



## PAROWAN CITY PLANNING AND ZONING MEETING MINUTES

Wednesday, May 6, 2026 – 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, Jerry Vesely, Weston Reese, Councilmember David Harris

**Excused:** Andy Nelson, Cecilie Evans (Alternate), Tracey Wheeler (Alternate)

**City Staff Present:** Dan Jessen, City Manager; Scott Burns, City Attorney; Callie Bassett, City Recorder

**Public Present:** Jeffrey Thomas, Larry Zajac

### 1. Call To Order 1:09

Chair Shane Williamson called the Parowan City Planning and Zoning Meeting to order on Wednesday, May 6, 2026, at 6:00 PM in the City Council Chambers, 35 E 100 N, Parowan, UT 84761.

### 2. Approval of Minutes from March 18, 2026 1:19

The minutes from the March 18, 2026 Planning and Zoning Meeting were presented for approval. Members confirmed they had reviewed the minutes and offered no corrections or changes.

Motion to approve the minutes from the March 18, 2026 meeting was made by Jerry Vesely and seconded by Jamie Bonnett. The motion carried unanimously.

### 3. Zone Change Recommendation for A-0026-0027-0000 1:53

Dan Jessen introduced the item, providing background on the parcel located near 200 North and 600 West on the west side of town. He explained that at a prior public hearing, the applicant had originally requested a zone change for only a portion of the parcel. The Commission had responded by directing the applicant to either complete a minor lot subdivision or rezone the entire parcel, as the city did not wish to zone only a partial parcel.

Dan reported that the applicant's engineer had since worked with the property owner and resolved a key misunderstanding: the owner had been reluctant to rezone the entire parcel out of a desire to keep a portion in Greenbelt status, not realizing that zoning designation has no effect on Greenbelt eligibility—only the use of the land matters. With that clarified, the applicant was now requesting a full rezone of parcel A-0026-0027-0000 from A-1 (Agricultural) to R-3 (High Density Residential), which would create a contiguous R-3 zone consistent with adjacent parcels.

Dan also shared a preliminary conceptual layout of the proposed subdivision, informally referred to as "Jack Rabbit Flats," which showed 36 single-family residential lots. He emphasized that this was not yet a formal preliminary plat, but was presented to give context to the Commission's deliberations. Dan noted that of the 36 proposed lots, only 4 fell below the 7,500 square foot minimum required for R-2 zoning, with the remainder sized at 8,000 to 10,000 square feet—lot sizes consistent with R-2 development. The

applicant's engineer, Jeffrey Thomas, confirmed that the original intent had been to use 6,000 square foot lots, and that R-3 zoning would provide the flexibility needed to accommodate the four smaller lots.

Dan clarified for the Commission that while the preliminary layout was strongly suggestive of R-2 style development, the Commission was acting on the posted R-3 request and could not formally recommend approval of R-2 without reposting and holding a new public hearing. He also noted that a second public hearing before City Council would be held regardless, as residents had raised concerns about whether the original posting had been adequate.

#### Traffic and Access Discussion

Weston Reese raised the issue of traffic access, noting that the development area currently funnels to a very limited number of ingress/egress points back to 600 West. Dan acknowledged the concern and referenced the Transportation Master Plan, which shows planned roads—including an extension of 100 North and a connection to Center Street—bisecting the subject parcel. He explained that the applicant's preliminary layout had already been designed around these planned road corridors. Dan confirmed that during the subdivision review process, the Commission would be able to require a second ingress/egress point, though the city could not dictate its precise location.

#### R-2 vs. R-3 Discussion

Jamie Bonnett expressed a preference for R-2 zoning, citing concern that if the current development plan did not proceed, an R-3 designation could allow duplexes, triplexes, or fourplexes that the community may not want. Weston and Councilmember David Harris concurred. Dan explained the density equivalency between R-2 and R-3 under the city's code—noting that per ERU requirements mean the maximum density is the same in both zones; R-3 simply permits different structure types (triplexes, fourplexes) in addition to what R-2 allows. Despite this, the Commission's consensus remained in favor of R-2.

Dan advised the Commission that since only an R-3 rezone had been noticed and posted, the Commission's options were to: (1) issue a negative recommendation on R-3 with a statement that an R-2 designation would be supported, and forward it to City Council; or (2) send the application back for reposting as R-2. The Commission agreed that a negative recommendation with an R-2 preference was the most efficient path forward.

Motion to send a negative recommendation to City Council on the zone change request for parcel A-0026-0027-0000 from A-1 to R-3, with the notation that the Commission would be supportive of an R-2 designation, was made by Jamie Bonnett and seconded by Weston Reese. The motion carried unanimously.

#### **4. Discussion Regarding Updating the Transportation Master Plan**

Dan presented a proposed minor amendment to the Transportation Master Plan. He explained that the west side of Parowan currently lacks any east-west minor collectors between 400 North and 200 South—a gap that stands in contrast to the east side of town, which has planned connector roads. With development now anticipated in that area, Dan proposed reclassifying 100 North from its current designation (shown in black on the master plan map) to a minor collector (shown in yellow), reflecting its intended role in connecting local streets to arterials.

The practical effects of this change would be twofold: the right-of-way width along that corridor would increase from 60 to 66 feet, and the reclassification would make the city eligible to pursue corridor preservation funding for acquiring and constructing the road. Dan noted that only half of 100 North has

been built in that area—the result of prior subdivision exaction limits—and that this amendment would better position the city to complete the connection as future development occurs. He also referenced the ongoing concerns from Sky Ranch residents about traffic congestion, framing this amendment as part of the city's longer-term strategy to improve east-west connectivity on the west side of town. The Commission received the discussion favorably and raised no objections.

**5. Setting a Public Hearing Date of 5-20-2026 for Updating the Transportation Master Plan**

Following the discussion under Item 4, a motion was made to formally set a public hearing date to consider the proposed Transportation Master Plan amendment.

Motion to set a public hearing date of May 20, 2026 for updating the Transportation Master Plan was made by Jamie Bonnett and seconded by Jerry Vesely. The motion carried unanimously.

**6. Public Comment**

No public comments were offered.

**7. Reports**

No reports were submitted by Commission members.

**8. Adjournment**

Motion to adjourn was made by Commissioner Jerry Vesely and seconded by Commissioner Jamie Bonnett. The motion carried unanimously. The meeting adjourned at approximately 6:30 PM.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Callie Bassett, CMC, City Recorder

Date Approved: 5/20/2026