



Planning Commission

Tuesday, October 13, 2026 at 7:00 PM
Council Chambers at City Hall Building and Online
110 S. Center Street, Santaquin, UT 84655

Meetings Held in Person & Online

The public is invited to participate as outlined below:

- **In Person** – The meeting will be held in the Council Chambers on the Main Floor in the City Hall Building.
 - **YouTube Live** – Some public meetings will be shown live on the Santaquin City YouTube Channel, which can be found at [Santaquin City YouTube Channel Link](#) or by searching for Santaquin City Channel on YouTube.
-

ADA Notice

If you are planning to attend this Public Meeting and due to a disability need assistance in understanding or participating in the meeting, please notify the City Office 10 or more hours in advance and we will, within reason, provide what assistance may be required.

AGENDA

WELCOME

INVOCATION/INSPIRATIONAL THOUGHT

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

ORDER OF AGENDA ITEMS

PUBLIC FORUM

DISCUSSION & POSSIBLE ACTION

1. PUBLIC HEARING - Modifications to Nonconforming Sign Provisions
2. Meeting Minutes Approval - September 8, 2026

STAFF REPORTS

ADJOURNMENT

Certificate of Mailing/Posting

The undersigned duly appointed City Recorder for the municipality of Santaquin City hereby certifies that a copy of the foregoing Notice and Agenda may be found at the City [of Santaquin, UT Website](#), in three physical locations (Santaquin City Hall, Zions Bank, Santaquin Post Office), and on the [State of](#)

[Utah's Public Notice Website](#). A copy of the notice may also be requested by calling (801)754-1904.

By:

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "Stephanie Christensen", is displayed within a light gray rectangular box.

Stephanie Christensen, City Recorder

MEMO



To: Planning Commission
From: Morgan Brim, Community Development Director
Date: October 8, 2026
RE: Proposed text amendment SCC. § 10.44.050 Nonconforming Signs

Summary

YESCO LLC., representing Maverik Inc., initiated an amendment to Santaquin City Code § 10.44.050 to allow the city to consider changes to legally established nonconforming signs when a proposal reduces the sign's overall nonconformity. The amendment would also direct the Development Review Committee (DRC) to evaluate impacts on nearby properties, including whether a relocated sign would interfere with the visibility of another legally established sign. The text amendment would establish a review process; it would not approve a particular Maverik sign, height, or location. Maverik would need to file a sign application and then proceed through the applicable process.

Request and Background

Maverik has discussed relocating its existing approximately 80-foot freestanding sign and reducing its height to approximately 65 feet. The sign is nonconforming under current sign standards. The current text generally limits changes to nonconforming signs unless the sign is brought into full compliance, while the proposed amendment would allow the city to consider certain changes that make a legally established sign reasonably less nonconforming.

The requested amendment applies citywide to legally established nonconforming signs that seek special exception approval. Any later application for the Maverik sign would require separate review under the ordinance and would be decided on its own record.

Proposed Changes

The following modifications to § 10.44.050 are proposed:

1. Language supports the eventual elimination of nonconforming signs while encouraging voluntary changes that reasonably reduce nonconformity and move signs closer to compliance.
2. The existing sentence requiring a sign to become fully compliant before it may be moved, altered, or enlarged would be removed. The amendment would clarify that the section does not discourage replacement, relocation, or modification of a legally established sign when the change makes it reasonably less nonconforming.
3. The DRC would replace the Appeal Authority as the body reviewing special exception requests.
4. Subsection C.2 would direct the DRC to consider the proposed sign's location, height, orientation, and design. It would require a finding that the proposal will not create greater adverse impacts on adjacent or nearby properties than currently exist. The listed examples include obstruction of visibility, interference with other legally established signs, and traffic safety concerns.

5. A new subsection, C.4, would require the proposed modification, alteration, or movement to reasonably reduce the sign's overall degree of nonconformity compared with the existing legally established sign and advance the chapter's purpose by bringing the sign closer to compliance.

Applying Review Criteria

The proposed criteria address two separate questions. Subsection C.2 concerns the effects of the proposed sign and its location on nearby properties. Subsection C.4 asks whether the sign as a whole would become less nonconforming and closer to current standards. A shorter sign could satisfy C.4 while still creating a visibility problem at a new location. The DRC would evaluate that issue separately under C.2.

