

**Lupita McClenning**  
Director  
**Izabela Miller**  
Operations Officer



G R E A T E R   S A L T   L A K E  
**Municipal Services**  
**District**

**Trent Sorensen**  
Chief Building Official  
**James McNulty**  
Planning Manager

March 25, 2021

Dan Knopp  
c/o John Brems, Esq.  
10717 Watery Way  
South Jordan, Utah 84009  
[john@bremslaw.com](mailto:john@bremslaw.com)

RE: Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law, and Decision on Revised  
Application for Special Exception, Application No. 31241

Dear Mr. Knopp:

You submitted a revised application to have a use violation declared legal through special exception ("Application"). On March 4, 2021, the Mountainous Planning District Planning Commission ("planning commission") announced its approval of Application No. 31241 subject to certain conditions, and indicated that the planning commission vice chair would issue written Findings and Conclusions consistent with its decision. The written Findings, Conclusions, and Decision of the planning commission are as set forth below:

## **FINDINGS OF FACT**

### **Procedural History**

On or about August 12, 2020, Dan Knopp ("Applicant") filed application #31241 to have a use violation declared legal through special exception to allow for a wedding/reception/event use on parcel number 24-21-208-011-0000. On or about October 27, 2020, Applicant filed revised application #312431 to expand the application to the following additional parcel numbers: #24-21-208-008, #24-21-208-013, #24-21-28-025, and #24-21-208-026. The subject property is located at 11332 E. Big Cottonwood Canyon Rd, Brighton, UT 84121. The subject property consists of five parcels, three of which are zoned C-V (commercial zone in area frequented by visitor/tourists), one of which is zoned FR-0.5 (forestry and recreation zone for lots of ½ to 1 acre), and one of which is partially zoned C-V with the remainder zoned FR-0.5 (see map attached as Exhibit 1). Applicant has been using all of the parcels for a wedding/reception/event use, which is not a recognized use in either the C-V or FR-0.5 zones (but is a

recognized use in other zones). See Salt Lake County Ordinance Sections 19.12.020/030 and 19.60.020/030 (FR and CV zones do not allow these uses); and 19.44.030, 19.55.040, 19.56.040, 19.62.040, and 19.64.040 (zones that do allow such uses).

In response to the Application, planning staff issued a notice on November 5, 2020 (“First Notice”). The First Notice was mailed to all property owners within 300’ of the subject parcels. The First Notice indicated that the planning commission would address the Application at a meeting to be held on January 7, 2021. The First Notice indicated that evidence in support of and in opposition to the Application was limited to documentary evidence pursuant to Salt Lake County Ordinance Section 19.88.140(B), that because testimonial evidence was not legally appropriate there would not be a public hearing, and that written evidence must be submitted by the deadlines outlined in the First Notice. The First Notice further indicated that written evidence should address the criteria outlined in County Ordinance 19.88.140(A). A subsequent notice was mailed to all property owners within 300’ of the subject parcels on November 20, 2020 (“Second Notice”), which extended the due dates for providing written evidence in support of the criteria in subsection (A) of the Ordinance, but retained the January 7, 2021 meeting date. The First and Second Notices were also posted on the Municipal Services District web site shortly after they were mailed to property owners.

Planning staff received a number of written comments, evidence, and argument from the Applicant, property owners in the vicinity, and others, which were posted online for parties to respond to in writing in accordance with the requirements and deadlines outlined in the First and Second Notices. A number of persons providing written comment/evidence/argument desired to remain anonymous, but in accordance with due process requirements to be able to confront witnesses, the planning commission did not review or consider such comments. A number of persons desired to provide comments, evidence, and argument after the deadlines outlined in the Second Notice, but the planning commission did not review or consider these comments because doing so would require another round of written response times and unduly delay the proceedings, contrary to State law requirements that land use applications be decided within a reasonable period of time (many months had already passed since the original application was filed in August 2020). See Utah Code Section 17-27a-509.5. Additionally, persons desiring to provide comments/evidence/argument after the deadlines received the First and Second Notice and had abundant opportunity to timely provide written comments/evidence/argument.

