

CITY OF SOUTH JORDAN  
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING  
COUNCIL CHAMBERS  
April 9, 2019

Present: Commissioner Earl Jolley, Commissioner Sean Morrissey, Commissioner Michael Haynes, City Planner Greg Schindler, Deputy City Engineer Jeremy Nielson, Staff Attorney Todd Sheeran, Planner Damir Drozdek, Planner David Mann, Planner Brad Sanderson, Planner McDonald, City Recorder Anna West

Absent: Commissioner Mark Woolley, Commissioner Julie Holbrook, Commissioner John Ellis

Others: See Attachment A

6:30 P.M.

## **REGULAR MEETING**

### **I. GENERAL BUSINESS**

#### A. Welcome and Roll Call

Vice-Chair Earl Jolley welcomed everyone present. He noted that Commissioners Woolley, Holbrook and Ellis will not be present and are excused. We do have three Commissioners that make a quorum.

#### B. Motion to Approve Agenda

**Commissioner Morrissey motioned to approve the April 9, 2019 Planning Commission Agenda. Commissioner Haynes seconded the motion. Vote was unanimous in favor. Commissioners Woolley, Holbrook and Ellis were absent.**

#### C. Approval of the Minutes from the Meeting held on March 26, 2019

**Commissioner Haynes made a motion to approve the March 26, 2019 Planning Commission Meeting minutes with changes. Commissioner Morrissey seconded the motion. Vote was unanimous in favor. Commissioners Woolley, Holbrook and Ellis were absent.**

### **II. INFORMATIONAL ITEMS AND OTHER BUSINESS**

#### A. Staff Business

Staff Attorney Todd Sheeran said the residents that were here against the Rocky Mountain Power upgrade have filed an appeal and I will keep you updated as far as dates and times. This will go to our Hearing Officer and right now we are waiting for a date for the public meeting. It is not a Public Hearing, so there won't be any resident comments. The Hearing Officer will be reviewing what was presented to the Planning Commission when RMP presented their application. No new evidence will be considered.

#### B. Comments from Planning Commission Members

None

### **III. CITIZEN COMMENT**

Chairman Woolley opened the Citizen Comment. No speakers. He closed the Citizen Comment.

### **IV. SUMMARY ACTION**

None

### **V. ACTION**

None

### **VI. PUBLIC HEARINGS AND POTENTIAL \*\*ADMINISTRATIVE ACTION ITEMS**

\*\*Administrative Action = Less Discretion, Substantial Evidence (Objective Standard)

**A.1 Issue: SMRTL- SPORTS MEDICINE RESEARCH TESTING  
LABORATORY OFFICE  
BUILDING AND PARKING STRUCTURE  
SITE PLAN**

**Location:** 10644 South Jordan Gateway

**File No:** PLSPR201900085

**Applicant:** Liza Hart

Planner Brad Sanderson reviewed the background information on this item from the packet staff report. Applicant is proposing a 77,000 sq. ft. four story office building. The right half is the building itself and the left half is a three story parking structure, with 261 parking stalls. He said this TOD zone required the building to be pushed up tight against the right-of-way. He said the ARC gave a favorable review and this meets all requirements of the zone and the master development plan. He said there is a Design Guideline Book that is required to be approved as part of this that amends what is already there.

**Michael Batt**, (Representative), said Brad did a good job of covering all information. He said they are coming out of Research Park and we feel this will be a great move for South Jordan and for SMRTL to attract other businesses. They will lease the upper two floors to other office users.

Commissioner Haynes said we at the ARC reviewed this whole plan and the design is great. It meets all requirements. It is a tough parcel to develop on but they have done a great job.

Vice-Chair Jolley opened the Public Hearing.

**Patty Latimer**, SJC, said she lives in Sterling Village and the traffic over there is really bad. She thinks it is too close to the road and you should take into consideration the people that live over there. She said I don't like it, it is not the right place.

Vice-Chair Jolley closed the Public Hearing.

Planner Sanderson said I would emphasize that this is an allowed and permitted use.

Transportation Engineer Jeremy Nielson said we are just updating our Master Transportation Plan and I know that in the am/pm peaks it is very busy there. Those roads are arterial and are intended to carry heavy loads of traffic. A lot of the congestion is created from the coordination timing of the traffic signals. We have to continuously coordinate with UDOT to have them constantly update the timing for our traffic volume.

