

January 17, 2026

To: Parowan Planning and Zoning Commission  
Parowan City Corporation  
P.O. Box 576  
35 E. 100 N  
Parowan, Utah 84761

From: Mr. Frank R. Lewis  
P.O. Box 721  
73 N. 775 W.  
Parowan, Utah 84761

Re: Rezoning of parcel# A-0026-0027-0000 from A-1 to R-3 Zoning

I received a letter on January 16, 2026 from this commission regarding a request to change the zoning of the above parcel. I am not an expert in the classifications, but I have done some research. I have concerns regarding changing the zoning of this parcel to an R-3 zone. From my limited research, I believe a zoning of R-3 would not be in the best interest of Parowan and its residents in this area. I would request that an R-1 zoning be allowed and at the most an R-2 zoning with restrictions.

Some of my concerns are density, type of residential structures, traffic, and privacy.

**Density and type of residential structures:**

The areas surrounding on the East and North of this parcel comprise of a mixture of primarily single story residential homes, single story residential homes with basements, and a couple two story residential homes. These homes are on a mixture of large, medium, and small lots.

My concern is an R-3 rezoning would allow too many homes to be built on small lots and would be too dense for the area in regards to population and traffic. Also the type of structures such as apartments, condominiums, etc. are not in character of the area and would negatively impact on the adjacent residents and its ambiance.

**Traffic:**

I am a retired highway patrol officer. I worked traffic for almost 30 years. When I look at google maps I see issues. I know human behavior, how driver's behave when driving, and the traffic they create. Currently there are no plans available to see how the streets would be designed to alleviate the increased traffic issue.

**Traffic Continued:**

Regarding streets, 825 W., 850 W., and 875 W., these streets travel in a North/South direction with the North ends terminating at 200 N. street and the South ends terminating at the parcel. If the parcel was connected to all three of these streets, this would allow traffic and emergency vehicles to have three access points to directly access this area. This would reduce and disperse roadway use and wear onto three different streets.

Regarding connecting the 100 N. street to the parcel. The 100 N. street travels in an East/West direction with the West end of 100 N. street terminating at the East side of the parcel, and the East end of the 100 N. street terminating into a dead end east of 600 W. street and well before connecting to 600 W. street. To connect 100 N. street to the 600 W. street, would require the city of Parowan to use “Immanent Domain” to take several hundred feet of private property, the expense of buying the private property, and expense of building a roadway from where 100 N. street ends currently to where 100 N. street would connect with 600 W. street. For 100 N. street to become a straightaway and direct access for traffic from this parcel to 600 W. street this seems what would need to happen.

There is another issue regarding connecting and using 100 N. street. If the West end of 100 N. street is connected to the East end of the parcel but no connection with 600 W. street is created, this creates other issues. As I have indicated before I understand human nature and how it affects driving patterns to develop. There is a saying the shortest way between two points is a straight line. Well there is no straight line between the parcel and 600 W. street. Human nature dictates, people driving vehicles from this new housing area, who want to travel toward the South where the post office, the general store, the on-ramp to the S/B I-15, etc.. will use this route because that would be the most direct route. This leads all of these drivers into an established residential area where there are currently 40 homes built. The driver/traffic coming from the parcel would travel East on 100 N. street and then turn right onto either 775 W. street or 725 W. street and all drivers/traffic would still come onto a single street, 60 W. street to make a left turn toward 600 W. street and the reverse is true coming from the South. The roadway in this area was not designed to handle the additional traffic and wear and tear on the roadway. Currently, 100 N. street and the nearby residential roadways are degraded and should be repaved. If 100 N. street is opened, rather than all the traffic and wear and tear being dis-pursed on three separate streets (825 W., 850 W, and 875 W.) a funnel effect occurs where a large amount of traffic from this parcel would travel through this one street, 60 W. street on a daily bases.

**Privacy:**

I bought my current home approximately 3 years ago. The backyard of my home (the West side) connects directly to the parcel (the East side). My house and me neighbors houses are slightly elevated from the parcel. My main concern is apartment buildings, condominiums, or two story houses being built near my backyard which would allow the occupants to look down into my backyard and worse yet directly into my home.

As I have stated, I am a former peace officer. I value my privacy and the ambiance of the area. I tell my family and friends that Parowan is very much like Mayberry in the Andy Griffith show. An area that has everything. It is calm and quiet. I value the serenity of where I live in Parowan. The reason why I would prefer the rezoning of the property to be R-1 is to prevent apartments buildings, condominiums, or two story houses being built. Trying to be reasonable, I am not opposed to single story houses or houses with basements being built on reasonable sized lots, but not elevated structures like the dark gray condominiums recently constructed near the I-15 freeway or houses barely fitting onto a small lots with zero lot lines.

**Summation:**

I understand that this parcel is owned by PCP Trust, LLC. This is private property, and they would like to make adjustments to the zoning from A-1 to R-3. To allow them to use their land to what is most advantageous for them. I undersstand and respect that. I also understand time stands still for no man and things change over time, look at Cedar City and Saint George. I also very much believe in everything in moderation. I do not know what PCP Trust, LLC. plans are and this unknown concerns me regarding density, type of residential structures, traffic, and privacy. From my limited understanding an R-3 rezoning this would allow them to do whatever they wanted to do. They would be able to build as many residential units, of whatever type, and where ever they wanted to. I believe an R-1 rezoning or at most and R-2 rezoning with restrictions to address my concerns and maintain the ambiance of the residential areas around this parcel should be considered. So, I would ask this letter be reviewed, that my concerns be considered, and a rezoning of R-3 not be granted.

Best regards,

Frank R. Lewis