



PAROWAN CITY PLANNING AND ZONING MEETING MINUTES

Wednesday, September 16, 2026 – 6:00 P.M.

Parowan City Council Chambers

35 E 100 N, Parowan, UT 84761

Office: (435) 477-3331

Commission Members Present: Jamie Bonnett, Andy Nelson, Jerry Vesely (Chair Pro Tem), Weston Reese, Councilmember John Dean

Excused: Shane Williamson (Chair), Cecilie Evans (Alternate), Tracey Wheeler (Alternate), Scott Burns (City Attorney)

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

Public Present: Larry Zajac.

1. Call to Order

The meeting was called to order 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 September 2, 2026 0:33

The minutes from September 2, 2026 were briefly reviewed. One member noted they had not been present at that meeting but had read the minutes and had no comments.

A motion to approve the minutes from September 2, 2026 was made by Jamie Bonnett and seconded by Weston Reese. The motion carried unanimously.

4. Public Comment

No public comments were offered at this time.

5. Continued Discussion on Sign Ordinance Update

Dan Jessen led the continued discussion on the sign ordinance update, referencing a comparative document previously distributed to commission members that surveyed sign regulations in other communities, covering height, area, number of signs, and setbacks by zone.

Billboard Definition. The commission identified a need to formally define "billboard" in the ordinance. The existing draft defined a billboard as any sign larger than 50 square feet, which was deemed too low and potentially problematic — it would technically classify recently approved off-site signs, such as one near a local hotel, as billboards. After reviewing standard billboard dimensions (e.g., 14×48 ft. = 672 sq. ft.; 12×25 ft. = 300 sq. ft.), the commission discussed setting the billboard threshold at greater than 300 square feet. Since the city's code prohibits any new billboards, defining the threshold at 300 square feet would allow permitted signs up to that size without conflicting with the billboard ban. This figure was noted as a working proposition to be refined.

Sign Standards Matrix. Dan Jessen presented a proposed standards matrix by zone type. Commission members generally supported using the higher end of proposed ranges to establish clear, single figures rather than ranges. The following was discussed as a working framework:

- *Residential zones:* Maximum height of 6 feet; maximum area of 32 square feet; 1 sign per frontage.
- *Downtown commercial:* Monument signs at 6–8 feet (with 8 feet favored); projecting signs building-related; monument signs only where setback space exists; 1 projecting sign per tenant frontage.
- *General commercial:* Maximum height of 20 feet; maximum area of 64–100 square feet; 1 sign per frontage, with a second permitted after 300 feet of frontage.
- *Highway services:* Maximum height of 40–50 feet; maximum area of 200 square feet, expandable to 300 square feet for multi-tenant signs; same frontage rules as general commercial.
- *Industrial:* Similar standards to general commercial, potentially slightly higher.
- *Minimum setbacks:* 10 feet across commercial, highway services, and industrial zones; 5 feet outside the right-of-way for monument signs downtown.

Andy Nelson suggested using the upper bounds of all proposed ranges to arrive at definitive numbers, which the commission agreed with.

Examples from Around Town. John Dean shared observations of existing signage around Parowan, including clusters of signs near the Maverick station, a "I Buy Water Shares" sign on a pole near the KB, signage on a block wall adjoining a storage unit on 200 North, and temporary signs for businesses such as Black Star Services. Dan reviewed photographs of these signs and used them to illustrate how existing conditions would or would not conform to the proposed standards. The Maverick lollipop sign, estimated at approximately 20 feet tall and 100 square feet in area, was noted as a reasonable benchmark that aligns closely with the proposed general commercial standards.

Signs Attached to Buildings. The commission revisited whether signs attached to or displayed in the windows of buildings should be regulated. The consensus was that on-building and window signs should be exempt from the ordinance, allowing businesses freedom to display what they need on their own structures. Dan Jessen noted this would need careful drafting to avoid conflicting with provisions for projecting signs, following a comment from a member of the public (Larry Zajac) who pointed out that "attached to the wall" could mean flat, perpendicular, or angled — each with different implications. Dan acknowledged he had already flagged this concern internally and would ensure the language did not create internal conflicts, particularly with existing historic preservation rules governing projecting signs downtown. Weston Reese also inquired whether language could allow signs to extend over rights-of-way, to which Dan confirmed that projecting and hanging signs are already addressed in the permitted-by-zone section.

