



PAROWAN CITY PLANNING AND ZONING MEETING MINUTES

Wednesday, September 3, 2025 – 6:00 P.M.

Parowan City Council Chambers

35 E 100 N, Parowan, UT 84761

Office: (435) 477-3331

COMMISSION MEMBERS PRESENT: Shane Williamson (Chair), Jamie Bonnett, Weston Reese, Jerry Vesely, Councilman David Burton

EXCUSED: Cecilie Evans (Alternate), Tracey Wheeler (Alternate)

CITY STAFF PRESENT: Mollie Halterman, Mayor; Dan Jessen, City Manager; Scott Burns, City Attorney; Keith Naylor, Assistant Zoning Administrator

PUBLIC PRESENT: Austin Hales, Lesli Walker, Trent Staheli, John Dean, Larry Zajac

CALL TO ORDER

Shane Williamson called the Planning and Zoning Commission meeting to order on September 3, 2025.

DECLARATION OF CONFLICTS WITH ANY AGENDA ITEMS

No conflicts were declared by the commission members.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES FROM AUGUST 20, 2025

Jerry Vesely made a motion to approve the minutes from August 20, 2025.

Weston Reese seconded the motion. The motion was approved unanimously.

NONEXCLUSIVE INGRESS/EGRESS EASEMENT – 1200 W and OLD HWY 91

City Manager Dan Jessen introduced the non-exclusive ingress/egress easement for a property at 1200 West and Old Highway 91. He explained that this was not a new issue, as the Planning Commission had previously dealt with it when updating the transportation master plan.

Dan described the property in question, showing the location on a map. He explained that the property was currently a flag lot with a 12-foot (later corrected to 17.17-foot) wide driveway accessing James Ipson's parcel. The city had previously updated the transportation master plan, reducing the number of crossings over the flood channel in this area.

Dan explained that the applicant, Lesli Walker (represented by her brother Trent Staheli), had initially approached the city about subdividing the property into four parcels, which would have required installing a public road. They later changed their request to simply build a single home on the property, but their building permit application was denied because city code requires lots to have frontage on a fully improved, dedicated, or publicly approved street. However, the code does include a provision that the Planning Commission and City Council can approve a private street or right-of-way.

Dan noted that the applicant has a utility and ingress/egress easement recorded against James Ipson's property, providing legal access to their property. He also discussed the city's collective driveway ordinance, which allows driveways serving two or fewer dwellings to be paved to a width of at least 10 feet and not exceed 150 feet in length, while driveways serving more than two dwellings must be at

least 18 feet wide. He pointed out that these standards align with the International Fire Code requirements.

The current easement is 17.17 feet wide with a turnaround area. Dan noted that while this doesn't fully meet fire code standards, it does include the required turnaround. He emphasized that approval of this easement would not make the road city-maintained.

Trent Staheli spoke on behalf of his sister Lesli, explaining that they purchased the property about four years ago and did their due diligence regarding what they could build. They were told that a subdivision would require more access and a zone change, but a single dwelling would be permitted. Mr. Staheli stated that they had already installed an 8-inch water line with a fire hydrant, as required by the previous city manager. They plan to continue farming alfalfa on the property while adding a single home.

Commission members discussed the application, with Jamie Bonnett stating she saw no problem allowing a single home with the understanding that if the property were ever subdivided, the owners would need to build a proper road. Weston Reese agreed, confirming that the turnaround area was adequate.

Jamie Bonnett moved to approve a building permit using the right-of-way as an access point instead of an approved street, noting that the city may not maintain the road or offer trash services to it, and with the knowledge that if it's ever subdivided or wanted to be developed, they would have to build out that road. Jerry Vesely seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

CONTINUED DISCUSSION ON FENCE ORDINANCES

Dan Jessen presented updates to the proposed fence ordinance that he had reworked according to the previous meeting's discussion. The changes included adding three definitions:

1. Non-obscuring fence (50% open)
2. Site obscuring fence (less than or equal to 10% open)
3. Opaque/high screen fence (less than or equal to 5% open)

He also added specifications for acceptable materials for each type of fence and maintained consistent language regarding fence heights (minimum 6 feet, maximum 8 feet).

The commission had an extensive discussion about who should be responsible for installing fencing between commercial and residential properties. The current language requires:

- Commercial/industrial developments abutting residential properties to install a masonry wall
- Residential developments abutting commercial/industrial properties to install a masonry wall
- The developer who comes in last is responsible for installing the required fence

Weston Reese expressed concern that requiring masonry walls in all situations might be too restrictive and expensive, suggesting that different types of commercial uses might warrant different fencing requirements. Jamie Bonnett preferred keeping the masonry requirement for all commercial properties.

The commission discussed whether to keep a provision allowing property owners to mutually agree to a lower fencing standard. Scott Burns raised concerns that such agreements could lead to future complaints if properties change hands. After discussion, they decided to keep this provision only for conditional use permits, where the agreement would be formally recorded.

John Dean, a member of the public, raised questions about enforcement in specific scenarios, such as when a commercial property is built adjacent to a subdivision where not all lots have homes yet, when

conditional use permits require fencing, and when phased developments like the RV resort are required to install fencing.

After addressing these questions and making clarifications to the language, the commission agreed to move the updated fence ordinance to a public hearing.

Jamie Bonnett moved to move the fencing code modifications to public hearing on September 17, 2025. Jerry Vesely seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

REPORTS

Shane Williamson reported that he would be absent from the September 17 meeting as he would be elk hunting in Idaho. No other reports were given.

PUBLIC COMMENT

No comments were made by the public.

ADJOURN

Jerry Vesely moved to adjourn the meeting. Jamie Bonnett seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously and the meeting adjourned.



Callie Bassett, CMC,
City Recorder

Date Approved: 9/17/2025