

2 The Lindon City Redevelopment Agency held a meeting on **Wednesday, July 30, 2025**
3 beginning at approximately 6:00 pm in the Lindon City Center, City Council Chambers, 100
4 North State Street, Lindon, Utah.

5 Conducting: Jeff Wilson, Vice-Chairperson

6 **PRESENT**

7 Jeff Wilson, Vice-Chairperson
8 Glen Mitchell, Boardmember
9 Greg Slater, Boardmember
10 Mike Florence, Community Development Director
11 Britni Laidler, Deputy Recorder

ABSENT

Jeff Southard, Chairperson
Steve Smith, Boardmember

12
13
14 **1. Call to Order**

The meeting was called to order at 6:23 p.m.

15
16 **2. Review of Minutes** – The minutes of the Board Meeting of May 28, 2025 were
17 reviewed.

18
19
20 BOARDMEMBER SLATER MOVED TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF THE
21 MEETING OF MAY 28, 2025 AS PRESENTED. BOARDMEMBER MITCHELL
22 SECONDED THE MOTION. ALL PRESENT VOTED IN FAVOR. THE MOTION
23 CARRIED.

24 **CURRENT BUSINESS** –

25
26 **3. Continued from May 28, 2025 - An appeal of a decision by Lindon City to revoke
27 building permit number 4779-2024 to construct a billboard on the property located
28 at 315 S. 1250 W.** Application is made by Darren Green and David Lambert.

29
30 Boardmember Wilson explained that this meeting was a continuation from May 28, 2025,
31 specifically to discuss and deliberate on the appeal of a decision by Lindon City to revoke
32 building permit number 4779-2024 for a billboard at 315 South 1250 West. He clarified that the
33 city had issued and subsequently revoked a building permit, and the Board was to determine
34 whether that revocation was appropriate.

35
36 Boardmember Slater raised questions about the financial arrangements, specifically
37 asking if Mr. Green was still obligated to pay the balance of his contract with Compass
38 regardless of the outcome. David Lambert, attorney for Mr. Green, confirmed that Mr. Green had
39 signed a binding contract. Mr. Lambert further emphasized the importance of confidentiality
40 regarding mediation discussions, pointing out that discussions versus actual offers were two
41 different things. Mike Florence, Community Development Director, mentioned that the city had
42 gone through a mediation process through the property rights office and had offered to pay Mr.
43 Green's initial down payment. Boardmember Slater then inquired about the city ordinance
44 limiting billboards to 10 when there were already 16 existing billboards. Mr. Florence explained
45 that the ordinance was passed decades ago with the expectation that through attrition, the number

2 would eventually decrease to 10. He noted that state law had since changed, giving additional
rights to billboard companies. Mr. Florence further explained that the city's reasons for wanting
to reduce billboards were primarily safety concerns and beautification.

4
6 There was discussion regarding whether an offer to compensate Mr. Green for his
\$41,000 down payment had been made. Mr. Florence stated that the city had been willing to
reimburse the down payment cost, but Mr. Green's asking price was so high (in the hundreds of
8 thousands) that they felt they would never reach a compromise.

10 Boardmember Wilson then questioned the city about their awareness of state statutes
regarding billboards during the permit approval process. Taylor Kordsiemon, counsel for the
12 City, responded that the city was aware of state law and the distinction between creating a new
billboard versus replacing an existing one. He explained that the confusion arose because the city
14 was not aware that Mr. Green did not actually own the billboard in question - they thought they
were approving a replacement rather than authorizing the construction of a brand new billboard.
16 Mr. Green, through his attorney Lambert, countered that they had presented substantial evidence
showing Mr. Green had multiple discussions with the city stating he was terminating his lease
18 with YESCO and wanted to replace the billboard. Mr. Lambert pointed out that Mr. Green
signed a binding contract, and that Mr. Green and the City had discussed the termination of the
20 YESCO lease to replace the existing billboard.

22 During deliberation, Boardmember Mitchell expressed that there was fault on both sides -
the city for misunderstanding ownership, but greater fault with YESCO, Compass, and the
24 lawyers for not providing clear information about billboard ownership and rights. He expressed
frustration that parties with interests in the billboard, like YESCO, did not provide information
26 that could have prevented confusion. He noted that Compass should have alerted Mr. Green to
potential liabilities, and lawyers involved also had a responsibility to better understand the
28 ownership situation.

30 Boardmember Wilson noted that he had visited the site at 315 South 1250 West and
observed that construction of the billboard would not be done on-site - only installation would
32 occur there. He argued that construction had already begun off-site before the permit was
revoked, which was significant to the question of whether an estoppel existed. He emphasized
34 the role of modern construction practices, noting it was common for much of the work to occur
off-site. His definition of estoppel—"an equitable doctrine, a bar that prevents one from asserting
36 a claim or right that contradicts what one has said or done before"—was used to support the
argument that construction, including prefabrication, had already started, thereby challenging the
38 city's justification for revocation.

40 Boardmember Slater expressed concern about potential precedent if they granted the
appeal, wondering what effect it might have with other billboard companies, though
42 acknowledging this was outside their jurisdiction. He shared worries that granting the appeal
might lead to more legal challenges, particularly regarding existing city ordinances and limits on
44 billboard numbers. This concern was shared by others who acknowledged the potential
complexity and ramifications of their decision, recognizing that it could set a significant
46 precedent for future cases.

2 BOARDMEMBER SLATER MOVED TO REVERSE THE REVOCATION OF
BUILDING PERMIT 4779-2024. BOARDMEMBER MITCHELL SECONDED THE
4 MOTION. THE VOTE WAS RECORDED AS FOLLOWS:
BOARDMEMBER SLATER AYE
6 BOARDMEMBER WILSON AYE
BOARDMEMBER MITCHELL AYE
8 THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

10 Following the vote, Taylor Kordsiemon initially requested a 14-day stay of the Board's
decision while the city evaluated its options for appeal but withdrew the request after discussion
12 about the need to formalize the findings.

14 Before adjournment, Mike Florence mentioned the need to schedule another variance
meeting requiring 10 days' public notice. The Board discussed potential dates in August, with
16 various members noting their availability on the 13th, 14th, 27th, and 28th. Florence agreed to
email all board members to confirm a date.

18 **ADJOURN -**

20 BOARDMEMBER SLATER MOVED TO ADJOURN THE MEETING AT 7:03 P.M.
22 BOARDMEMBER MITCHELL SECONDED. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

24 Approved – August 13, 2025

26
28 _____
Jeff Southard, Chairperson

30
32 _____
Mike Florence, Planning Director