



PLANNING AND ZONING MEETING MINUTES

WEDNESDAY, NOVEMBER 19, 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, Cecilie Evans (Alternate), Tracey Wheeler (Alternate)

CITY STAFF PRESENT: Dan Jessen, City Manager (via Zoom); Scott Burns, City Attorney; Keith Naylor, Building Inspector; Callie Bassett, City Recorder

PUBLIC PRESENT: Councilmember John Dean, Larry Zajac

CALL TO ORDER

The meeting of the Parowan City Planning and Zoning Commission was called to order by Chairman Shane Williamson on Wednesday, November 19, 2025, at 6:00 PM.

DECLARATION OF CONFLICTS WITH ANY AGENDA ITEMS

No conflicts were declared by any commission members.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES FROM OCTOBER 15, 2025

Jerry Vesely noted there was a spelling error in the heading where "October" had an extra "o" in it. After brief discussion, no other corrections were identified.

Motion: Jerry Vesely moved to approve the minutes of October 15, 2025. Second: Cecilie Evans. Vote: Approved unanimously.

REVIEW AND POSSIBLE APPROVAL OF JUNIPER HILLS PHASE 2 PRELIMINARY PLAT

Dan Jessen presented comprehensive information about the Juniper Hills Phase 2 preliminary plat. This project had been initiated prior to the adoption of the Rural Done Right plan, therefore allowing it to move forward under the previous regulations. He detailed that the developers had addressed multiple required elements throughout the project's iterative process. Specific issues included the design of storm water detention, which will be located under the parking lot, and the requirement to annex Phase 2 into the current Phase 1 Homeowners Association (HOA). They had to ensure sufficient documentation was provided to demonstrate that Phase 2 can share the HOA infrastructure without infringing on existing Phase 1 residents.

Further, Dan explained that initially, the fencing code had been somewhat vague, but they managed to resolve those issues by clarifying and adhering to current standards. The developers addressed the need for a block wall along the east property line, which had previously been a point of concern, and included a 6-foot sight-obscuring fence between the two residential areas to ensure compliance with the fencing chapter of city ordinances.

During the review, Keith Naylor inquired whether the developers had acquired land across the southern boundary to correct the property line, which appeared to jut northwards into the parcel, raising concerns about boundary alignment. Dan acknowledged the complexity but focused the discussion on their

adherence to the necessary documented solutions, confirming that the southern boundary in question remained unchanged.

Meanwhile, David Burton sought an understanding of whether subsequent phases of development would receive similar grandfathered approvals or be subject to the new Rural Done Right regulations. Dan clarified that any future developments would indeed be subject to the current regulations post-January implementation of Rural Done Right.

The commission considered the project meticulously and concluded that they were ready to approve the preliminary plat, contingent on the comprehensive staff analysis and recommendations, despite remaining questions regarding whether the developers would complete the full build-out before requesting final plat approval or opt to provide financial surety to the city as an interim measure.

Motion: Jamie Bonnett moved to approve the Juniper Hills Phase 2 Preliminary Plat. Second: Jerry Vesely. Vote: Approved unanimously.

PUBLIC MEETING ON ANNEXATION POLICY PLAN & MAP – INPUT FROM AFFECTED ENTITIES

Dan Jessen explained that part of the procedure of updating the annexation policy plan & map was to notify affected entities (in this case the County Commissioners and the Iron County School District) that a public meeting would be held to receive their input. Since this was not a zone change, city code does not require notices to be sent out to the public. He mentioned wanting to make sure the public was aware of the discussion without creating unnecessary confusion. None of the affected entities attended the meeting to provide input.

No formal action was taken.

DISCUSSION TO FINALIZE SHARED DRIVEWAY CODE AND SCHEDULE PUBLIC HEARING DATE

Dan Jessen presented an in-depth review of the shared driveway code proposal to the commission. He outlined a structured continuum of options with increasing requirements based on the number of dwellings served, beginning with the most basic level:

1. **Standard Driveway:** This option serves a single dwelling or lot and requires a width of 12 feet.
2. **Shared Driveway:** Designed to accommodate up to two dwellings, this driveway must be 16 feet wide. It necessitates a recorded access and maintenance easement. The maximum allowable length is 150 feet unless an approved turnaround is included.
3. **Private Lane:** Aimed at serving 3 to 4 dwellings, the private lane mandates a 20-foot width and paving. It can extend up to 400 feet if equipped with a turnaround beyond 150 feet. All utilities must be placed within recorded easements of adequate width. Parking is strictly prohibited except in designated pullouts to ensure emergency access, in line with international fire code.
4. **Public Road Standard:** This level requires compliance with full subdivision street requirements, adhering to the standard regulatory measures that govern public roads.