Recommended Motion

"Motion to recommend [approval/denial] to the City Council of the proposed code amendments to SCC. § 10.44.050 Nonconforming Signs"

Attachments

1. Proposed Ordinance

ORDINANCE NO. ... DRAFT

AN ORDINANCE AMENDING SANTAQUIN CITY CODE § 10.44.050, NONCONFORMING SIGNS, TO ALLOW SPECIAL EXCEPTION REVIEW OF MODIFICATIONS, ALTERATIONS, AND RELOCATIONS THAT REASONABLY REDUCE THE DEGREE OF NONCONFORMITY; TO ESTABLISH CRITERIA FOR REVIEWING IMPACTS ON ADJACENT AND NEARBY PROPERTIES; TO DESIGNATE THE DEVELOPMENT REVIEW COMMITTEE AS THE REVIEWING AUTHORITY; AND PROVIDING FOR CODIFICATION, CORRECTION OF SCRIVENER'S ERRORS, SEVERABILITY, AND AN EFFECTIVE DATE FOR THE ORDINANCE.

WHEREAS, the City of Santaquin is a fourth-class city of the state of Utah; and

WHEREAS, the City Council has specific authority pursuant to Title 10, Chapter 20 Utah Code Ann. (1953 as amended) to adopt a zoning plan including an ordinance and map which divide the municipality into districts or zones and within such districts to regulate the erection, construction, reconstruction, alteration, repair and uses of buildings and structures and the uses of land; and

WHEREAS, the state legislature has granted general welfare power to the City Council, independent, apart from, and in addition to, its specific grants of legislative authority, which enables the city to pass ordinances which are reasonably and appropriately related to the objectives of that power, i.e. providing for the public safety, health, morals, and welfare; and

WHEREAS, the City Council desires to amend Title 10 of the Santaquin City Code, specifically Section 10.44.050, *Nonconforming Signs*, to allow special-exception review of modifications, alterations, and relocations of legally established nonconforming signs when the proposed action reasonably reduces the degree of nonconformity, and to establish criteria for reviewing impacts on adjacent and nearby properties; and

WHEREAS, Maverik, Inc. initiated the proposed text amendment in connection with a potential modification and relocation of an existing nonconforming sign; and

WHEREAS, the proposed amendment would apply citywide and establish review standards for eligible nonconforming signs; it would not approve a specific sign, height, or location; and

WHEREAS, the Santaquin City Planning Commission held a public hearing on October 13, 2026, after notice was provided as required by law, and forwarded its recommendation to the City Council; and

WHEREAS, after the noted public hearing, the Santaquin City Planning Commission forwarded a recommendation to the City Council;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT ORDAINED by the City Council of Santaquin City, State of Utah, as follows:

Section I. Amendments

Title 10 Chapter 44 Section 050 is amended as follows: (underlined text is added, stricken text is deleted)

10.44.050 NONCONFORMING SIGNS

~~A.~~ Regulation, Containment, And Elimination: In order to minimize confusion and unfair competitive disadvantage to ~~those~~ businesses that comply ~~which are required to satisfy with~~ the current Sign Ordinance standards, the City intends to apply firm regulation of existing nonconforming signs with a view to ward their eventual elimination. This goal shall be achieved by strictly construing limits on the change, expansion, - alteration, abandonment, and restoration of nonconforming signs while encouraging voluntary modifications that reasonably reduce the degree of nonconformity and move signs closer to compliance with this chapter. ~~Excluding normal maintenance and repair, a nonconforming sign shall not be moved, altered, (including face changes) or enlarged unless it is brought into complete compliance with this chapter. Nothing in this section is intended to discourage the replacement, relocation, or modification of a legally established nonconforming sign when the proposed changes result in a sign that is reasonably less nonconforming than the existing sign.~~ The following alterations are exempt from this provision:

