PAROWAN CITY PLANNING AND ZONING MEETING MINUTES

Wednesday, June 3, 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), Jerry Vesely, Andy Nelson, Councilmember John Dean

Excused: Jamie Bonnett, Weston Reese, Cecilie Evans (Alternate), Tracey Wheeler (Alternate), Scott Burns (City Attorney)

City Staff Present: Mollie Halterman, Mayor; Dan Jessen, City Manager; Callie Bassett, City Recorder

Public Present: See sign in sheet.

1. Call to Order
Chair Shane Williamson called the Parowan City Planning and Zoning Commission meeting to order on Wednesday, June 3, 2026, at 6:00 PM in the Parowan City Council Chambers, 35 East 100 North, Parowan, Utah.

2. Declaration of Conflicts by Commission Members with Any Agenda Item
No conflicts were declared by any commission members.

3. Approval of Planning and Zoning Meeting Minutes from May 20, 2026
Chair Williamson noted he had reviewed the minutes and found no errors. Commissioner Vesely indicated he had no changes.

Commissioner Vesely moved to approve the minutes from the May 20, 2026 meeting. Commissioner Nelson seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

4. Public Comment
Chair Williamson opened the floor for public comment on non-agenda items. No members of the public came forward, and the public comment period was closed.

5. PUBLIC HEARING TO HEAR COMMENTS regarding a preliminary subdivision plat for Gateway Peaks Subdivision, Phase 1, and the 1200 West Road Dedication for Evil Water Land LLC
Prior to opening the public hearing, City Manager Dan Jessen provided background on the project. He explained that the subdivision, originally submitted under the name "Red Hills Phase 1," was renamed Gateway Peaks Phase 1 to avoid confusion with an existing subdivision. The project represents Phase 1 of development on approximately 51 acres that were annexed into the city under an annexation agreement originally negotiated with Larry Pendleton and subsequently acquired by the developer, Red Hills Capital.

Dan noted that the project had gone through multiple review cycles with the subdivision review committee and the city engineer, and described two primary complexities. First, because Phase 1 is part of a larger planned buildout, the city had to evaluate the project within the context of future phases, particularly with respect to roads, storm drainage, and the city's transportation master plan. Second, the project required a concurrent road dedication for 1200 West, which had been designed as a future public street but had not yet been formally dedicated to the city.

Regarding access, Dan stated that Phase 1 will have a single point of ingress and egress via 1200 West, which is in compliance with the International Fire Code. Vehicular access to 200 North has been intentionally restricted at this phase. A 5-foot gravel walking path will connect the subdivision to the existing frontage road, fulfilling the Phase 1 off-site improvement requirement under the annexation agreement. Additional off-site improvements include the improvement of 1200 West itself and an asphalt path along 200 North on the south side of the road, in front of existing residences.

Dan also confirmed that the developer has deeded water rights to the city — more than needed for Phase 1 — with excess rights banked for future phases. The Division of Drinking Water has approved the water plan. A retention basin to be dedicated to the city will capture storm water for the entire project and meter it out in accordance with the city's master drainage master plan.

Commissioner Vesely moved to open the public hearing. Commissioner Nelson seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously. The public hearing was opened at 6:13 PM.

Public Comment —
Shelly Roy expressed concern about the connection between the subdivision and 200 North, seeking clarification on whether 200 North would be abandoned or blocked. Jessen clarified that 200 North will not be abandoned; under the annexation agreement, the developer is required to connect to 200 North when a future phase reaches within a specified distance of it. However, that connection will run through a frontage road rather than directly into the subdivision.

Shelly raised a significant concern about the existing and worsening problem of ATVs, side-by-sides, and motorcycles traveling up and down 200 North, noting that construction of a cut-off road to an adjacent subdivision had more than doubled recreational vehicle traffic. She stated her belief that the new subdivision would exacerbate the problem and asked what could be done to address it proactively. Jessen acknowledged the issue but noted that restricting ATVs is a matter of city code enforcement, not a subdivision requirement. He confirmed that the walking path is a 5-foot-wide gravel path not intended for vehicular use.

Shelly also sought confirmation that the developer would ultimately be required to improve 200 North — including widening it to a 26-foot road profile — and Jessen confirmed this obligation is triggered when a future phase reaches within a certain distance of 200 North. The asphalt path along 200 North is a Phase 1 requirement.