Dan noted most provisions were derived from common sense and fire code regulations. During the discussion, he underscored the necessity of confirming that the shared driveway code would not conflict with the existing hillside development code, as consistency is crucial in regulatory measures. The commission concurred with Dan's proposal to scrutinize these potential conflicts. They agreed to revisit the issue and bring an updated proposal in the next meeting, thereby allowing for a thorough review prior to scheduling a public hearing date.

DISCUSSION ON UPDATING TYPICAL SECTIONS OF ROADWAYS IN CITY ENGINEERING STANDARDS

Dan Jessen provided an extensive review of the city's roadway standards, explaining that most subdivisions in Parowan have not followed the official "gold standard" 60-foot right-of-way with 42-foot asphalt width. He presented data showing most subdivisions have used 50-foot rights-of-way with approximately 34-35 feet of asphalt. He illustrated that there has been a variety of implementations with different widths of sidewalks and curb and gutter configurations across the city, which led to a discussion about the practicality and implications of maintaining the current standards.

Key discussion points included state law limitations on maximum pavement width that cities can require when developers use "low impact development" (LID) approaches without curb and gutter. Dan clarified the importance of determining when curb, gutter, and sidewalk are explicitly required in new subdivisions, emphasizing that this could have significant legal and logistical ramifications if not properly defined.

Another significant point of consideration was the potential for a 50-foot right-of-way standard that could still accommodate necessary infrastructure like parking, adequate travel lanes, and sidewalks. This was viewed as a potential solution to balance the need for housing affordability against the city's infrastructure needs. He also noted how snow removal on narrower streets could pose additional challenges.

Regarding ADA requirements, the discussion touched upon sidewalk widths where narrower sidewalks might necessitate regular passing areas to comply with regulations, highlighting the necessity for a consistent approach.

Jamie Bonnett expressed strong support for reducing the right-of-way to 50 feet, noting that 60-foot rights-of-way with 42-foot roads seemed excessive compared to existing subdivisions that function well under narrower conditions. Jamie appreciated that narrower roads might help to reduce speeds and discourage unwanted large vehicles from parking in residential areas.

Tracey Wheeler shared that developers had voiced concerns about the current 60-foot requirement making development in Parowan less affordable, citing feedback from contractors who noted that other areas might become more attractive for development due to these restrictions. Tracey also mentioned exploring more rural aesthetic options without curb and gutter in their development plans.

Cecilie Evans raised questions about the practicality and timing of sidewalk installations. She pointed out that when sidewalks are installed before homes are built, they often sustain damage during construction, leading to premature replacement and increased costs. There was a consensus that considering the potential revision of installation timing and practices could alleviate some of these issues.

The commissioners generally concurred to: consider creating a 50-foot right-of-way standard for new developments; eliminate the "no on-street parking" option from the standards as it didn't offer considerable benefits to developers or residents; and take time to research and drive through various subdivisions to observe actual conditions and inform their decisions before making final recommendations. Dan offered to promptly email the subdivision measurements to all members for further consideration and invited commissioners to explore the implications practically in the lead-up to the next meeting.

MEMBER REPORTS

David Burton mentioned he had some written comments but would save them for a future meeting.

Dan reported that the city council approved the new building inspection code. This was not brought to the Planning Commission because it did not involve land use. The code was adopted because the city will be doing its own building inspections. He said they referenced the international building codes, and the Utah Wildland Urban Interface (WUI) code. The city had to adopt the state's WUI code by law by January 1, 2026, so that was included in the building code. Dan said the city is also required to adopt the WUI map, which is where the local entity defines where the WUI code will apply. He said they have received zero guidance on this. Dan mentioned that one good thing about the WUI is that it will hold insurance companies within certain boundaries.

No other commission members had reports.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Larry Zajac urged the commission to broaden its perspective when considering road widths. He expressed concern that discussions currently overlook the active transportation plan and accompanying needs. Mr. Zajac posed several questions for the commission's consideration:

- If a 60-foot right-of-way is not necessary, could the excess space be repurposed for trails?
- Considering the new subdivision open space code, which sometimes results in the city not wanting the extra space, could that area be converted into active transportation trails on a foot-by-foot basis?

He concluded by asking the commission to evaluate road widths comprehensively, keeping these broader community and transportation needs in mind.

ADJOURN

Motion: Jamie Bonnett moved to adjourn the meeting. Second: Cecilie Evans. Vote: Approved unanimously. The meeting adjourned at 7:31 p.m.



Callie Bassett, CMC, City Recorder

Date Approved: 12/03/2025