Temporary Signs. The commission reviewed the temporary sign language already drafted. Key provisions include: signs in the public right-of-way may not exceed 4 square feet in area or 3 feet in height; no more than 1 such sign per street frontage; signs may not be attached to utility poles, light poles, trees, or other public facilities; adjacent property owners may remove signs placed in their park strip without the sign owner's permission; and the city may relocate or remove signs for public safety or maintenance without prior notice, with unclaimed signs discardable after 7 calendar days.

The commission noted a separate carve-out for political signs had already been addressed in prior sessions. Weston Reese raised the importance of not being overly restrictive during campaign season, and it was confirmed that a separate temporary sign provision already handles political signage.

Regarding duration of temporary signs, the commission discussed whether to set a time limit for how far in advance of an event a sign may be placed. It was noted that "after the event" removal timelines were already in place for yard sales, community events, and grand openings. The consensus was that specifying a pre-event placement deadline was unnecessary, and the language would remain as drafted.

The commission also discussed the distinction between signs in the public right-of-way versus those on private property, agreeing that regulations should be more lenient for private property and more restrictive within the right-of-way. Andy Nelson noted that the existing language already addresses right-of-way more specifically, while duration provisions could be less stringent for private property placements.

Off-Premises Signs. The commission discussed off-premises signs — those advertising a business or activity located elsewhere. After reviewing examples around town, the commission agreed that off-premises signs should be permitted, but must comply with the same standards as on-premises signs (height, area, number, and setback requirements from the applicable zone table). It was agreed that such signs would follow the same per-frontage number limitations, with Weston Reese proposing that the standard should be based on footage rather than a flat per-parcel limit to avoid inadvertently restricting large parcels. The example of a property with approximately 1,500 feet of freeway frontage was raised, and the commission agreed that allowing one additional sign per 300 feet of frontage (rather than a hard cap of two) was more appropriate for such situations.

The commission agreed off-premises signs should be allowed in general commercial, highway services, and industrial zones, with the sign simply needing to comply with the relevant zone's standards as set out in the sign table. Dan Jessen will draft language referencing the applicable table accordingly.

Nonconforming Signs and Billboard Integration. Dan noted that the existing standalone billboard ordinance would be repealed and its relevant language incorporated into the new sign ordinance to eliminate redundancy and resolve any internal conflicts.

Next Steps. Dan will finalize the outstanding items — including plugging definitive numbers into the standards matrix, refining the definition of "billboard," clarifying language around on-building signs, and incorporating off-premises sign provisions — and will distribute a revised draft to commission members. The commission agreed to schedule a public hearing on the sign ordinance update at the next meeting on October 7, 2026.

6. Consideration of Record of Survey and Road Dedication Plat

Dan Jessen reported that the record of survey and road dedication plat was not yet ready for commission consideration. The engineer had submitted a version but had misunderstood the scope of the assignment, so the item will be carried to the next meeting.

By way of background, Dan Jessen provided context for commission members who were not present at the prior discussion. The matter involves parcels located behind Heritage Park, near the Main Street Bridge. The original city plat included a segment of Main Street in that area that was never constructed, as it abuts a hillside leading to BLM land. The City Council will hold a public hearing the following week

to formally vacate that unconstructed portion of Main Street. Upon vacation, the right-of-way will be split equally to the adjacent parcels.

Following that vacation, the commission will be asked to consider a survey and road dedication plat that reconfigures the parcels in that area, establishes a new 60-foot-wide road right-of-way aligned with the existing travel way (Parowan Foothills Drive), and creates the framework for a land exchange between the city and property owner Lance Shotwell. Upon completion of all steps, the city will own parcels contiguous to Heritage Park (potentially used for trails or other park amenities), and Shotwell will own two parcels on either side of the new road, enabling him to develop a building lot. No action was taken on this item.