Commissioner Morrissey said I think this is going to be a great addition to our city. I don't see any way that this item doesn't meet all the requirements.

Vice-Chair Jolley said I think as long as the city is aware of the traffic issue and they continue to work with UDOT to maintain the traffic flow there this is a good addition.

## **A.2 Potential Action Item – (See VI.A.1)**

**Commissioner Haynes made a motion to approve the SMRTL site plan, File Number PLSPR201900085, as proposed. Commissioner Morrissey seconded the motion. Roll Call Vote was 3-0. Commissioners Woolley, Holbrook and Ellis were absent.**

**B.1 Issue: DETACHED GARAGE  
CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT**  
**Location:** 528 West Miller Hollow Cove  
**File No:** PLCUP201900265  
**Applicant:** Tony Passey

Planner Brad Sanderson reviewed the background information on this item from the packet staff report. He said normally these types of things don't come to you as a Planning Commission for an accessory building. The reason this is before you is because the city code reads "any portion of the building that sits within 20 feet of a property line needs to meet the following requirements unless otherwise approved by the Planning Commission." The requirements are that as far as opening go, you can't have any openings, windows or doors and you can't have an average wall height over 16 feet. That is only for the portion of the building that is within 20 feet of a property line. What is being proposed here is a 23-24 foot high building. There is a good portion of the building that is within that 20 foot limit. There could be a potential detriment to the adjacent property owners by the 2<sup>nd</sup> floor window. We suggest there be some kind of opaque glass and that it be fixed so that it can't open. We need to be conscientious of privacy for the neighbors. Because of the height overall of the structure, this is scheduled to go before a Hearing Officer for a variance. That is not under review at the moment, but would be subject to that variance approval. The overall height and setback ratios are closer than what the code requires.

Tony Passey (applicant), we worked with Brad on the design on this and we eliminated a door and windows on the backside. If we had a normal straight line on the back of our property the window issue would not be an issue at all. Our property has a really odd triangle shape and this has been a complicated long process to figure out exactly how to put an accessory structure anywhere on this lot and get it to meet codes. We have already removed the back fence and re-graded the lot and have fixed a couple neighborhood problems with drainage issues. I think we are ready to do the project. We tried to move the dormer window as far forward to the building as we possibly could. The plan is to put a swimming pool between the garage structure and the house. The idea for a window there is if someone is up above the garage we want to be able to look out the window and see the swimming pool. We can actually see our house from where the front windows would be. We put a camera up on a 16 foot pole to be exactly where the window would be so we could see the view and you can see part of the back yard and part of our yard. We want a window to where we can see the rest of our yard out of the structure. Where the fence is, there is not an option for a window in the garage. The window

isn't a daylight issue, for us the value is to be able to see our yard from the garage and from that angle we can't see the house behind us.

Vice-Chair Jolley asked, what the intended use for this structure is.

Mr. Passey said motorcycles, trucks, etc. This is the biggest man cave I've ever seen. We will put a separate driveway into this garage and will be parking for a car and a woodshop space and a bonus room for a pool table up above. I have a trailer and bunch of stuff that is sitting out because our two car garage doesn't fit everything.

Commissioner Haynes said I have driven the area and I don't think this will be out of place at all. I don't think it will look as big as it is.

Mr. Passey said it meets the setback requirement off the back fence. It is the jog in our fence line that creates the problems for building anything. That is why we are going through this additional variance process. We want to create privacy to our yard and eventually this will all be fenced in.

Vice-Chair Jolley opened the Public Hearing.

**Jennifer Anderson**, I am in the odd shaped lot that sits directly behind that. I have worked with Tony a lot on this project over the last couple of years and the drainage he mentioned was my yard that happen to fill in a couple of times. That was because my yard was the lowest point in the neighborhood. We have worked all of that out and even with today's rain storm there is no flooding. I have a 2-story living room with 2-story windows directly behind where this structure fits and because there are no windows facing me I don't see a problem with the window that is there and the reason he is using it is for the pool. I wanted to let the Commission know that.

Vice-Chair Jolley closed the Public Hearing.

Staff Attorney Sheeran asked Planner Sanderson to review the reason for the variance and how it ties into the motions.