Tim Roy raised concerns about storm drainage on 200 North. He described a longstanding flooding problem along the road, which he attributed to road improvements that were never properly engineered, resulting in roads sitting too high relative to adjacent properties. He argued that adding a 5-foot asphalt path on the south side of the road — in front of developed residences — would worsen drainage and create a deep ditch that would impede driveway access.

Tim questioned why the path could not be placed on the north side of the road, where properties are undeveloped. Engineer Dallas Buckner responded that the full right-of-way is dedicated on the south side, but not on the north side, where power lines and private property make placement infeasible without a land use trigger. Buckner clarified that the proposed improvement involves saw-cutting and widening the existing asphalt to the south, with a 2% cross-slope for ADA compliance, and that all proposed improvements are within the existing right-of-way.

Dan Jessen acknowledged the drainage concern directly and reiterated a commitment previously made to Roy: the city will need to engineer a proper drainage solution along 200 North in conjunction with the installation of the path. He noted that the city's public works director is aware of the longstanding drainage issues and that cross-gutters and culverts along the corridor will need to be properly engineered and potentially upgraded. Jessen emphasized that this obligation falls on the city, not the developer, as the developer had declined to take on additional costs beyond those required under the annexation agreement.

Tim also sought clarification on whether the path would be asphalt or gravel. Jessen clarified that the path along 200 North (the off-site portion through the undeveloped area) will be gravel, while the path installed with Phase 1 along 200 North near the existing residences will be asphalt. The gravel path was agreed to in lieu of asphalt because future phasing would likely require it to be torn out and rebuilt anyway.

Commissioner Vesely moved to close the public hearing. Commissioner Nelson seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously. The public hearing was closed at 6:41 PM.

6. Approval of the 1200 West Road Dedication Plat

Dan Jessen explained that the 1200 West Road Dedication Plat required separate action from the subdivision approval because the road segment is currently owned by the owners of the adjacent RV park (Evil Water Land LLC), not by the subdivision developer. The developer worked with the RV park owners to obtain their agreement to deed the road to the city. Because road dedications do not fall neatly within the city's subdivision code, the Planning Commission serves as the land use authority for this action, which is why the public hearing addressed both items concurrently.

Dan confirmed that the road dedication complies with all requirements of the annexation agreement and has been reviewed and signed off on by the city engineer and in-house surveyor. He also noted that UDOT reviewed the access arrangement — as 1200 West connects to a UDOT-controlled highway — and a transportation impact study confirmed that Phase 1 does not trigger any required improvements to the 200 South access. UDOT granted approval for Phase 1 under the existing access agreement.

Commissioner Nelson moved to approve the 1200 West Road Dedication Plat. Commissioner Vesely seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

7. Discussion Regarding the Commercial Sign Code

Dan Jessen presented a detailed overview of deficiencies in the city's current commercial sign code (Section 1550) and proposed initiating a full repeal-and-replace effort. He outlined several core problems with the existing code: it lacks definitions for key terms such as "advertising sign" versus "business sign"; the permitted use table is largely blank or ambiguous with respect to zoning districts; there is no defined permit process; setback and right-of-way restrictions are absent; and it fails to address modern issues such as electronic reader boards, illumination standards, and sign animations.

Dan noted that a sign permit application for a commercial center — which, by his interpretation of the existing code, constitutes an advertising sign and therefore requires a conditional use permit — is anticipated to come before the Planning Commission in the near future.

The discussion touched on several policy questions the Commission will need to address, including whether to encourage monument signs over pole signs, whether to allow electronic reader boards and under what conditions (e.g., auto-dimming, no active animation, minimum display intervals), how to balance pro-business values with Parowan's rural character, and how to handle temporary and exempt signs. Jessen noted that the historic district is already governed by separate standards under the Historic Preservation Committee's code and would not need to be addressed in the new ordinance.

Dan also flagged that the city's political sign ordinance may need to be reviewed in light of new state legislation passed in the 2026 session, and that city legal counsel would need to confirm compliance.

Dan stated that this meeting served as a kickoff discussion and indicated that the next meeting would include more specific deliberation on policy preferences. He encouraged commissioners to research sign codes from comparable rural, historic, highway-oriented, and tourism-focused Utah communities before the next meeting, and to review the list of notable sign code approaches from various cities included in the meeting materials.

The proposed framework for a new ordinance would include: a statement of purpose, clear definitions, exempt signs, general standards, residential and commercial standards, temporary sign provisions, electronic sign provisions, nonconforming sign provisions, and an administrative permit process.

