PAROWAN CITY PLANNING AND ZONING MEETING MINUTES

Wednesday, June 17, 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, Jamie Bonnett, Weston Reese, Councilmember John Dean

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

City Staff Present: Mollie Halterman, Mayor; Dan Jessen, City Manager; Scott Burns (City Attorney); Callie Bassett, City Recorder

Public Present: Larry Zajac, Candace Horne (YesCo), Elizabeth Bishop

1. Call to Order
Shane Williamson called the meeting of the Parowan City Planning and Zoning Commission to order on Wednesday, June 17, 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
Shane Williamson asked commission members to declare any conflicts with agenda items. City Manager Dan Jessen noted that Commissioner Andy Nelson had a conflict of interest with Item 4, the Conditional Use Permit for the commercial sign, given his affiliation with a business in the commercial subdivision the sign would serve. Andy confirmed he would recuse himself from the vote on that item. No other conflicts were declared.

---

3. Approval of Planning and Zoning Meeting Minutes from June 3, 2026
The minutes from the June 3, 2026 meeting were presented for approval. No corrections or comments were offered.

Jerry Vesely moved to approve the minutes from the June 3, 2026 Planning and Zoning meeting. Jamie Bonnett seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

---

4. Conditional Use Permit for Commercial Sign
Dan Jessen introduced the item, noting that a building permit application had previously been submitted by Gary Jones on behalf of the property owner for a second commercial monument sign. The sign is proposed for a parcel owned by South Central Holdings LLC, located at the secondary entrance to the commercial subdivision off 200 South—a road that functions as a frontage road parallel to the freeway and connects to 400 North. Because the sign parcel is separate from the commercial subdivision it would advertise, the sign qualifies under the city's current code as an "advertising sign" rather than a "business sign," which requires a conditional use permit in the Highway Service zone.

Dan described the proposed sign as a monument sign standing 15 feet tall, with three panels each approximately 9 feet wide by 4 feet tall—one for each of the three lots in the commercial subdivision, including ACE Hardware and the anticipated Terrible Herbst location. Andy Nelson clarified that the sign

is intended to mirror the existing monument sign at the hotel entrance, necessitated by the pork chop traffic island that prevents a left-in turn at that access point.

The commission's discussion focused on three primary concerns:

Sight Distance and Future Road Changes: Dan Jessen explained that the sign is proposed at 19 feet from the frontage road and 5 feet from the edge of the right-of-way, placing it approximately 40 feet from the edge of the asphalt. He described the sight triangle concept—typically a measured setback from both road edges at an intersection within which no obstructions are permitted—and acknowledged that while the current setback appears more than adequate, future road widening by UDOT could reduce that buffer. Audience member Candace Horne, a sign industry representative attending to observe the later sign code discussion, noted that most municipalities she has worked with use a 12-foot minimum setback from the edge of the right-of-way as a standard. The commission discussed adding a condition requiring review of the CUP if a significant change to 200 South occurs.

Ownership and Off-Site Sign Status: Dan Jessen raised the concern that because the sign parcel and the commercial subdivision are under separate ownership, a future sale of either property could result in a sign advertising a business with no connection to the sign's owner, which could effectively convert it into a billboard—prohibited under Patchwork Parkway protections. Audience member Larry Zajac suggested that requiring a recorded easement for the sign on the host parcel, as a condition of the CUP, would resolve the ownership concern regardless of future transfers. The commission agreed this was the most practical solution, as it would permanently tie the sign's use to the commercial subdivision.

Maintenance: Jamie Bonnett and others emphasized the importance of a maintenance requirement given the sign's prominent location at a main entrance to the city, to prevent future deterioration without recourse.

The commission reached consensus on three conditions to attach to the approval: (1) a recorded easement must be established on the sign parcel for the benefit of the commercial subdivision; (2) the sign must be kept in good repair; and (3) if 200 South experiences a significant lane change or road widening, the CUP must be brought back for review.

Andy Nelson recused himself from the vote.

Jamie Bonnett moved to approve the Conditional Use Permit for a commercial sign on parcel A-0500-0002-000, subject to the following conditions: (1) a recorded easement must be established where the sign is placed on the property; (2) a maintenance requirement must be met; and (3) if any significant lane changes occur on 200 South, the permit must be returned for review. Jerry Vesely seconded the motion. The motion carried with Andy Nelson recused.

---

5. Discussion Regarding the Commercial Sign Code

Dan Jessen led a structured discussion to gather commission direction ahead of drafting a new commercial sign code ordinance. He framed the conversation around several key topics, noting the current sign code is outdated and insufficiently clear. A sign industry representative, Candace Horne (Yes Co.), was present and offered technical input at the commission's invitation. Local business owner Elizabeth Bishop also addressed the commission, urging that regulations not be overly burdensome for small business owners who cannot afford monument signs and simply need flexibility to advertise effectively.