1. Face changes in nonconforming multi-tenant signs, and
 2. Copy changes in nonconforming permanent signs which were originally approved by the City with a changeable copy feature.
- B. Abandonment: Within forty five (45) calendar days after vacation of an existing business, any on site nonconforming signs must be removed or brought into compliance by the property owner. If removal does not occur, Santaquin City may have the entire nonconforming sign (both face and structure) removed through the processes specified in SCC 10.44.040 paragraph C. An abandoned sign may not regain any legal nonconforming status later, even if the original business reoccupies the property. (Ord. 2-01-2002, 2-5-2002, eff. 2-5-2002)
- C. Special Exceptions: Upon application for a special exception ~~appeal~~ by the sign owner or business, the ~~Appeal Authority~~ Development Review Committee is empowered to grant a special exception to allow the retention, alteration, or movement, ~~or expansion~~ of a nonconforming sign, provided the Appeal Authority ~~Development Review Committee~~ determines that: (Ord. 2-01-2002, 2-5-2002, eff. 2-5-2002; amd. Ord. 02-02-2008, 2-6-2008, eff. 2-7-2008)

1. The nonconforming sign poses an alternative equivalent means of meeting the intent of this chapter and the City's ~~comprehensive~~general plan;
2. The proposed location, height, orientation, and design of the nonconforming sign will not create greater adverse impacts upon adjacent or nearby properties than currently exist, including but not limited to obstruction of visibility, interference with other legally established signs, or traffic safety concerns.~~action will not impose a burden on other properties in the City beyond that posed by a conforming sign; and~~
3. Approval will provide a forum for free expression or other articulable benefits to the public-: and (Ord. 2-01-2002, 2-5-2002, eff. 2-5-2002)

The proposed modification, alteration or movement of the nonconforming sign results in a reasonable reduction in the overall degree of the nonconformity compared to the existing legally established sign and advances the purpose of this chapter by bringing the overall sign closer to compliance.

Unfair competitive disadvantage of businesses in the City whose signs do comply with this chapter is to be construed as a burden to be considered by the Development Review Committee~~Appeal Authority~~. A new business generally shall not qualify for a special exception for reuse of a nonconforming sign left by a previous business. Purely economic factors, such as the expense of removing or altering a nonconforming sign or of purchasing a new conforming sign are not to be considered as reasons for granting a special exception by the Development Review Committee~~Appeal Authority~~.

The Development Review Committee~~Appeal Authority~~ is empowered to attach reasonable requirements with which the petitioner must comply as a condition of approval of a special exception. The duration of the special exception shall not extend beyond that period allowed by any Amortization Ordinance in effect at the date the exception is granted and any special exception shall be conditioned on the posting of a bond with the City sufficient to cover the cost of timely removal of such sign. (Ord. 2-01-2002, 2-5-2002, eff. 2-5-2002; amd. Ord. 02-02-2008, 2-6-2008, eff. 2-7-2008)

Section II. Severability

If any part of this ordinance or the application thereof to any person or circumstances shall, for any reason, be adjudged by a court of competent jurisdiction to be unconstitutional or invalid, such judgment shall not affect, impair or invalidate the remainder of this ordinance or the application thereof to other persons and circumstances, but shall be confined to its operation to the section,

subdivision, sentence or part of the section and the persons and circumstances directly involved in the controversy in which such judgment shall have been rendered. It is hereby declared to be the intent of the City Council that this section would have been adopted if such invalid section, provisions, subdivision, sentence or part of a section or application had not been included.

Section III. Contrary Provisions Repealed

Any and all other provisions of the Santaquin City Code that are contrary to the provisions of this Ordinance are hereby repealed.

Section IV. Codification, Inclusion in the Code, and Scrivener's Errors

It is the intent of the City Council that the provisions of this ordinance be made part of the Santaquin City Code as adopted, that sections of this ordinance may be re-numbered or re-lettered, and that the word ordinance may be changed to section, chapter, or other such appropriate word or phrase in order to accomplish such intent regardless of whether such inclusion in a code is accomplished. Typographical errors which do not affect the intent of this ordinance may be authorized by the City without need of public hearing by its filing a corrected or re-codified copy of the same with the City Recorder.

