

2 The Lindon City Planning Commission held a regularly scheduled meeting on **Tuesday,**  
4 **February 24, 2026 beginning at 6:00 p.m.** at the Lindon City Center, City Council Chambers,  
100 North State Street, Lindon, Utah.

**REGULAR SESSION – 6:00 P.M.**

6 Conducting: Steve Johnson, Chairperson  
8 Invocation: Mike Marchbanks, Commissioner  
Pledge of Allegiance: Scott Thompson, Commissioner

**PRESENT**

12 Steve Johnson, Chairperson  
14 Mike Marchbanks, Commissioner  
16 Scott Thompson, Commissioner  
18 Rob Kallas, Commissioner  
20 Sharon Call, Commissioner  
Jared Schauers, Commissioner  
Karen Danielson, Commissioner  
Michael Florence, Community Dev. Director  
Brittany Wilde, City Planner  
Whitney Hatfield, Deputy Recorder

**EXCUSED**

Ryan Done, Commissioner  
Brian Haws, City Attorney

- 22 1. **CALL TO ORDER** – The meeting was called to order at 6:00 p.m.  
24 2. **APPROVAL OF MINUTES** –The minutes of the regular meeting of the Planning  
26 Commission meeting of February 10, 2026 were reviewed.

28 COMMISSIONER THOMPSON MOVED TO APPROVE MINUTES OF THE  
30 REGULAR MEETING OF FEBRUARY 10, 2026. COMMISSIONER CALL SECONDED  
THE MOTION. ALL PRESENT VOTED IN FAVOR. THE MOTION CARRIED.

- 32 3. **PUBLIC COMMENT** – Chairperson Johnson called for comments from any audience  
34 member who wishes to address any issue not listed as an agenda item. There were no  
public comments.

36 **CURRENT BUSINESS-**

- 38 4. **Concept Plan Review – Colliers Lindon, 500 S 400 W.** Rick Magness from AWA  
40 Engineering has applied for a concept plan review to receive general feedback for future  
development of the property located at 500 S 400 W.

42 Brittany Wilde, City Planner, presented the concept plan on behalf of applicant Rick  
44 Magness, with Jake Tate of AWA Engineering representing the project. She stated that the  
property is currently zoned Research and Business and that the applicant is proposing a three-  
46 phase mixed-use development consisting of commercial uses and residential townhomes. The  
proposed development includes approximately 114,253 square feet of retail and commercial  
space, 19,682 square feet of standalone pad sites, 94,571 square feet for anchor tenants, and 126

2 townhome units at a density of 14.8 units per acre. She noted that Phase 1 would consist of pad  
3 sites and multi-tenant retail. Phase 2 would include two anchor tenants. Phase 3 would be the  
4 residential component. The proposed development would require an ordinance amendment and  
5 the creation of a new zoning district to allow a mix of commercial and residential uses.

6 Staff provided the following feedback to the developer:

- 8 • Relocate the pickleball courts to function as a stronger amenity for the overall  
9 development rather than placing them adjacent to an anchor tenant;
- 10 • Evaluate the visitor parking ratio (currently proposed at 0.5 stalls per unit with 63  
11 visitor stalls for 126 units), citing comparisons with Tilly Court, Songbird Cove, and  
12 Anderson Farms;
- 13 • Expressed a preference for owner-occupied townhome units;
- 14 • Incorporate a mix of front-loaded and rear-loaded units to allow some townhomes to  
15 have private rear yards;
- 16 • Noted that the three common open space areas appear to represent approximately 10  
17 percent of the site;
- 18 • Voiced concerns regarding the quality and livability of units located near the anchor  
19 tenant and delivery areas.

20 Staff noted the applicant had already removed one unit at the end of each building  
21 adjacent to the anchor to allow for additional trees and landscaping. Staff also noted that 400  
22 West and 600 North (1600 North) would be widened by UDOT, including a right-hand turn lane,  
23 and that the commercial development would help the city's tax base.

24 City Planner Wilde then turned the time over the Jake Tate, civil engineer with AWA  
25 Engineering, who is representing the applicant. He presented additional detail on the project and  
26 described the site as ideal for mixed-use development given its location at the edge of town,  
27 surrounded by streets on all sides with commercial and office uses to the north, west, and south,  
28 and with only one proposed residential connection to 400 West. He noted this configuration  
29 would minimize impact on surrounding residential neighborhoods while providing efficient  
30 freeway access for future residents.

31 Regarding the development timeline, Mr. Tate indicated Phase 1 would begin as soon as  
32 rezoning and subdivision work were completed, noting that existing warehouse leases on the  
33 property would need to play out first. He anticipated Phases 2 and 3 coming online in five to ten  
34 years, with the possibility of Phases 2 and 3 proceeding simultaneously once an anchor tenant  
35 committed. He indicated the residential elevations provided were conceptual and based on prior  
36 Colliers Group projects, and that front-loaded unit options were entirely feasible given the four-  
37 to-five year lead time before detailed residential design would begin.