### **Applicant’s Evidence**

Applicant has owned the Silver Fork Lodge & Restaurant since 1993. Applicant indicates that he has operated and conducted outdoor receptions, events, and weddings on the property zoned FR-0.5 since

2002 and indoor receptions, events, and weddings on the property zoned C-V since 1993. Applicant has submitted his own affidavit testifying to this use of the subject property for these periods of time. Applicant has submitted affidavits of property owners in the vicinity of the subject property, testifying to this use of the subject property for similar periods of time. Applicant also has submitted "Function Sheets" indicating use of the subject property for both indoor and outdoor receptions, events, and weddings from 2008-2019 (among other years). These affidavits also indicate that the use of the subject property for receptions, events and weddings has not had a detrimental impact on the peace and quiet that those property owners enjoy.

### **Opposition Evidence**

A number of property owners in the vicinity expressed opposition to Applicant's request for a special exception. This opposition includes the following concerns, which planning staff researched.

**Amplified Outdoor Music, Speeches, and Announcements:** Matthew Mudek, Laynee Jones, Thomas Loken and Sally Loken ("Opponents") and other property owners in the vicinity of the subject property submitted evidence in opposition to the Application related to amplified noise. As a result, planning staff reached out to the County Health Department to understand the applicable noise regulations. Salt Lake County Health Department, Health Regulation #21, Community Noise Pollution Control includes various noise limits. When a complaint is received by the County Health Department, an area inspector is sent out to measure noise levels and follow-up with the property owner on future compliance. The next step in the process includes a Notice of Violation (NOV), and an Order of Compliance which may include court action.

**Inadequate parking in the SFL parking lot, leading to parking along neighborhood streets and Big Cottonwood Canyon Road ("BCCR"):** Opponents and other property owners in the vicinity of the subject property have submitted evidence in opposition to the Application regarding inadequate parking for weddings/receptions/events. Planning staff conducted multiple site visits at Silver Fork Lodge. A total of 38 paved parking spaces were counted in the adjacent parking area between BCCR and the lodge operation.

Planning staff researched the requirements of the Salt Lake County off-street parking ordinance, located in County Code Section 19.80.040. This ordinance outlines off-street parking requirements for various uses, with parking requirements tied to number of persons/seats, square footage of buildings, dwellings, beds, etc. For uses not specified in this section, Subsection (B) of the Ordinance allows the planning director to determine the number of required parking spaces after being guided, where appropriate, by

comparable ordinances from other jurisdictions, accepted planning industry standards, or uses or buildings which, in the opinion of the division director, are similar to the use or building under consideration. Any approved special exception would need to comply with this ordinance.

Planning staff contacted UDOT regarding parking and access for the site. UDOT indicated that the property owner is required to apply for an "Access Permit" and go through a process allowing for safe site ingress/egress.

Planning staff noted that parking had been reported along BCCR during weddings/receptions/events, that BCCR is a UDOT roadway, and that UPD enforces parking along the roadway on behalf of UDOT. Planning staff discussed this item with UDOT and noted that parking is allowed on either side of BCCR in areas with appropriate shoulder width. However, planning staff also noted that on-street parking is not considered when determining parking requirements under Salt Lake County Ordinance. See Salt Lake County Code Sections 19.80.020(A), 19.80.040(A).

**Risk to Bicyclist and Pedestrians along BCCR:** Opponents and other property owners in the vicinity of the subject property submitted evidence in opposition to the Application regarding bicycle and pedestrian safety along the frontage of the lodge. Apparently, patrons pull out into the BCCR right-of-way without first looking for traffic. Planning staff noted that this concern can be addressed by the property owner working with UDOT through the required "Access Permit" process as previously stated, and specific areas of conflict can possibly be identified with appropriate signage as per UDOT standards.

**Parking along East Silver Fork Road and Rufus Road:** Opponents and other property owners in the vicinity submitted evidence in opposition to the Application regarding patrons' vehicles being parked along these roadways during weddings/receptions/events. Planning staff indicated that parking along these narrow roads is not allowed. These roadways provide access to homes in the area and allow fire and emergency vehicle access for the Unified Fire Authority ("UFA").

**Wedding Guest Loitering and Trespassing along East Silver Fork Road and Rufus Road:** Opponents and other property owners in the vicinity submitted evidence in opposition to the Application regarding wedding/reception guests loitering and trespassing in this area before and after events. This includes individuals who have been drinking and allegedly are inebriated and individuals who urinate on the property of others.