7. Discussion on Boundary Line Adjustments/Subdivision Amendments – Alignment with 2025 SB 104

Dan Jessen presented an overview of proposed changes to Parowan City Code to align with 2025 Senate Bill 104, which substantially revised Utah state law governing boundary adjustments, lot line changes, subdivision amendments, and boundary establishments. These revisions were subsequently codified under the Municipal Land Use Development Management Act (LUDMA).

Background and Need for Update. The existing ordinance (Chapter 14.08) was written under a prior statutory framework and contains terminology and procedures that are now obsolete or inconsistent with state law. A key practical problem under the old framework was that the Iron County Recorder had indicated she would approve qualifying parcel boundary realignments if they met state law requirements, regardless of what the city's local code required — because state law preempts local ordinance. The proposed update resolves this conflict while also preserving appropriate city review in cases involving public infrastructure, easements, and other significant interests.

Simple vs. Full Boundary Adjustments. The new state law creates a clear distinction between two categories:

A *simple boundary adjustment* applies when adjoining property owners wish to relocate their common boundary without creating an additional parcel, and where the adjustment does not affect public rights-of-way, municipal utility easements, public property, existing recorded easements, on-site wastewater systems, or internal lot restrictions, and does not create zoning nonconformities. Under the proposed ordinance, simple boundary adjustments would be handled administratively by the zoning administrator. If the statutory requirements are satisfied, approval is mandatory — it is not a discretionary decision. Dan emphasized that this differs from legislative land use decisions such as rezoning, where the city retains discretion.

A *full boundary adjustment* is required when any of those conditions are implicated. Full adjustments would continue to come before the planning commission, also in an administrative capacity. Dan noted that the commission's role in these cases is still not discretionary in the traditional sense — if the requirements are met, the commission shall consent.

Survey and Plat Requirements. State law requires a plat amendment for full boundary adjustments. Dan stated his intent to also require a licensed survey for simple boundary adjustments in the local ordinance, reasoning that new legal descriptions and dimensional exhibits practically necessitate a surveyor regardless of what state law technically requires.

Lot Consolidations. The proposed code includes a specific section on combining lots, addressing issues such as the preservation of easements and water entitlements that may be affected when boundaries

are erased. State law authorizes municipalities to provide that lot combinations do not require a subdivision plat amendment, and the proposed ordinance takes advantage of that provision while still ensuring critical interests are protected.

Subdivision Amendments and Vacation Changes that amend a recorded subdivision — particularly those increasing the number of lots or affecting public rights-of-way, easements, or common areas — remain subject to the subdivision amendment process. However, Dan noted that state law has significantly streamlined internal subdivision boundary adjustments over recent years. What once required public hearings with notice to all subdivision residents now largely follows the same administrative process as a simple parcel adjustment, provided no significant public interests are affected.

Vacation of an entire subdivision or a road within a subdivision remains a legislative act requiring city council action by ordinance, and the proposed ordinance preserves that structure.

Summary of Proposed Code Structure. The proposed ordinance replaces Sections 14.08.010 and 14.08.020. Simple adjustments go to the zoning administrator; full adjustments go to the planning commission; subdivision vacation goes to the city council. A draft of the proposed ordinance was distributed to commission members to review before the next meeting, at which the commission will go through the specific language in detail and, if satisfied, set a public hearing date.

8. Member Reports

Dan Jessen noted that the commission may soon be considering a subdivision amendment related to the Eagle Rock PUD commercial component. A business (Trailer Source) is constructing on one of the commercial lots within that subdivision and had initially sought to avoid a subdivision amendment by obtaining private easements across lots for their internal road and utilities. However, given the complexity that approach has created — particularly around ownership and maintenance of fire hydrants, sewer mains, and other infrastructure — the parties are now moving toward a formal subdivision amendment to realign the internal road and properly dedicate the infrastructure within the public right-of-way. Dan Jessen noted that the original reluctance to amend the subdivision stemmed from the consultant's familiarity with the old, more burdensome amendment process, and that the updated process should make this significantly more straightforward.

9. Adjourn

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

The meeting was adjourned at 7:24 PM.



Callie Bassett, CMC, City Recorder

Date Approved: 10/07/2026