



PAROWAN CITY PLANNING AND ZONING MEETING MINUTES

Wednesday, September 2, 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, Weston Reese, Councilmember John Dean

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

City Staff Present: Mayor Mollie Halterman; Dan Jessen, City Manager; Callie Bassett, City Recorder; Megan Guymon, Zoning Assistant

Public Present: Larry Zajac

1. Call to Order

Chair Shane Williamson called the meeting of the Parowan City Planning and Zoning Commission to order on Wednesday, September 2, 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 member.

3. Approval of Planning and Zoning Meeting Minutes from August 5th, 2026 1:20

The minutes from the August 5, 2026 meeting were presented for approval. Jerry Vesely noted they had not been in attendance at that meeting and had not reviewed the recording, and therefore offered no comment. No corrections, edits, or additions were offered by other members.

A motion to approve the minutes from the August 5, 2026 Planning and Zoning meeting was made by Weston Reese and seconded by Jerry Vesely. The motion carried unanimously.

4. Public Comment

No public comments were received, either in person or in writing.

5. Discussion on Upcoming Annexation Petition Zoning Recommendations

Dan Jessen provided an overview of two pending annexation petitions that have been formally accepted by the City Council for review. He outlined the general annexation process: petitions are certified within 30 days of acceptance, followed by a 30-day protest period open to affected entities such as the county, school district, and utility companies, as well as unincorporated landowners within a half-mile radius. A public hearing before the City Council then follows. Per the City's annexation policy plan—though not required by state code—the Planning Commission is expected to recommend a zone concurrently with the annexation process, so that a recommendation is ready before the City Council moves toward a potential annexation agreement.

Dan Jessen noted that applicants were not invited to this meeting, as the purpose was solely to put the Commission on notice and allow members time to review and reflect before a future public hearing and formal recommendation.

Heritage Hills Holdings LLC Annexation

The first petition involves two parcels owned by Heritage Hills Holdings LLC, located off Old Highway 91 near the upper edge of town, adjacent to BLM land. The properties include a large barn and an existing home. The City has accepted the petition and is working through a legal question before formal certification.

Dan noted several development challenges associated with this area, including its location within the Wildland Urban Interface (WUI), steep terrain that limits density, potential fire flow constraints at higher elevations, and the requirement for multiple points of ingress and egress. He referenced a recent nearby fire that was only contained by a fortuitous rainstorm, and noted the fire chief's strong concerns about single-access development in hillside areas. The applicant's engineer has been made aware of these constraints.

The City's General Plan designates this area as "Open Space / Limited Development," which is distinct from the light-density residential designation in surrounding areas. The applicant has requested an **A-1** zone. Their stated intention is to develop large, rural equestrian-style lots with shared access to the barn facility—a concept that Dan noted is broadly consistent with surrounding development patterns, though he acknowledged that A-1 allows lots as small as one acre, and natural constraints would likely limit actual density regardless. Commission members were encouraged to review the General Plan language on this designation and begin considering whether A-1 is appropriate given the context.

Daveco LLC Annexation

The second petition involves a parcel owned by Daveco LLC located near 400 North and 600 West, where the road passes under the interstate. Dan described the parcel shape as resembling a key, running along the freeway frontage.

A complication exists in that the petition paperwork identifies only one parcel, while the annexation plat includes two parcels. The county has indicated it cannot allow a roughly one-acre parcel to remain as an unincorporated island, and Dan indicated the likely resolution is an update to the paperwork to include both parcels. The second parcel owner had previously expressed willingness to be annexed. Under the City's ordinance, if a parcel is compelled to annex rather than doing so voluntarily, it may be brought in as a "dry lot" without water rights—a mechanism previously used in the Alex Meissner annexation.

This annexation is more complex from a zoning standpoint, as the applicant has requested a combination of commercial/industrial and residential zoning on different portions of the parcel. The commercial/industrial portion is intended to accommodate a metal building for the owner's tree-trimming business, which he argued is not incompatible with adjacent land uses given its proximity to the freeway. The residential portion is intended for a personal residence, though the specific residential zone type had not yet been formally specified.

A key unresolved issue is the alignment of a planned frontage road through the property, identified in the City's Transportation Master Plan. Dan reported that, working with the City engineer, the parties have explored a configuration that keeps the road aligned close to the freeway using a gradual S-curve, tying into 600 West. The engineer confirmed that this alignment is achievable under good engineering standards provided the road is designated as a 25-mph minor collector—appropriate given that

residential driveways will access it. The property owner indicated this alignment would work for his plans. Dan noted that if the City is satisfied with this configuration, the Transportation Master Plan could be updated accordingly to preserve the design intent for future administrations.