**Hours of Operation:** Opponents and other property owners in the vicinity have submitted evidence in opposition to the Application regarding hours of operation for weddings/receptions. Planning staff notes that according to the County Health Department, quiet hours are from 10 PM to 7 AM daily. Opponents and other property owners in the vicinity have indicated that wedding/reception parties go inside at 9 PM in an effort to keep noise levels down for adjacent property owners, but that the noise level remains high after 9 PM as the doors to the lower level of the lodge remain open to accommodate parties.

### **Reply Evidence**

Applicant provided evidence that the use existed at the time of the original application and continuously for 10 consecutive years, that no complaints regarding the use were received during the preceding 10-year period, and that the use will not have a detrimental impact. Applicant submitted calendars and Function Sheets from 2009-2019 showing regular use of the subject property for events/receptions/weddings.

### **CONCLUSIONS OF LAW**

Salt Lake County Ordinance Section 19.88.140 provides a mechanism for property that has been used in violation of the zoning ordinance to be recognized as a lawful use. It provides:

- A. Whenever land or a structure is used in violation of this title, the owner may file an application with the planning commission to have the use declared legal through special exception. The planning commission may approve such an application only when the evidence establishes all of the following:
  - 1. The use exists on the property at the time of the application and has been in continuous violation of the zoning ordinance for a period exceeding ten years;
  - 2. No complaint has been made to the development services division concerning the violation for a period exceeding ten consecutive years during which the violation existed;
  - 3. Continuation of the use will not have a detrimental effect on the health, safety or welfare of persons or property in the vicinity.

Section 19.88.140(B) outlines the evidence that the planning commission may consider when making its determination. It provides:

- B. The planning commission may consider as evidence:

1. Documents that are part of the public record, such as tax appraisals, utility records, aerial photographs, building permits, etc.
2. Documentation from third parties, such as affidavits, photographs, etc.
3. Documentation from current or past property owners, such as tax records, rental/lease agreements, appraisal records, etc.

In accordance with these provisions, the Applicant, Opponents, a number of property owners in the vicinity of the subject property and other citizens have timely submitted evidence, as summarized in the Findings of Fact section. The planning commission has reviewed the evidence and provides the following analysis.

Applicant notes that he is actually requesting two Special Exceptions—one for the indoor and outdoor events conducted on his property in the C-V zone and the second for the outdoor events conducted on his property in the FR-0.5 zone. Knopp’s Initial Brief at paragraph 7. Accordingly, the planning commission will analyze the Application first with respect to the C-V zoned property, then with respect to the FR zoned property.

#### C-V zoned property

The C-V zoned property is designated on the map attached as Exhibit 1, and includes the historical lodge building, part of the outdoor patio, and parking lot. The first criterion for granting a special use exception is that the requested wedding/reception/event use exist on the property at the time of the application, and has been in continuous violation of the zoning ordinance for a period exceeding ten years. The wedding/reception/event use did exist at the time of the original application, as supported by Dan Knopp’s Affidavit at paragraph 6 and Silver Fork Lodge’s current web site which advertises such use (as shown on Mudek Affidavit at Exhibits 15, 17, and 19). Any decrease in the use in 2020 is reasonably attributable to the current pandemic, as acknowledged in the Mudek Affidavit at paragraph 45 and the Dunlap Affidavit at paragraph 14. The C-V property also meets the second prong of this criteria—continuous violation of the zoning ordinance for a period exceeding ten years. The wedding/reception/event use is a violation of the C-V zone, which does not recognize such use, although other zones in the County zoning ordinance do. See County Ordinance Sections 19.44.030, 19.55.040, 19.56.040, 19.62.040, and 19.64.040. The wedding/reception/event use existed on the C-V property for a period exceeding ten years, as indicated in Dan Knopp’s Affidavit at paragraphs 6 and 7 and the Function Sheets attached to the Affidavit. The Function Sheets show use of both the Lodge and outdoor areas of the subject property during the years 2008-2019, with the exception of 2012, but the Jones Affidavit at paragraph 40 and Mudek Affidavit at paragraph 6 acknowledge such use during that year. Additionally, Dan Knopp’s Supplemental Affidavit with associated documentation show regular wedding/reception/event use during the years 2009-2019, including 2012.