Purposes of the Ordinance: The commission identified helping businesses succeed, helping visitors find places, and preserving rural character as the primary goals. Safety was acknowledged as an implicit baseline requirement. Dark sky preservation was noted as a recurring community interest, though not identified as a top priority at this time.

Sign Types: The commission discussed monument signs, pole signs, wall signs, window signs, and directory signs. There was general consensus that signs attached to buildings present few concerns regardless of type. For freestanding signs, the commission leaned toward encouraging monument signs—particularly along the highway corridor—as more consistent with the rural character of Parowan, while acknowledging that pole signs, particularly near the freeway, serve a practical visibility purpose. Commissioner Vesely and others noted that the primary considerations should be size, scale, and location rather than sign type. The commission agreed not to prohibit specific sign types outright, but to address concerns through size and height standards in the draft ordinance.

Electronic Message Centers (EMC): The commission agreed that electronic signs should be permitted, but with brightness controls. Several members noted concerns about excessively bright signs, citing an example of a sign near Harrisburg Hill that creates visibility hazards at night. The commission favored an auto-dimming requirement tied to ambient light levels at dusk. Ms. Horne noted that the national standard for measuring sign brightness uses foot candles, which is measurable with a readily available device, and recommended the commission consider that metric. The commission also discussed allowing EMC signs in Highway Service zones while potentially restricting them closer to the city center or where they would adjoin residential properties. There was no interest in regulating animation intervals, flashing, or video content at this time, and the commission agreed not to pursue billboard-style restrictions given that new billboards are already prohibited.

Temporary Signs: The commission agreed that temporary signs—including banners, grand opening signs, real estate signs, political signs, and similar items—should be clearly defined and exempted from permit requirements, with a definition of "temporary" that addresses construction type and duration to prevent permanent structures from being classified as temporary. A 60-day timeframe for certain temporary signs was noted as a commonly used standard.

Size, Number, and Height: The commission directed staff to research comparable municipalities and present a matrix of standards. General consensus favored more flexibility in Highway Service zones and progressively more restrictive standards moving toward the city center. The commission did not set specific figures at this meeting but will evaluate staff's proposed standards upon seeing the draft ordinance.

Signs in the Right-of-Way and Setbacks: The commission agreed that signs should not be placed in the public right-of-way. For setbacks, members supported allowing signs within the front setback with a minimum setback from the property line, with the specific distance to vary by zone (Highway Service, General Commercial, and Downtown Commercial). Sight triangle requirements at intersections should be addressed in coordination with the city engineer.

Utility Poles: The commission did not reach a formal conclusion on whether private signs may be attached to utility poles, but noted that signs on traffic sign posts should be prohibited outright.

Nonconforming Signs: The commission agreed that existing signs that do not conform to the new code should be grandfathered only until they are substantially altered, at which point full compliance would

be required. A maintenance requirement was also supported so that dilapidated nonconforming signs do not remain indefinitely.

Permit Requirements: The commission agreed that a permit should be required for all permanent signs, with staff-level approval for standard applications. A conditional use permit process should be triggered for signs above a certain size or in unusual circumstances. The commission also supported including a variance pathway within the sign code to allow flexibility for unusual sign requests, provided decisions are made on objective, consistent criteria.

Dan Jessen noted that he would review Lake Point, Utah's sign code—recommended by Ms. Horne as a comparable community with a well-structured ordinance—and would compile the commission's direction into a draft ordinance for a future public hearing.

---

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

Dan Jessen summarized the issue: under the current literal reading of Parowan City's code, a building permit is required for any "repair" to a structure, which a prior building inspector had applied to shingle replacement on a residential roof, requiring a $250 permit. Dan noted he consulted with the city's certified building official, Lynn from Enoch, who indicated he does not require permits for simple re-roofing unless structural changes are involved, and confirmed the issue stems from ambiguity rather than a clear mandate.

The commission reviewed three general options: (1) require permits for all re-roofing, (2) exempt re-roofing from permit requirements unless structural modifications are made, or (3) maintain current language and defer to state code. The commission expressed clear consensus in favor of Option 2, which would exempt the removal and replacement of roofing materials from permit requirements, while still requiring a permit if roof framing is altered, rafters or trusses are modified, the roof structure changes, additional loads are added, or sheathing replacement exceeds a defined threshold.

Dan proposed adding this exemption language to the existing list of permit exceptions in the city code and scheduling a public hearing. The commission agreed to move forward with drafting that language and presenting it for public hearing.

---

7. Member Reports

No member reports were offered.

---

8. Adjourn

Jerry Vesely moved to adjourn the meeting. The motion was seconded by Jamie Bonnett. The motion carried unanimously.

The meeting was adjourned at 7:20 PM.

Callie Bassett

Callie Bassett, CMC, City Recorder

Date Approved: July 1, 2026