Planner Sanderson said the variance deals with the height to setback ratio. When an accessory structure would be located in the rear yard, it can be located as close as three feet to the property line as long as it is under 16 feet high. You can go taller but for every foot you go over 16 you have to add a foot. The east side of the building is the issue. It is only 6 feet away and you really need the 11 feet away. The reason there are two applications is the one before you tonight is regarding the overall average height and the window. The variance deals with the total overall height of the building in relation to the property line. Normally we wouldn't bring this to you until it had gone through the variance to see if that was issued. We felt that worst case scenario for the applicant if for some reason the variance does get denied, the applicant does have the ability to shift the building further to the east and still build it the same height proposed and still meet the setbacks.

Staff Attorney Sheeran said the only reason why I had him bring that up is because the condition of approval would be for this building to meet the setback requirements or that the variance be granted.

## **B.2 Potential Action Item – (See VI.B.1)**

**Commissioner Haynes motioned to approve File No. PLCUP201900265 allowing the proposed accessory structure to have an average wall height that exceeds 16 feet as proposed, and a second-floor**

**window, each within 20 feet of a property line as shown on the submitted plans and subject to the following conditions:**

- 1. That Applicant receive approval of his variance application to allow the structure to be less than the required side setback OR that the applicant modify the plans and build the structure to conform to all required setbacks; and**
- 2. That the second-floor window on the east building elevation be fixed (i.e. cannot be opened) and made of obscuring glass as approved by City Planning Staff (i.e. distorted or opaque).**

**Commissioner Morrissey seconded the motion. Roll Call Vote was 3-0. Commissioners Woolley, Holbrook and Ellis were absent.**

**C.1 Issue: ADDITION TO CURRENT HOME  
ACCESSORY LIVING UNIT  
Location: 3919 West Leicester Bay  
File No: PLALU201900241  
Applicant: Joshua Cobabe**

Planner Drew McDonald reviewed the background information on this item from the packet staff report.

**Joshua Cobabe** (applicant), said we want to build this for my aging parents to live in and rather than have them in a senior living community, which they can't afford, this will provide us the opportunity to care for them. My wife is a family practice doctor and I am a former Army medic, so if there is something they need they won't be in Rexburg, which is 4 ½ hours away, they will be in our back yard.

Vice-Chair Jolley opened the Public Hearing. No speakers. He closed the Public Hearing.

**C.2 Potential Action Item – (See VI.C.1)**

**Commissioner Morrissey made a motion to approve file no. PLALU201900241 for an accessory living unit within a proposed addition to the main home, located at 3919 W. Leicester Bay. Commissioner Haynes seconded the motion. Roll Call Vote was 3-0. Commissioners Woolley, Holbrook and Ellis were absent.**

**D.1 Issue: PARKWAY OFFICE CONDOS AMENDED  
CONSOLIDATION OF A CONDOMINIUM PLAT  
Location: 912 West Baxter Drive  
File No: PLPLA201900096  
Applicant: Brad Christensen**

Planner Damir Drozdek reviewed the background information on this item from the packet staff report. The whole intention with this application is to consolidate different parcels into one parcel. Each one of the condos, there are 16 condos between the two buildings, and they each have their own unique tax ID number. The building to the west is not being changed but the building to the east, all of the condo units are being consolidated into one tax ID number.

**Brad Christensen**, applicant; we were hoping to make this as simple as possible. Our intentions are to sell the buildings and they are more easily sold on separate parcels.

Vice-Chair Jolley opened the Public Hearing. No speakers. He closed the Public Hearing.

**D.2 Potential Action Item – (See VI.D.1)**

**Commissioner Haynes made a motion to approve consolidation of condominium plat, File No. PLPLA201900096. Commissioner Morrissey seconded the motion. Roll Call Vote was 3-0. Commissioners Woolley, Holbrook and Ellis were absent.**

**E.1 Issue: OWNER-OCCUPIED RENTAL BASEMENT  
ACCESSORY LIVING UNIT**  
**Location:** 10843 South Jacks Pride Court  
**File No:** PLALU201900264  
**Applicant:** Zach Williams

Planner Damir Drozdek reviewed the background information on this item from the packet staff report. This is in the McKee Farms subdivision and is located in the R-2.5 Zone which allows for accessory living units. The reason why this is in front of you is because of the city requirement that says if it exceeds 35% of the home area it needs to be approved by the Planning Commission. In this case, almost the entire basement is proposed to be the Assisted Living Unit and would be rented out as a supplemental income. According to the City Building Department records, the above grade area of the home is 1,842 sq. ft. and the basement area is 1,969 sq. ft. This comes out to approximately 40% of the home living area. The applicant has not included the two stairways and the utility room in the calculations for the basement apartment size. This being a rambler, we don't think it meets the spirit of the ordinance and in this case due to its size and nature I think it approaches being a duplex. Staff recommends against approval of this application.