The second criterion for granting a special use exception is that no complaint has been made to the development services division concerning the violation for a period exceeding ten consecutive years during which the violation existed. It is important to note that this requirement does not specify which ten-year period applies. There is no evidence that any complaint was filed with Salt Lake County or the MSD from 2008-2019. Reading the ordinance to require the ten-year period to go back from the present day would allow a veto of an application by anyone, regardless of years of that use without any complaint. Such a strict reading of the ordinance also conflicts with Utah Code Section 17-27a-308(2)(if a land use regulation does not plainly restrict a land use application, i.e., is ambiguous, the land use authority shall interpret and apply the land use regulation to favor the land use application).

The third criterion for granting a special use exception is that continuation of the use will not have a detrimental effect on the health, safety or welfare of persons or property in the vicinity. This provision needs to be read in conjunction with the following provision from the same section of the ordinance: "In approving an application hereunder, the planning commission may set any conditions it deems necessary for protection of adjacent properties or the public welfare..." Opponents and other property owners in the vicinity have provided evidence of detrimental effects on health, safety and welfare. However, based on its review of the evidence submitted and the planning staff's thorough analysis, the planning commission concludes that with certain conditions imposed to address the valid concerns raised by Opponents and other property owners in the vicinity of the C-V zoned property, continuation of the wedding/reception/event use in the C-V zoned property will not have a detrimental effect on the health, safety or welfare of persons or property in the vicinity. These conditions (including those proposed by planning staff and others proposed by Applicant and Opponents) are outlined in the Decision section of this memorandum.

These conclusions regarding the CV property also apply to parcel # 24-21-208-008, which is zoned FR but would likely be used to access the CV property for wedding/reception/event uses because its driveway sits to the rear (southwest) of the Silver Fork building.

As a side note, a conditional use process, as Opponents propose, is not an option at this time for the subject property because wedding/reception/event use is not listed as a conditional use in the C-V zone (but such uses are listed in other zones, further indicating that the uses are not permitted in the C-V zone). Additionally, it should be noted that the following provision does not preclude approval of the Application for the C-V property: "This section (19.88.140) shall in no way be interpreted to permit the continuation of any violation which exists on the effective date of the ordinance codified in this section." This provision is not applicable to the Application because there is no evidence that the wedding/reception/event uses existed when the C-V zone came into being in 1984. The provision simply states that the special exception process (by which an unlawful use that came into being after

adoption of a zoning ordinance) does not apply to a nonconforming use (a lawful use that existed before a zoning ordinance was adopted).

### FR Zoned Property

The FR zoned portion of parcel # 24-21-208-011 (for purposes of this paragraph the “FR property”) is designated on Exhibit 1, and is referred to as the lower lawn or lower grass area, together with part of the outdoor patio. The first and second criteria for granting a special use exception are met for the reasons outlined in the previous section. Planning staff concluded that the third criterion could not be met by the conditions proposed by planning staff. However, after the planning staff submitted its report, Applicant and Opponents submitted additional proposed conditions to protect adjacent properties and the public welfare from the impacts of the wedding/reception/event use. For example, the following additional conditions were proposed: more specific noise mitigation requirements (*See Condition 1*), limits on number and timing of events (*See Condition 2*), fencing and screening measures (*See Condition 9*), and limits on uses for certain portions of the property (*See Condition 10*).

The planning commission has considered the evidence provided by Applicant, Opponents, and other property owners in the vicinity on the issue of alleged detrimental effects of the wedding/reception/events use taking place on the FR property to persons and property in the vicinity. After considering this evidence, the planning commission finds that conditions can be imposed to protect adjoining property and the public welfare from detrimental effects of a wedding/reception/event use such that approval of Applicant’s special exception request will not have a detrimental effect on the health, safety or welfare of persons or property in the vicinity. For example, notwithstanding the proximity of the FR property to adjoining properties, those properties are protected by the following conditions that are in addition to those proposed by planning staff: the time certain completion of events in Condition 1, guest limits being subject to parking ordinances/building code/fire code in Condition 2, number of event limits in Condition 2, fencing requirements in Condition 9, and use limits in Condition 10. Accordingly, the planning commission hereby imposes those conditions on the FR property that are outlined in the Decision section below.

