



PAROWAN CITY PLANNING AND ZONING MEETING MINUTES

Wednesday, August 5, 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), Andy Nelson, Weston Reese, Councilmember John Dean

Excused: Jamie Bonnett, Jerry Vesely, Cecilie Evans (Alternate), Tracey Wheeler (Alternate)

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

Public Present: No public present.

1. Call to Order

Shane Williamson called the meeting of the Parowan City Planning and Zoning Commission to order on Wednesday, August 5, 2026, at 6:04 PM.

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 July 15, 2026

Motion to approve the minutes from the July 15, 2026 meeting was made by Andy Nelson and seconded by Weston Reese. The motion carried unanimously.

4. Public Comment

The floor was opened for public comment on non-agenda items. No members of the public came forward, and the public comment period was closed.

5. PUBLIC HEARING: The Planning and Zoning Commission will receive public comments regarding a proposed zone change to the parcel of property located at 825 W and 100 S, owned by PCP Trust, LLC (Parcel #A-0026-0027-0000). The property owner has requested a change from Agricultural Zoning (A-1) to Residential 2 (R-2).

Dan Jessen provided background on the history of this application. The parcel had previously been the subject of a zone change request from Agricultural (A-1) to Residential 3 (R-3). The Commission had issued a negative recommendation on the R-3 request, with language suggesting that an R-2 designation might have warranted a positive recommendation. The matter proceeded to City Council, which held a second public hearing due to questions regarding the adequacy of the original notice. At that hearing, the Council considered approving R-2 rather than R-3, but was advised by legal counsel that because the application had been noticed as R-3, they could not approve R-2 without a new application. The Council denied the R-3 request and directed the applicant to reapply for R-2. The current application, properly noticed as R-2, was now before the Commission.

Motion to open the public hearing was made by Andy Nelson and seconded by Weston Reese. The motion carried unanimously. The public hearing was declared open at 6:10 PM.

Dan Jessen read into the record a written comment submitted via email by Douglas Hill of 763 West 60 North, whose property backs up to the subject parcel. Mr. Hill stated that he purchased his property in part for its southern view and requested that any development be limited to single-level, single-family homes, expressing concern that multi-family or two-story construction would destroy the view valued by himself and his neighbors.

Mark Smith asked for clarification on what R-2 zoning permits. Dan explained that R-2 allows single-family homes and duplexes or twin homes. Single-family homes may be built on lots as small as 7,500 square feet, while duplexes and twin homes require a minimum lot size of 10,000 square feet. Mark also inquired about building height restrictions, and Megan Guymon confirmed that two-story homes up to 35 feet are permitted in all residential zones, with no ordinance currently in place restricting the number of stories. Dan noted that a draft subdivision plan submitted by the applicant had shown primarily single-family lots, though that draft is not binding and the applicant could return with a different configuration.

Mark also asked about access and road connectivity, specifically whether 100 North would eventually connect westward through the area. Staff confirmed that the city had recently acquired a corridor preservation parcel to facilitate the future extension of 100 North to 600 West, though funding to construct the road has not yet been secured.

Scott Burns, legal counsel, noted for the record that property owners generally do not have a legally protected right to an unobstructed view, absent a specific easement or ordinance to that effect, and that no such restriction currently exists in Parowan.

Motion to close the public hearing was made by Andy Nelson and seconded by Weston Reese. The motion carried unanimously. The public hearing was declared closed at 6:21 PM.

6. Possible Recommendation to City Council on Zone Change to R-2 for Parcel ##A-0026-0027-0000

The Commission discussed the application. John Dean raised a concern about traffic density, noting that the subject parcel is substantially surrounded by existing R-3 zoned development comprising over 120 homes on two sides, and that any additional density from R-2 development—particularly before secondary road connections are established—would direct more vehicle traffic through already-dense neighborhoods.

Weston Reese expressed concern about access in and out of the development. Dan Jesson and Andy Nelson noted that specific access requirements are addressed at the subdivision stage, not during a zone change. Dan elaborated that the city's transportation master plan bisects the property with three planned roadways, and that the applicant would be required to comply with that plan during subdivision review. He also confirmed that the applicant would be required to provide a secondary ingress and egress as a condition of subdivision approval, and that various options exist for achieving that second access point, including connecting to 100 North or routing through adjacent streets.

Shane Williamson confirmed that the application covers the entire parcel, with no attempt to split or partially rezone it, as had been an issue in prior proceedings.

The Commission expressed general support for a positive recommendation.

Motion to send a positive recommendation to City Council for the zone change from A-1 to R-2 for Parcel #A-0026-0027-0000 (825 West 100 South) was made by Andy Nelson and seconded by John Dean. The motion carried unanimously.

Note: The Commission voted to adjust the agenda, taking Item 8 before Item 7.

Motion to adjust the agenda to hear Item 8 before Item 7 was made by Andy Nelson and seconded by Weston Reese. The motion carried unanimously.

8. Conditional Use Permit – Painted Hills RV Sign

Dan Jessen presented an application from Painted Hills RV Resort for a conditional use permit to install a monument sign at the corner of 200 South and 1200 West. Under the current sign code, the sign qualifies as an off-premises sign and requires a conditional use permit, consistent with a similar application the Commission had addressed at a prior meeting.