Commissioner Morrissey asked for confirmation that the only issue here is the ratio of the unit in the basement versus the entire structure. Planner Drozdek confirmed that.

Vice-Chari Jolley asked what the square footage that it is exceeded by was. Planner Drozdek said about 40%; they are approaching 50%.

Commissioner Haynes asked if there has been any consideration to adjust the plan to fit the percentage. Planner Drozdek said it was suggested but the applicant doesn't think it is feasible due to the basement layout.

**Zach Williams**, (applicant), I am proposing this because in the accessory living permits requirement document provided by South Jordan City regarding all other rules and guidelines outlined in the document I would be following all of those, including finishing the basement with a building permit up to code. In the ALU pdf document section 17.130.030.010 says the purpose of the accessory unit may be approved in order to provide affordable housing units, economic relief to homeowners, create housing types of appropriate for households and individuals at a variety of stages in their life cycle. As a home owner, what I would need is called economic relief in order to maintain and live in the home. When I built the home, I looked up the rules to make sure that I should be ok with it. I did notice that by the time the plan was done and built it was roughly 200 sq. ft. and looked like I would be at 170 more than the allotted amount. The reason for that is because I didn't see that the layout lent itself to taking pf some square footage because the walkout basement comes from the bottom of the picture and the bedrooms are on the other side of the staircase. Without doing some major modifications it felt like it would be a challenge to do that. I didn't see the point in doing that anyway, even if I was to keep it as a three bedroom apartment. Before I moved into this subdivision, I lived in Sandy and I had a four-plex and I lived in one unit and rented out the other three units. We did that for about 8 years. I have gone through 35-40 tenants and I think I know what it takes to make sure that when I rent to people I rent to decent citizens. My profession is as a Real Estate Agent, and at times there are spans where I don't get as much commissions as a regular every two weeks job. This would help me maintain the good financial basis to stay in the home not be too stressed out about it.

Commissioner Morrissey said so your home is already built and you want to build out the basement portion now as an ALU in its entirety? Mr. Williams said yes. There is a small portion under the stairs that would not be built out.

Commissioner Morrissey asked how long have you lived in this home? Mr. Williams said 2 months. Commissioner Morrissey said when you moved into this home you built it based on your current financial situation? Mr. Williams said yes. Commissioner Morrissey asked what has changed? Mr. Williams said nothing has changed. I built it and was able to get approved for the loan but I just know the nature of my business and sometimes there are lean times. I have read through all of the ALU requirements a couple of times and I think with the exception of slightly more square footage, I would be in alignment with every other item on the list, including parking. I have talked to a couple of neighbors about it already and no one is here to contest it. I can't wrap my head around the differences because my neighbor next door to me have an ALU as well, and they are similar to the last gentleman that was here where their parents were going to live there. As far as impact to the neighborhood, I can't seem to understand why there would be a concern there, even if it was slightly less square footage.

Vice-Chair Jolley said I assume that the door going downstairs from the interior stair would be a lockable door. Mr. Williams said correct.

Vice-Chair Jolley asked about the small area under the porch area and if it will be built out as well. Mr. Williams said yes. Vice-Chair Jolley asked what the square footage of that area is. Mr. Williams said approximately 9 feet long by 3 ½ feet wide; so maybe 36 sq. feet.

Vice-Chair Jolley said you will be able to comment again after the Public Hearing.

Commissioner Morrissey asked if he owned any other real estate. Mr. Williams said yes; I still own that four-plex.

Vice-Chair Jolley opened the Public Hearing. No speakers. He closed the Public Hearing.

Commissioner Haynes said I understand the intent and the purpose behind it, but as a city we set a precedent when we adjust our codes to accommodate certain things and when we make one of adjustments to that it sets a bad precedent for future. As this is submitted I don't feel like it is the right thing for me.

Commissioner Morrissey said I feel the same as far as precedent goes. My biggest concern is setting a precedent in which we move the line as far as what the ordinance is that the City already has established. I understand that there are opportunities for reduction. Based on the applicant and his expression for economic need, I don't see a necessity to change that precedent at this time base on this application. I think City Staff has done a good job in vetting this application.