### **DECISION**

Based upon the above findings of fact and conclusions of law, the planning commission hereby approves a special exception for the C-V zoned properties and the F-R zoned properties, i.e., all of the subject parcels, with the Applicant being subject to the following conditions:

1. That the Applicant is required to comply with Salt Lake County Health Department, Health Regulation #21, Community Noise Pollution Control, and that no outdoor amplified music or announcements (i.e., no outdoor sound system) is allowed. To meet this requirement, Applicant will be required to end its outdoor weddings and/or events at 9 pm and cleanup be completed by 9:30 pm.
2. That a maximum number of guests for the wedding/reception/event use combined with the restaurant and lodging use be set at 250 subject to Salt Lake County Code Chapter 19.80, and subject to the applicable building code and fire code. To allow Applicant to take advantage of the demand for outdoor events in a mountain setting while being sensitive to the impact upon surrounding properties, Applicant will have a maximum of 12 outdoor weddings and/or events per month from May 1 to October 31, not to exceed 250 guests at any given time, with no outdoor weddings/event outside those dates. In an effort to accommodate the maximum number of guests, Applicant will be required to convert the area currently used for the food truck into additional parking spaces.
3. That the Applicant be required to apply for an "Access Permit" with UDOT and go through a required process allowing for safe site ingress/egress.
4. That the Applicant be required to work with UDOT to address bicycle and pedestrian safety along the frontage of the Silver Fork Lodge, SFL, as well as areas impacted by wedding/reception/event parking as part of the UDOT "Access Permit" review process.
5. That the Applicant be required to work with UDOT to address site distance and visibility issues along BCCR at the intersection of Rufus Road to see if "No Parking" signs can be placed in appropriate locations allowing for better visibility in the area.
6. That no parking or vendor access be allowed along East Silver Fork Road and Rufus Road. These roadways provide access to homes in the area and are used for fire and emergency vehicle access for the Unified Fire Authority, UFA.
7. That all outdoor lighting be shielded and directed downward to avoid light spill on adjacent properties, consistent with Salt Lake County Code Section 19.72.170, Figure 19.72.23.
8. That use of the cross-hatched area of the FR-0.5 zoned parcel #24-21-208-011 may be used for weddings/events, provided the events are limited to the existing upper patio. (See map attached as Exhibit 2)
9. That Applicant is required to build a fence on the south and east edge (must comply with FCOZ requirements) of outdoor lower lawn and patio areas to visually screen the activities and light,

mitigate noise, and contain persons. Applicant will further be required to install visual screen (boulders or fence) in the parking area to block headlights into neighboring properties instead of fence at existing food truck area that will be converted to parking by applicant.

10. That Applicant shall be required to limit use of the lower patio area in the FR-0.5 zone on parcel #24-21-208-011 (which Applicant began to construct in the summer of 2020 bounded by the Trex paver edge board) to wedding ceremonies only (no dancing, dining, or serving drinks or food).
11. That the Applicant be required to work with MSD staff both seasonally and annually to remain in compliance with all Business Licensing requirements. Violation of any of these conditions may be grounds for suspending or revoking Applicant's business license in accordance with Salt Lake County Code Section 5.07.020(C).

This decision is final and may be appealed to the Salt Lake County Land Use Hearing Officer within sixty days of the date of this written decision by any person adversely affected by this decision as provided in Salt Lake County Ordinance Section 19.88.140 and 19.92.050. Appeals shall be submitted to the Municipal Service District Planning and Development Services Division, Attn: Wendy Gurr, 2001 S. State St., N3-600, Salt Lake City, UT 84190. Appeals must be accompanied by the \$1,000 application fee (\$900 of which will be refunded if Land Use Hearing Officer finds in favor of appellant).

Respectfully,



Don Despain, Vice Chair

Salt Lake County Mountainous Planning District Planning Commission

Attachments: Exhibit ~~A~~ and Exhibit ~~B~~  
1 2

## CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that I mailed a true and correct copy of the foregoing Salt Lake County Planning Commission Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law and Decision to the following, postage prepaid, this 25 day of March, 2021:

John Brems, Esq.  
Counsel for Dan Knopp  
10717 Watery Way  
South Jordan, UT 84009  
[john@bremslaw.com](mailto:john@bremslaw.com)

Nathan Kopp  
Counsel for Matthew Mudek, Laynee Jones, Tom and Sally Loken  
257 East 200 South Ste 1050  
Salt Lake City, UT 84111  
[nkopp@dadlaw.net](mailto:nkopp@dadlaw.net)

All addresses on the attached list of parcel numbers and addresses, which are within 300' of the subject parcels.