Section V. Posting and Effective Date

This ordinance shall become effective at 5:00 p.m. on Wednesday, October 21, 2026. Prior to that time, the City Recorder shall deposit a copy of this ordinance in the official records of the City and place a copy of this ordinance in three places within the City.

PASSED AND ADOPTED this 20th day of October 2026.

Daniel M. Olson, Mayor

Councilmember Art Adcock	Voted	___
Councilmember Brian Del Rosario	Voted	___
Councilmember Lynn Mecham	Voted	___
Councilmember Jeff Siddoway	Voted	___
Councilmember Travis Keel	Voted	___

ATTEST:

Stephanie Christensen, City Recorder

STATE OF UTAH)
) ss.
COUNTY OF UTAH)

I, STEPHANIE CHRISTENSEN, City Recorder of Santaquin City, Utah, do hereby certify and declare that the above and foregoing is a true, full, and correct copy of an ordinance passed by the City Council of Santaquin City, Utah, on the 20th day of October 2026, entitled

“AN ORDINANCE AMENDING SANTAQUIN CITY CODE § 10.44.050, NONCONFORMING SIGNS, TO ALLOW SPECIAL EXCEPTION REVIEW OF MODIFICATIONS, ALTERATIONS, AND RELOCATIONS THAT REASONABLY REDUCE THE DEGREE OF NONCONFORMITY; TO ESTABLISH CRITERIA FOR REVIEWING IMPACTS ON ADJACENT AND NEARBY PROPERTIES; TO DESIGNATE THE DEVELOPMENT REVIEW COMMITTEE AS THE REVIEWING AUTHORITY; AND PROVIDING FOR CODIFICATION, CORRECTION OF SCRIVENER’S ERRORS, SEVERABILITY, AND AN EFFECTIVE DATE FOR THE ORDINANCE.”

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the Corporate Seal of Santaquin City Utah this 20th day of October 2026

Stephanie Christensen
Santaquin City Recorder
(SEAL)

AFFIDAVIT OF POSTING

STATE OF UTAH)
) ss.
COUNTY OF UTAH)

I, STEPHANIE CHRISTENSEN, City Recorder of Santaquin City, Utah, do hereby certify and declare that prior to the ordinance taking effect, I posted a short summary of the ordinance on the Utah Public Notice Website as required by Utah State Code 10-3-711(1)(b) as a Class A Notice and Santaquin City Code 1-2-050(D)

I further certify that copies of the ordinance were posted online at www.santaquin.org, at the City Hall Building at 110 S. Center Street and on the State of Utah's Public Notice Website, <https://www.utah.gov/pmn/index.html>. A copy of the notice may also be requested by calling (801)754-1904.

STEPHANIE CHRISTENSEN
Santaquin City Recorder

The foregoing instrument was acknowledged before me on this ____ day of ____ 2026, by
STEPHANIE CHRISTENSEN.

My Commission Expires:



Planning Commission Members in Attendance: Commissioners Mike Weight, Drew Hoffman, Trevor Wood, BreAnna Nixon and Tyrell Russell.

Excused: Commissioners Jesse Christopher, LaDawn Moak and Jayson Johnson

Others in Attendance: City Council Member Jeff Siddoway, City Manager Norm Beagley, Community Development Director Morgan Brim, City Planner Aspen Elmer, Fire Chief Ryan Lind, Fire Marshall Allen Duke, Deputy City Recorder Gwen Butters and other members of the public.

Chairman Wood called the meeting to order at 7:21 p.m.

INVOCATION/INSPIRATIONAL THOUGHT

Resident, Chase Andrizzi offered an invocation.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Weight led the Pledge of Allegiance.

ORDER OF AGENDA ITEMS

PUBLIC FORUM

Chairman Wood opened the Public Forum at 7:23 p.m.

No members of the public wished to address the Planning Commission in the Public Forum.

Chairman Wood closed the Public Forum at 7:23 p.m.

DISCUSSION & POSSIBLE ACTION ITEMS

1. PUBLIC HEARING: Wilson Development Agreement

Beagley presented the proposed Wilson Development Agreement for approximately 21 acres near the mouth of Pole Canyon, across from Theodore L. Ahlin Park. Because the property is located within the Hillside Overlay Zone, a development agreement is required. The Planning Commission was asked specifically to consider whether the proposed open space improvements would satisfy the city's Hillside Overlay open space requirements.