Vice-Chair Jolley said we have had several of these in the past come before us and we have tried to always stay to the city ordinance and this is such a large living space which is equal to or greater than the upstairs living space so effectively it does become a duplex. The reason why we have that ordinance is to protect our citizens and their property values and their perceived values that they want to live in a single family home in the area. There are allowances to build out a basement and have some additional income as long as we comply with these ordinances. There are some things that can be done with this plan and be revised and come back again.

Mr. Williams said my question is, if this is regarding the square footage, is it just the fact that it is about 170 square foot more living space, if I was to take that out what difference would it make in terms of looking like a duplex or looking like my neighbor's house. I can guarantee that their square ALU footage is not within the square footage requirements. What difference would that make?

Commissioner Haynes said it wouldn't make a lot of difference but technically it makes a big difference. We can't go beyond and overlook our city ordinance if we allow one instance to take place, do we let the next and the next, come forward to do this.

Mr. Williams said with all due respect, that is assuming that all of a sudden the flood gates would be opened up. I just don't see that all of a sudden there will be all these people coming in to overstep the bounds by 100 or 200 square feet. Like the other gentleman with the tall garage, that doesn't technically meet the requirements but it was ok to make an exception, even though it doesn't follow the rules.

Commissioner Morrissey said why don't you go back and carve out 177 square feet and come back and we will approve it because it will then meet the requirements. The way you've set it up right now it doesn't meet the ordinances. That is up to you. You can work with staff to do that. You came here asking for economic relief as your first concern. These other sub-issues you brought up can be remedied through working with the city to come up with a plan that works for you and meets our ordinances.

Vice-Chair Jolley said one of the biggest concerns we have and why the ordinance is in place is because we want to provide affordable housing for smaller families. If four people can reside in this size of space then you would be tempted to rent to a larger family. We are trying to stay away from a townhouse or twin-house type of situation to protect the residents that live in this area. You can comply with this if you make some modifications.

## **E.2 Potential Action Item – (See VI.E.1)**

**Commissioner Haynes made a motion to Deny the application for an accessory living unit, File No. PLALU201900264, which seeks approval for a larger basement apartment. Commissioner Morrissey seconded the motion. Roll Call Vote was 3-0 to Deny. Commissioners Woolley, Holbrook and Ellis were absent.**

**F.1 Issue: SEQUOIA BUILDING (Unmanned Wireless Telecommunications Facility)  
CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT  
Location: 11240 South River Heights Drive  
File No: PLCUP201801140- SL08096B  
Applicant: Matthew T. Schutjer**

Planner Damir Drozdek reviewed the background information on this item from the packet staff report. This is in the BH-MU Zone and is located on a roof top. They have met all city code requirements. There are three antennas and are 20 feet away from the buildings edge and stick out 10 feet above the buildings parapet. They meet all of the city code requirements and staff is recommending approval of the CUP.

**Matthew T. Schutjer**, applicant, said this was challenging for me to meet the setback requirements to get coverage over the parapet that we needed. T-Mobile is the applicant and I am the contractor for them. They will be located in three sleds with three antenna per sled. We do these all over the valley because owners don't like us to penetrate their roofs.

Vice-Chair Jolley opened the Public Hearing. No speakers. He closed the Public Hearing.



**F.2 Potential Action Item – (See VI.F.1)**

**Commissioner Morrissey made a motion to approve application PLCUP201801140 to allow for construction and operation of a wireless telecommunications facility at 11240 S. River Heights Dr. Commissioner Haynes seconded the motion. Roll Call Vote was 3-0 in favor. Commissioners Woolley, Holbrook and Ellis were absent.**

**G.1 Issue: AGILITY CUSTOMS  
CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT  
Location: 9875 South 500 West  
File No: PLCUP201900191  
Applicant: Todd Hansen**

Planner David Mann reviewed the background information on this item from the packet staff report. This is for a business that is looking to operate out of this building in the Pheasant Hollow business park which is an office/warehouse type use. The use being proposed is a vehicle repair use to make modifications to vehicle for off-roading activities. Staff is recommending approval with some conditions just to make sure that is won't cause any issues.

**Todd Hansen**, (applicant), this is not vehicle repair like a mechanics shop, we do customization of off-road vehicles. These are very nice vehicles. We do have enough space inside to store about 8 vehicles.