Dan noted an unusual circumstance: the proposed sign location falls within the city's public right-of-way. Dan initially denied the placement on that basis, but the applicant provided documentation showing that when the RV park was originally approved, the city granted a sign easement within the right-of-way at that specific location. He verified the easement on the Iron County recorder's website and confirmed that the road dedication for 1200 West was made subject to that existing easement. The easement describes a precisely delineated area within the right-of-way for signage purposes.

The proposed sign measures 12 feet by 7 feet, is within the dimensions permitted under the current sign code, and will be either non-illuminated or indirectly lit. Staff indicated an updated site plan showing the exact orientation of the sign would be obtained, though orientation was noted as not affecting the conditional use permit determination.

The Commission discussed whether conditions should be attached. It was agreed that requiring the sign to conform to the new sign code once adopted would be prudent, particularly given its location within the public right-of-way.

Motion to approve the conditional use permit for the Painted Hills RV sign, on the condition that the sign complies with the new sign code upon its adoption, was made by Andy Nelson and seconded by Weston Reese upon amendment; the amended motion was made by Andy Nelson and seconded by the Weston Reese. The motion carried unanimously.

7. Discuss New Sign Code and Possibly Schedule Public Hearing

Dan Jessen presented research compiled with the assistance of AI tools comparing sign regulations from several Utah municipalities, including Lehi, Moab, Cedar City, Washington City, and St. George. The analysis examined four key variables across different zoning districts: maximum sign height, maximum sign area, maximum number of signs, and setback requirements.

Dan summarized the key findings: Lehi takes a simple two-tier approach distinguishing residential from commercial/industrial zones, with residential freestanding signs limited to 5 feet and 32 square feet, and commercial signs allowed up to 25 feet and 64 square feet, both subject to a 10-foot setback. Moab distinguishes between highway and non-highway commercial zones and uses a total square footage per lot approach rather than a strict count of signs. Cedar City allows signs within designated I-15 interchange areas to reach 50 feet above the nearest interstate travel lane, a provision staff connected to discussions about signage along Cedar City's "burger alley." Washington City uses a tiered system similar to what Parowan is considering, with standard commercial at 25 feet and higher-intensity

commercial and freeway exit locations allowed up to 50 feet. St. George similarly ties sign height to roadway context, with freeway exit locations also receiving 50-foot allowances.

Dan explained that Parowan's approach is expected to create distinct standards for at least three commercial contexts: downtown commercial, general commercial, and highway services zones near the I-15 interchange. Downtown commercial is a notably different case due to zero-setback buildings, wall signs, and projecting signs that extend over the right-of-way. Staff cautioned that any restrictions adopted for downtown signs must be carefully reconciled with the city's historic preservation overlay to avoid conflicts between the two regulatory frameworks.

On the question of maximum number of signs, staff presented a formula used by several cities: one freestanding sign per street frontage, with a second freestanding sign permitted along the same frontage where that frontage exceeds 300 feet, provided the two signs are separated by at least 150 feet and the secondary sign does not exceed a reduced maximum size.

On setbacks, staff noted that approaches vary widely: some cities require 10 feet, others require 6 feet for monument signs, some tie the setback to the standard building setback for the zone, and others simply require that signs stay out of the right-of-way.

Dan also presented draft language on temporary signs within the public right-of-way, following the Commission's prior direction to allow such signs subject to specific limitations modeled on political sign rules. The draft provisions address prohibited locations (sidewalks, clear-view triangles, areas obstructing traffic control devices), prohibited attachment points (utility poles, trees, public facilities), the right of adjoining property owners to remove signs placed in front of their property without consent, the city's authority to remove signs for safety or maintenance reasons without prior notice, and a seven-day reclaim period before discarded signs may be disposed of. A separate paragraph was added to clarify that signs within UDOT rights-of-way must also comply with all applicable federal, state, and UDOT regulations, and that UDOT retains primary enforcement authority within its jurisdiction.

Dan noted that one item not yet addressed in the draft is how far in advance of an event a temporary sign may be placed. The Commission was asked to consider whether a maximum pre-event display period should be established, in addition to the existing requirement that signs be removed within one week after the event.

Dan also identified a significant gap in the draft ordinance: off-premises signs—defined as signs advertising a business, activity, or product not located on the same premises as the sign—were addressed in the old sign code but were entirely omitted from the current draft. Staff illustrated the issue by referencing several wood-framed signs near the Maverick convenience store that advertise various local businesses and are located within city right-of-way. These signs function as small billboards and would fall under the off-premises sign category. The Commission was asked to consider whether such signs should be prohibited, allowed with limitations, or permitted subject to reasonable standards, and whether existing signs of this type should be treated as legally nonconforming if new restrictions are adopted.

Shane Williamson raised the question of whether, if off-premises signs are permitted, eligibility could be limited to businesses holding a valid Parowan business license. Scott Burns agreed to research the legal feasibility of that restriction.

Staff indicated that the revised draft ordinance, with items requiring Commission attention highlighted, along with the comparative city research document, would be distributed to all Commission members for review prior to the next meeting. The Commission plans to review the materials, discuss final numbers for the sign standards table, and conduct an exercise evaluating existing signs in town against the proposed ordinance before scheduling a public hearing.

No public hearing date was set at this meeting.

9. Member Reports

No member reports were given.

10. Adjourn

Motion to adjourn was made by Andy Nelson and seconded by Weston Reese. The motion carried unanimously. The meeting was adjourned.

A handwritten signature in blue ink, reading "Callie Bassett", is written over a horizontal line.

Callie Bassett, CMC, City Recorder

Date Approved: Sept. 2, 2026