Dan stated he has asked the applicant to provide a diagram showing the requested zone boundaries and approximate location of the commercial-to-residential transition before the next meeting, so the Commission can make a more informed recommendation.

6. Discussion Regarding Lance Shotwell & Parowan City Boundary Adjustment, Record of Survey and Road Dedication Plat

Dan Jessen presented the background and current status of a long-standing boundary adjustment and road dedication process involving a parcel near Heritage Park, informally referred to as the "P Hill" area.

The situation arose because the road serving that area—a historic livestock trail—was never formally dedicated to the city, and Main Street, as originally surveyed, technically bisects a private parcel owned by the Shotwell family, creating two disconnected pieces under a single parcel record. Dan explained that the City undertook a detailed title and records search, financed by the property owner, to establish the City's legal ownership of both Main Street and an adjacent parcel in that area.

The property owner approached the City about a mutual land trade: the owner would like to consolidate ownership of the parcels on his side of the new road alignment, while the City would receive parcels contiguous with Heritage Park, providing an opportunity to extend park amenities and protect a nearby spring. Dan emphasized that the acreage exchange is nearly equal in raw terms, and that both parties benefit by ending up with more functionally usable land.

The process involves multiple coordinated steps and requires participation from both the Planning Commission and the City Council. The City Council has already signed an agreement with the property owner committing both parties to see the process through to completion, in order to avoid a scenario where partial completion leaves either party in a worse position—for example, vacating Main Street without first dedicating the new road alignment.

The Planning Commission's role will be a public hearing and vote to approve the record of survey, parcel boundary realignment, and road dedication plat. Separately, the City Council will hold two meetings: one to vacate the existing Main Street alignment through that area, and ultimately one to approve the land trade itself. Dan noted that the actual land trade requires a public process for disposal of city-owned land, independent of the Planning Commission's role.

At the conclusion of the process, the City will own two parcels—one likely to be incorporated into Heritage Park, and one that will technically be a buildable lot for future disposition—as well as the dedicated road. The property owner will hold two consolidated lots and will be required to extend utilities and the road to his parcels before any building permits can be issued.

7. Continued Discussion on Sign Ordinance Update

Dan Jessen acknowledged that reference materials comparing sign ordinance standards across other cities—intended for Commission members to review in advance of this meeting—had not been sent out following the prior meeting, as he had left town immediately afterward. The materials were distributed at this meeting. Discussion was deferred to the next meeting, with Commission members asked to review the materials in preparation.

8. Member Reports

Shane Williamson noted he would be absent from the next meeting due to a prior commitment.

Dan Jessen provided a report on state-level land use activity. He noted that the Utah Governor's office has publicly pressured Heber City over its denial of a 144-unit residential development, with threats to withhold state funding—though Dan noted that funding authority rests with the legislature, not the governor. He described the Governor as frustrated that the state's goal of 35,000 new starter homes has yielded only approximately 7,000 units, and expressed anticipation of aggressive housing-related legislation in the 2027 session. One bill concept that has been floated would mandate that all residential zones statewide allow lots as small as 6,000 square feet, though it may ultimately be limited to larger cities subject to Moderate Income Housing Plan (MIHP) requirements. Parowan is not currently an MIHP city. Dan noted that the League of Cities and Towns remains active in advocating for a partnership approach with the legislature rather than outright preemption of local zoning authority.

Dan also reported on two outcomes from a recent City Council meeting. First, the zone change from A-1 to R-2 that the Planning Commission had forwarded with a positive recommendation was voted down by the City Council, and the property will remain zoned A-1. Second, the PUD application for the development near Eagle Rock was denied by the City Council. Dan explained that after more than a year of negotiations, during which significant concessions had been worked out on both sides, the applicant resumed the process by reverting to their original position on key issues, which the City Council found unacceptable. The denial extinguishes the applicant's ability to reapply under the prior code under which they had been vested; any new application would be subject to current code provisions, limiting options to by-right uses in an R-3 zone or the City's cottage courtyard subdivision process. Dan noted the situation remains fluid and the City may face further legal or procedural questions from the applicant.

9. Adjourn

A motion to adjourn was made by Jerry Vesely and seconded by Weston Reese. The motion carried unanimously. The meeting was adjourned at 6:59 p.m.



Callie Bassett, CMC, City Recorder

Date Approved: 9/16/2024