The applicants propose dedicating approximately 2.75 acres to Utah County within the Santaquin Canyon debris basin area. The dedication would support an ongoing NRCS debris basin and channel improvement project being undertaken jointly by the city and Utah county. The proposal also includes an access road for Utah county maintenance that could potentially serve as a public non-motorized trail and future connection to the Bonneville Shoreline Trail and other trail systems.

Staff explained that the proposed land dedication exceeds 10 percent of the property acreage, although the amount of improved open space may be slightly less than 10 percent. Staff supported the proposal as providing significant benefit to the city and county through flood-control improvements, property acquisition, and future trail connectivity.

Applicant Lori Wilson stated that the property is intended primarily for homes for herself and her children and expressed a desire to work cooperatively with the city and surrounding community.

Chairman Wood opened the Public Hearing at 7:31 p.m.

No members of the public wished to address the Planning Commission in the Public Hearing.

Chairman Wood closed the Public Hearing at 7:31 p.m.

The Commission expressed support for the proposal, noting the benefits to the city, Utah county, flood-control efforts, and the future trail system.

No further comments from the Planning Commission were received.

Weight made a motion to forward a positive recommendation for the Wilson Development Agreement to the City Council. Nixon seconded the motion.

Commissioner Jesse Christopher	Absent
Commissioner Mike Weight	Yes
Commissioner Drew Hoffman	Yes
Commissioner Trevor Wood	Yes
Commissioner BreAnna Nixon	Yes
Commissioner LaDawn Moak	Absent
Commissioner Jayson Johnson	Absent
Commissioner Tyrell Russell	Yes

The motion passed.

2. PUBLIC HEARING: Detached Additional Dwelling Units

Staff presented a proposed amendment to City Code addressing detached accessory dwelling units (DADUs) in response to changes in Utah State Code. Beginning October 1, state law requires cities to permit DADUs on qualifying properties when the lot is at least 11,000 square feet, contains an existing single-family dwelling, and allows a single-family dwelling as permitted use.

Staff clarified that Santaquin already permits DADUs in certain residential zones, including the Main Street Residential, R-8, R-10, and R-15 zones. Existing rights within those zones would remain unchanged and would not become subject to the new 11,000-square-foot minimum.

The amendment would update the general accessory dwelling unit standards and several residential zone tables. Proposed parking requirements include one off-street parking space for DADUs smaller than 650 square feet and two spaces for units 650 square feet or larger. Tandem parking would not satisfy the requirement.

Chairman Wood opened the Public Hearing at 7:38 p.m.

Resident Jessica Ferrick asked whether a property could contain both an attached and detached accessory dwelling unit. Staff clarified that only one accessory dwelling unit, either attached or detached, is permitted on a property.

No other members of the public wished to address the Planning Commission in the Public Hearing.

Chairman Wood closed the Public Hearing at 7:39 p.m.

The Commission discussed adding “accessory use” to the Agricultural Zone table for consistency with other residential zoning tables. Staff agreed that this would be appropriate.

No further comments from the Planning Commission were received.

Weight made a motion to forward a positive recommendation to the City Council, with the recommendation that the Agricultural Zone table also be revised for consistency regarding “accessory uses.” Russell seconded the motion.

Commissioner Jesse Christopher	Absent
Commissioner Mike Weight	Yes
Commissioner Drew Hoffman	Yes
Commissioner Trevor Wood	Yes
Commissioner BreAnna Nixon	Yes
Commissioner LaDawn Moak	Absent
Commissioner Jayson Johnson	Absent
Commissioner Tyrell Russell	Yes

The motion passed.

3. Santaquin City Property and Salisbury Development Proposal

Beagley presented a city-initiated development agreement involving property on the East Bench. The city is seeking property needed for access to a municipal water tank, construction and maintenance of a debris basin drainage channel, and fulfillment of access obligations associated with a previous development agreement.