I further certify that I e-mailed a true and correct copy of the foregoing Salt Lake County Planning Commission Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law and Decision to the following email addresses, who provided input on this matter, this 25 day of March, 2021:

[mogule001@aol.com](mailto:mogule001@aol.com)  
[jmabley@hotmail.com](mailto:jmabley@hotmail.com)  
[4421967@gmail.com](mailto:4421967@gmail.com)  
[hvanert@gmail.com](mailto:hvanert@gmail.com)  
[matthewmudek@gmail.com](mailto:matthewmudek@gmail.com)  
[Kevin@kuhl.com](mailto:Kevin@kuhl.com)  
[ndunlap@gmail.com](mailto:ndunlap@gmail.com)

[fryeshawn@hotmail.com](mailto:fryeshawn@hotmail.com)  
[Lokens@juno.com](mailto:Lokens@juno.com)  
[SallyLoken@gmail.com](mailto:SallyLoken@gmail.com)  
[rjensen@xmission.com](mailto:rjensen@xmission.com)  
[karl@vanshellenbeck.com](mailto:karl@vanshellenbeck.com)  
[glenn@vanshellenbeck.com](mailto:glenn@vanshellenbeck.com)  
[elizabethanne.lovett@gmail.com](mailto:elizabethanne.lovett@gmail.com)  
[mdaniels@riverdesigngroup.net](mailto:mdaniels@riverdesigngroup.net)  
[jennamalone@brighton.utah.gov](mailto:jennamalone@brighton.utah.gov)  
[slaughterj48@gmail.com](mailto:slaughterj48@gmail.com)  
[roviba2011@gmail.com](mailto:roviba2011@gmail.com)  
[barbaracameron@hotmail.com](mailto:barbaracameron@hotmail.com)  
[nhenderson2179@gmail.com](mailto:nhenderson2179@gmail.com)  
[getms.x@gmail.com](mailto:getms.x@gmail.com)

