neighborhood much better and help to define a vision for the Carterville area that promotes a safe and attractive environment for our residents.

Thank you for your consideration of this matter,

Regards,

Cheri Soelberg
Vice Neighborhood Chair
869 W 2000 N
Provo, Ut 84604
cherisberg@hotmail.com
801.636.6199

September 25, 2019

To the Provo City Planning Commission:

We are writing to express our concerns about the proposed commercial development and zoning change at 1009 West 2000 North, in the Carterville neighborhood, by Dudley and Associates.

First, we want to make a plea that the Planning Commission and City Council give highest consideration to the views and opinions of those homeowners most directly affected by the proposed project: All those living on 2000 North—but especially those whose property is adjacent to the project, those who have a direct view onto the property, and those living on the west end of 2000 North who will be affected by potential light pollution from the proposed clinic and parking lot. (At the informational Carterville neighborhood meeting on Sept 5th, there were people in attendance who expressed very strong opinions but didn't even know the location of the proposed development.)

The Dudley and Associates proposal massively impacts our family: we live directly across the street from the property, and two of our children and their families live in homes whose back yards adjoin the property. In 2011, when we purchased and renovated our home at 962 West 2000 North, we chose to make a large investment in the neighborhood. It seemed like a neighborhood that had fallen on hard times but was poised to make a comeback as more owners began again to occupy the homes. Encroachment into the residential area by a large commercial development seems like a setback.

What is clear is that the current situation is untenable. The current owner has neglected the property for years, and has used it to store junk and rusting vehicles. The home on the property is severely run down. It seems to have become a magnet for illegal drug activity—buying, selling, and using. We are concerned for our safety, and the safety of the children in our neighborhood.

We want to say that we unequivocally oppose this commercial development in a residential neighborhood. It is the wrong development, in the wrong place, at the wrong time.

In our opinion, property owners on 2000 North have not had the opportunity to consider other, more appropriate projects on the property in question, because none have been brought forward for our consideration. We know that there has been at least one serious proposal to purchase the property and build affordable, single-family homes there. The potential buyers were under contract to purchase the property, and went to Provo City to present their plans, only to be told that the water main on the street wouldn't support the 5 additional homes proposed, because the fire department wanted more pressure for a new hydrant. Not having the resources to pay for that upgrade, the potential buyers were forced to withdraw their offer.

We have heard repeatedly that Provo city leaders want to preserve the character of residential neighborhoods and make it possible to build more affordable homes in these neighborhoods. Why then, in this case, were obstacles thrown up that essentially torpedoed this neighborhood-appropriate project? It seems to me that if the City is serious about helping to preserve and improve residential neighborhoods that city administrators would look for ways to help projects like this, instead of making them more difficult. Is there really no way to find funding for utility upgrades that could smooth the way for desirable development in residential areas? Are there other workable solutions that would make residential development possible?

We said above that the current situation, with a deteriorating, neglected property attracting crime and presenting an eyesore, is untenable. And so it is. But we do not feel it is fair for property owners in the neighborhood to be held hostage by one neglectful property owner and an inappropriate commercial development that presents itself as a solution to these problems. While it might provide some relief from the deteriorating property on the other side of our fences, we believe that it will negatively affect property values and quality of life on 2000 North. We believe that there are other potential projects that could resolve the problems, while still preserving the residential atmosphere of the street. We want to have the opportunity to hear and give our input on these types of projects. But if the city moves to approve this zoning change request, we will never get the chance.

As we said at the outset of this letter, the proposed commercial development on 2000 North is the wrong development, in the wrong place, at the wrong time. We urge that the Planning Commission recommend to the City Council that they reject the rezoning request.

Devin and Wendy Asay
962 W 2000 N
Provo