In exchange for the necessary property dedication, the property owner is requesting reinstatement of development rights for 11 residential lots in the Stone Hollow/Summit Ridge area. The lots had previously received approval, but the entitlement later expired. Staff noted that the proposed lots and lot sizes are consistent with the original approval and with the surrounding neighborhood. Utilities and portions of the roadway infrastructure are already in place.

The city would also accept an existing roadway section that contains approximately 34 feet of asphalt with sidewalk on one side. Some proposed lots do not meet current minimum frontage or lot-size requirements; however, staff explained that the layout is consistent with the previously approved development and surrounding development pattern.

The Commission discussed potential future access to property owned by the Nebo School District. Staff explained that the existing neighborhood roads would not be appropriate as primary access for a future school because they are not designed for significant school traffic. They could potentially serve as emergency access, but primary access would need to be provided elsewhere.

Staff also noted that acquiring the East Bench property outright could cost the city several hundred thousand dollars, while the proposed agreement would provide the needed property through

dedication in exchange for reinstating previously approved development rights. Following discussion, the Commission found the proposed exchange reasonable and beneficial to the city.

No further comments from the Planning Commission were received

Nixon made a motion to forward a positive recommendation for the Santaquin City Property and Salisbury Development Proposal to the City Council. Weight seconded the motion.

Commissioner Jesse Christopher	Absent
Commissioner Mike Weight	Yes
Commissioner Drew Hoffman	Yes
Commissioner Trevor Wood	Yes
Commissioner BreAnna Nixon	Yes
Commissioner LaDawn Moak	Absent
Commissioner Jayson Johnson	Absent
Commissioner Tyrell Russell	Absent

The motion passed.

4. PUBLIC HEARING: Restricting Bulk Fuel Storage in Residential Zones

Staff provided an update on the previously discussed bulk fuel storage code amendment. Earlier versions of the amendment proposed regulating or prohibiting storage of more than 150 gallons of fuel within residential zones. After additional discussion, the proposed language had been narrowed to focus primarily on commercial activities and home occupations.

Following consultation with Fire Chief Ryan Lind and Fire Marshal Allen Duke, staff determined that fuel storage is already adequately regulated through the International Fire Code adopted by the city. Under the Fire Code, certain quantities of fuel require hazardous materials reviewed and permitted by the Fire Department. This process allows the city to evaluate tank location, setbacks, dispensing methods, fire protection, and other safety requirements.

The Fire Department clarified that gasoline, diesel, and propane are regulated differently based on their characteristics and quantities. Propane tanks may be permitted in residential settings when applicable setback and safety requirements are met. Staff stated that the existing Fire Code provides sufficient authority to address safety concerns without creating duplicate land-use regulations.

Chairman Wood opened the Public Hearing at 7:51 p.m.

No members of the public wished to address the Planning Commission in the Public Hearing.

Chairman Wood closed the Public Hearing at 7:51 p.m.

Staff recommended withdrawing the city-initiated text amendment. The Commission agreed and no further comments were received.

Nixon made a motion to withdraw the proposed bulk fuel storage amendment.
Russell seconded the motion.

Commissioner Jesse Christopher	Absent
Commissioner Mike Weight	Yes
Commissioner Drew Hoffman	Yes
Commissioner Trevor Wood	Yes
Commissioner BreAnna Nixon	Yes
Commissioner LaDawn Moak	Absent
Commissioner Jayson Johnson	Absent
Commissioner Tyrell Russell	Yes

The motion passed.

5. Meeting Minutes Approval - August 25, 2026

Nixon made a motion to approve the August 25, 2026 Planning Commission Meeting Minutes.
Weight seconded the motion.

Commissioner Jesse Christopher	Absent
Commissioner Mike Weight	Yes
Commissioner Drew Hoffman	Yes
Commissioner Trevor Wood	Yes
Commissioner BreAnna Nixon	Yes
Commissioner LaDawn Moak	Absent
Commissioner Jayson Johnson	Absent
Commissioner Tyrell Russell	Absent

The motion passed.

STAFF REPORTS

No staff wished to report to the Planning Commission

ADJOURNMENT

Weight made a motion to adjourn the meeting.

The meeting was adjourned at 8:11 p.m.

Deputy City Recorder – Gwen Butters

Planning Commission Chair – Trevor Wood