38 Mr. Tate discussed taking advantage of the approximately 15-foot grade drop from 400  
39 West to the interior parking level, particularly for units facing 400 West. He described a potential  
40 three-story unit where a basement garage would be accessed from the lower parking level while  
41 the upper two stories would present as a two-story home from 400 West, providing additional  
42 storage and a natural way to manage the grade transition.

2 Regarding amenities, Mr. Tate described three distinct pods, each with its own amenity: a park or  
4 playground area, a pool and clubhouse in the northeast, and pickleball courts near the anchor  
6 tenant area. He explained the reasoning for placing the pickleball courts in their current location  
8 was to provide a degree of privacy for residents, limit noise impacts on the broader community,  
10 and keep it accessible primarily to the development's residents. He acknowledged this was  
subject to discussion with the city. He also addressed the decision to orient units adjacent to the  
anchor away from the loading dock, noting that while residents would need to drive past the  
anchor to enter, they would not face it directly, and that wall and landscape screening would be  
used.

12 Mr. Tate noted that no commercial tenants had been formally signed, as the intent was to  
14 secure zoning first before approaching tenants. He described the southwest pad as likely a high-  
16 use drive-through restaurant based on its layout, with Pad B envisioned as a fast-casual concept  
18 similar to Cafe Rio, and Pad C as a standard fast-food layout. The primary anchor tenant would  
most likely be a grocer, such as Associated Foods, Harmon's, or Smith's. He added that Anchor 2  
would likely be driven by the preference of Anchor 1. The Colliers Group had not yet decided  
whether the residential component would be for-sale or for-lease, given the long horizon of  
Phase 3.

20 A detailed discussion revolved around several key topics:

- 22 1. **Density and Residential Character:** Concerns were raised about the high density of  
24 14.8 units per acre, with a preference expressed for a closer to 10 units per acre. Some  
commissioners favored residential development at the location due to its commercial  
surroundings and distance from single-family neighborhoods.
- 26 2. **Commercial Preservation:** Protecting the site as a valuable commercial corridor was  
28 emphasized, noting its strategic importance near the auto mall and upcoming road  
widening. A preference for commercial uses at the front and residential at the rear was  
voiced, contributing positively to traffic flow and city tax revenue.
- 30 3. **Rezoning Strategy:** The commission agreed on prompt rezoning of Phase 1 to  
32 commercial, with caution against rezoning phases 2 or 3 immediately due to their long-  
term nature. A hybrid plan of rezoning in phases aligned with the developer's timeline  
was suggested.
- 34 4. **Parking Concerns:** Inadequate visitor parking and the absence of driveways posed as  
36 significant issues, leading to potential street parking overflow. Adjustments such as  
increasing parking stalls and exploring parking agreements were suggested.
- 38 5. **Access and Grade Issues:** The topography was discussed regarding single access to the  
40 residential area, with a preference for multiple access points. Concerns over traffic flow  
and necessary infrastructure changes, such as potential medians, were considered.
- 42 6. **Affordability and Ownership:** The preference was expressed for ownership over rental  
44 units to benefit local residents. Considerations of affordability were complex given  
market prices, though multifamily housing units were noted to provide affordable  
options.
- 46 7. **Vacant Parcel and Existing Infrastructure:** The possibility of incorporating adjacent  
parcels for additional planning needs was discussed, alongside assessing existing building  
usage and potential demolition as future phases develop.
8. **Project Comparison and Feedback Summary:** The project shared  
similarities to successful nearby developments, generating positive city revenue and

2 supporting the commercial and residential mix. Overall feedback reflected support for the  
4 proposal, paired with suggestions for balance in density, thorough rezoning strategy, and  
infrastructure planning.

6 Following general discussion, Chairperson Johnson called for any further comments or  
discussion from the Commission. Hearing none he moved onto the next agenda item.

8  
**6. Community Development Director Report**

- 10 • Next meeting: March 10<sup>th</sup>
- 12 • Temple Open House Invitations
- 14 • Mayor's State of the City Address
- 16 • Cell Tower Ordinance Update
- 18 • Byland Development Update
- 20 • Misc. City Updates

22 **ADJOURN** –

24  
26 COMMISSIONER DANIELSON MOVED TO ADJOURN THE MEETING AT 7:22  
28 PM. COMMISSIONER THOMPSON SECONDED THE MOTION. ALL PRESENT VOTED  
30 IN FAVOR. THE MOTION CARRIED.

32  
Approved, March 10, 2026

\_\_\_\_\_  
Steven Johnson, Chairperson

\_\_\_\_\_  
Michael Florence, Community Development Director