Wendy J. March 25, 2012

Owner of 24212020100000  
11271 E MOUNTAIN SUN LN  
SALT LAKE CITY UT 84121

Owner of 24212080110000  
11332 E BIG COTTONWOODCYN  
SALT LAKE CITY UT 84121

Owner of 24212080280000  
5888 S RIVER POINT CIR  
MURRAY UT 84123

Owner of 24212020160000  
6426 S CANYON COVE DR  
HOLLADAY UT 84121

Owner of 24212080130000  
11332 E BIG COTTONWOODCYN  
SALT LAKE CITY UT 84121

Owner of 24212080290000  
5888 S RIVER POINT CIR  
MURRAY UT 84123

Owner of 24212020170000  
5615 S HILLSIDE DR  
MURRAY UT 84107

Owner of 24212080140000  
6532 S MOOSE CREEK LN  
SALT LAKE CITY UT 84121

Owner of 24212270050000  
5615 S HILLSIDE DR  
MURRAY UT 84107

Owner of 24212070030000  
560 SALERNO CIR  
MESQUITE NV 89027

Owner of 24212080200000  
11202 E MOUNTAIN SUN LN  
SALT LAKE CITY UT 84121

Owner of 24212270060000  
2674 MIRABELLA ST  
HENDERSON NV 89052

Owner of 24212070100000  
560 SALERNO CIR  
MESQUITE NV 89027

Owner of 24212080210000  
560 S LINDSAY SPRING RD  
HEBER UT 84032

Owner of 24212270090000  
9845 S 2465 E  
SANDY UT 84092

Owner of 24212070130000  
6532 S MOOSE CREEK LN  
SALT LAKE CITY UT 84121

Owner of 24212080220000  
560 S LINDSAY SPRING RD  
HEBER UT 84032

Owner of 24212270110000  
11329 E MOUNTAIN SUN LN  
BRIGHTON UT 84121

Owner of 24212070140000  
2728 W COUNTRY CLASSIC DR  
BLUFFDALE UT 84065

Owner of 24212080240000  
5888 S RIVER POINT CIR  
MURRAY UT 84123

Owner of 24212270130000  
12000 E BIG COTTONWOODCYN  
SALT LAKE CITY UT 84121

Owner of 24212070150000  
2728 W COUNTRY CLASSIC DR  
BLUFFDALE UT 84065

Owner of 24212080250000  
11332 E BIG COTTONWOODCYN  
SALT LAKE CITY UT 84121

Owner of 24212280080000  
11392 E MOOSE TRACK LN  
SALT LAKE CITY UT 84121

Owner of 24212080080000  
11332 E BIG COTTONWOODCYN  
SALT LAKE CITY UT 84121

Owner of 24212080260000  
11332 E BIG COTTONWOODCYN  
SALT LAKE CITY UT 84121

Owner of 24212280090000  
11385 E MOOSE TRACK LN  
SALT LAKE CITY UT 84121

Owner of 24212080090000  
11287 E SILVER FORK RD  
SALT LAKE CITY UT 84121

Owner of 24212080270000  
5888 S RIVER POINT CIR  
MURRAY UT 84123

Owner of 24212280100000  
11355 E BIG COTTONWOODCYN  
SALT LAKE CITY UT 84121

Owner of 24212280110000  
944 S MILITARY DR  
SALT LAKE CITY UT 84108

Owner of 24212760030000  
375 E THIRD AVE  
SALT LAKE CITY UT 84103

Owner of 24212780010000  
PO BOX 712484  
SALT LAKE CITY UT 84171

Owner of 24212520110000  
210 PRESTON  
ALPINE UT 84004

Owner of 24212760040000  
11365 E SILVER SNOW LN  
SALT LAKE CITY UT 84121

Owner of 24212780020000  
3090 BOULDER DR  
LAYTON UT 84040

Owner of 24212520130000  
210 PRESTON  
ALPINE UT 84004

Owner of 24212760050000  
11365 E SILVER SNOW LN  
SALT LAKE CITY UT 84121

Owner of 24212780030000  
5926 S NORMANDY OAKS CIR  
MURRAY UT 84123

Owner of 24212520140000  
11358 E SILVER FORK RD  
SALT LAKE CITY UT 84121

Owner of 24212760080000  
11354 E BIG COTTONWOODCYN  
BRIGHTON UT 84121

Owner of 24212780040000  
2764 E COMANCHE DR  
SALT LAKE CITY UT 84108

Owner of 24212530020000  
6554 S MOOSE CREEK LN  
SALT LAKE CITY UT 84121

Owner of 24212760090000  
11354 E BIG COTTONWOODCYN  
BRIGHTON UT 84121

Owner of 24212780050000  
1584 E 1500 N  
LOGAN UT 84341

Owner of 24212530030000

Owner of 24212770010000  
11354 E BIG COTTONWOODCYN  
BRIGHTON UT 84121

Owner of 24212780060000  
11299 E MOOSE CREEK LN  
SALT LAKE CITY UT 84121

Owner of 24212530040000  
6554 S MOOSE CREEK LN  
SALT LAKE CITY UT 84121

Owner of 24212770020000  
2144 E APPLEWOOD AVE  
HOLLADAY UT 84121

Owner of 24212780070000  
11303 E MOOSE CREEK LN  
SALT LAKE CITY UT 84121

Owner of 24212530050000  
6554 S MOOSE CREEK LN  
SALT LAKE CITY UT 84121

Owner of 24212770030000  
1148 E CHARLTON AVE  
SALT LAKE CITY UT 84106

Owner of 24212780080000  
11315 E MOOSE CREEK LN  
SALT LAKE CITY UT 84121

Owner of 24212530060000  
4 WYNDHAM ST  
LADERA RANCH CA 92694

Owner of 24212770040000  
11359 E SILVER FORK RD  
SALT LAKE CITY UT 84121

Owner of 24212760020000  
11354 E BIG COTTONWOODCYN  
BRIGHTON UT 84121

Owner of 24212770050000  
115 AARAMAR LANE  
CORRALES NM 87048

Exhibit "1"

# ZONING & LAND OWNERSHIP\* | SILVER FORK



- Parcel
- C-V
- FR-0.5
- FR-1

\*Parcel and zoning layers have been adjusted to coincide with ROW and are not official representations.

Created for office use by the MSD on: 9/17/2020 8:43 PM



Exhibit "2"

# SILVER FORK LODGE AREA\* | TOWN OF BRIGHTON



## Project Area

- Patio/Retaining Wall
- Parcel

## Zoning

- C-V
- FR-0.5

\*Parcel and zoning layers have been adjusted to coincide with ROW and are not an official representation. Retaining wall area has been manually digitized from aerial imagery.

Created for office use by the MSD on: 2/16/2021 12:11 PM