8. Discussion Regarding Building Permits for Re-Roofing a House

Dan Jessen brought forward a discussion on whether the city's building permit code should be amended to explicitly address re-roofing. He explained that the current code requires a building permit for most construction activities but does not list roofing as an explicit exemption. A recent situation arose in which a building official red-carded a re-roofing project in progress and required the property owner to obtain a building permit — which was calculated at $250 — before work could resume. The property owner complained to city council, and Jessen acknowledged that while the building official's interpretation was defensible under the current code, the outcome seemed disproportionate.

Dan presented two primary options. Option 1 would require a permit for all re-roofing, providing maximum oversight and a record of improvements, but creating an administrative burden and being generally unpopular. Option 2 would exempt simple removal-and-replacement of roofing materials, requiring permits only when structural elements are altered, roof geometry is changed, or additional structural loads are imposed.

Public comment from Larry Zajac highlighted the importance of addressing structural loading, using the example of a homeowner re-roofing with tile rather than shingles — a change that substantially increases roof load and warrants engineering review. Jessen agreed that any exemption language would need to be carefully worded to exclude such scenarios.

John Dean, who has roofing experience, raised the issue of multi-layer shingles, noting that code generally limits re-roofing to two layers and that removing back to the sheathing raises different considerations than simply adding a layer.

Dan expressed a preference for adding an explicit exemption for ordinary maintenance, repair, and like-for-like replacement of roofing materials, provided no structural members are altered, no roof geometry is changed, and no additional structural loads are imposed. Commissioner Vesely supported moving forward with a code amendment for the sake of administrative consistency. Jessen indicated he would draft a formal proposal for a future public hearing and Planning Commission recommendation to city council.

9. Report on 2026 Legislative Changes
Dan Jessen presented a summary of recent state legislative changes affecting land use and planning, noting that he had used AI to assist in summarizing the bills and found the output to be accurate and on point.

House Bill 368 (2025) was described as one of the most significant land use bills in recent years, making broad changes to LUDMA (the Land Use, Development, and Management Act) with an emphasis on making the development approval process more objective and predictable. Key impacts include increased scrutiny of application requirements and timelines, changes to appeal authority procedures, and a reinforced need for clearly written ordinances and application checklists. Jessen noted that Parowan is already largely on track with these requirements through its ongoing "Rural Done Right" code modernization effort, and that he is actively developing application checklists for each land use action type, beginning with annexations.

Housing Affordability Amendments included new state standards governing minimum parking requirements for multifamily and commercial developments. Jessen indicated that the city's parking standards should be reviewed for compliance, though he was not aware of any immediate conflict. This review is planned for a future agenda.

Boundary Line Adjustment Bill clarified state procedures for lot line adjustments and subdivision amendments. Jessen noted that Parowan's last boundary line adjustment was processed under the new state code, but that the city's local code language should be updated for consistency.

Local Land and Water Modifications addressed water entitlement and transfer policy. Jessen praised Parowan's existing water entitlement ordinances as ahead of the curve compared to other Utah cities, citing an example of a city near North Logan that had burned through 30 years of projected water capacity in just five years due to lack of similar provisions. He noted that the city may in the future explore mechanisms for transferring development entitlements alongside water rights.

House Bill 184 (failed) — Small Lots and Starter Home Amendments — was highlighted as the most important bill to monitor going forward, despite failing to pass. The bill would have significantly curtailed local control over minimum lot sizes to promote affordable housing. Jessen credited the LUDMA working group — a year-round body that includes the Utah League of Cities and Towns, developers, and special service districts — with helping defeat the bill, and predicted it would return in some form in the 2027 session. He emphasized the importance of Parowan maintaining local zoning authority and noted that the city's "Rural Done Right" strategy, which proactively allows smaller lots by right, was designed in part to preempt state mandates on this issue.

Mayor Mollie Halterman briefly shared her experience successfully fighting a bill that would have eliminated the city's Tourism, Recreation, and Transportation (TRT) tax revenue, noting that direct engagement with legislators — including testifying at a senate hearing and sending thank-you notes — had made a meaningful difference.

Dan Jessen summarized the recommended actions arising from the legislative review: review parking standards for compliance with housing affordability amendments; review lot line adjustment procedures; continue development of application checklists; continue water entitlement allocation work; and closely monitor House Bill 184 and future housing and affordability legislation in the 2027 session.

10. Member Reports
There were no member reports were offered.

11. Adjourn
Commissioner Vesely moved to adjourn. Commissioner Nelson seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously. The meeting was adjourned at 7:32 p.m.

Callie Bassett, CMC, City Recorder

Date Approved: June 17, 2026