Vice-Chair Jolley said so if a vehicle were to be done it would be outside for a very short period of time? Mr. Hansen said yes.

Vice-Chair Jolley opened the Public Hearing. No speakers. He closed the Public Hearing.

**G.2 Potential Action Item – (See VI.G.1)**

**Commissioner Haynes made a motion to approve File No. PLCUP201900191 for a vehicle customization shop in the Pheasant Hollow Business Park, located at 9875 S. Jordan Gateway, with the following conditions:**

- 1. All vehicles that the business will work on shall be stored at all times inside the building.**
- 2. There shall be no outside storage related to business, including but not limited to the storage of vehicles and potentially hazardous materials.**
- 3. All potentially hazardous materials shall be properly disposed of according to applicable regulations.**

**Commissioner Morrissey seconded the motion. Roll Call Vote was 3-0 in favor. Commissioners Woolley, Holbrook and Ellis were absent.**

**VII. PUBLIC HEARINGS AND POTENTIAL \*\*LEGISLATIVE ACTION ITEMS**

**\*\*Legislative Action = More Discretion, Reasonably Debatable (Subjective Standard)**

**H.1 Issue: ZONE TEXT AMENDMENT  
REDUCTION OF MONOPOLE SETBACK  
Location: 5343 West Daybreak Parkway  
File No: PLZTA201900069  
Applicant: Brenda Ivie**

Planner David Mann reviewed the background information on this item from the packet staff report. The reason this is being brought forward as a Text Amendment is because the applicant originally applied for a variance for what they were proposing to do on this property in Daybreak across Daybreak Parkway from the Trail Crossing Shopping Center. This is an RV storage area that is owned and operated by Daybreak for their residents. There is currently a monopole that is used for communications. They were trying to go through the process to put another facility there but there is a requirement for monopoles to be located no closer than 150 feet from a right-of-way. At the time when that existing monopole was constructed, Mountain View Corridor was not there. It met the codes for that time but now it severely restricts any location where a monopole can be located. They came back with a proposal to reduce the setback from right-of-way so they can locate it in that corner. I looked through some of the neighboring cities code regarding monopoles and setbacks. I looked at Draper, Bluffdale, Herriman, Holladay, Murray, Salt Lake City, Taylorsville and West Jordan. Six of the eight cities do not have a right-of-way setback requirement. The two that do have 100 foot set-back. Staff feels that it would not be an issue to change it to allow some flexibility to this site as well as any other sites. That is why we are recommending approval. The applicant was not able to attend tonight but will be present at the City Council meeting to answer any questions they might have.

Vice-Chair Jolley asked who the applicant represents. Planner Mann said she works for Daybreak Communities.

Vice-Chair Jolley opened the Public Hearing. No speakers. He closed the Public Hearing.

## **H.2 Potential Action Item – (See VII.H.1)**

**Commissioner Jolley made a motion to recommend to the City Council that it approve Ordinance 2019-08. Commissioner Morrissey seconded the motion. Roll Call Vote was 3-0 in favor. Commissioners Woolley, Holbrook and Ellis were absent.**

## **VIII. OTHER BUSINESS**

None

## **ADJOURNMENT**

**Commissioner Haynes motioned to adjourn the April 9, 2019 Planning Commission meeting. Commissioner Morrissey seconded the motion. Vote was unanimous in favor. Commissioners Woolley, Holbrook and Ellis were absent.**

The April 9, 2019 Planning Commission Meeting adjourned at 8:02 p.m.

**This is a true and correct copy of the April 9 2019 Planning Commission minutes, which were approved on April 23, 2019.**

*Anna M. West*  
**South Jordan City Recorder**



APRIL 9, 2019

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING SIGN IN SHEET

PRINT NAME

ADDRESS

Tony & Shula Passey  
Zachary N Williams

528 W. Miller Hollow Cove  
10843 ~~B~~. Jack's Pride Ct. S.J.

Todd Hansen

9875 Jordan Gateway

Matthew T. Schutjer

1125 E Browning Ave. SLC, UT

Kate Jordan

1125 E Browning Ave, SLC, UT

Brad Christensen

912 Vest Baxter Dr

Joshua Cobabe

3919 Leicester Bay

Patty Latimer

11177 Caddbury Dr.

Michael Batt

423 W. Broadway

Jennifer Anderson

521 N. Aspen Peak Dr.

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_