



AGENDA

PUBLIC INFORMATION SESSION ON THE NATIONAL FLOOD INSURANCE PROGRAM AND THE REGULAR MEETING OF THE PLANNING AND LAND USE COMMISSION TOWN OF CASTLE VALLEY WEDNESDAY, NOVEMBER 1ST, 2023 AT 6:30 P.M.

CASTLE VALLEY COMMUNITY CENTER - 2 CASTLE VALLEY DRIVE

This meeting will be a hybrid meeting held electronically by Zoom and also in person at the anchor site the Town Building. If you have comments or concerns for the PLUC please attend or email them prior to the Meeting: townclerk@castlevalleyutah.com or call 259-9828 M-W 9AM-

1PM. Thank you!

PLEASE NOTE: ** HOW TO JOIN THE ZOOM CONFERENCE CALL **

Meeting ID: 660 541 0108 Passcode: 84532

Option 1 Dial-in phone number (US): (253) 215-8782 follow prompts.

Option 2 Join the online meeting (must have computer speakers and microphone):

<https://zoom.us/j/6605410108?pwd=Q05sYm5qQ0lpNIY5TVp2bTU5VnZjQT09>

CALL TO ORDER

Roll Call

Public Information Session on the National Flood Insurance program with Traci Harrison, State Floodplain Program Manager | NFIP.

REGULAR MEETING

1. Adoption of Agenda
2. Open Public Comment
3. Approval of Minutes from Public Hearings and Regular Meeting July 12, 2023.
4. Reports - Correspondence: TBA
 - Town Council Meeting(s) - Thompson
 - Building Permit Agent Report - Thompson
 - Procedural Matters: PLUC Clerk position open

NEW BUSINESS

5. Discussion and Possible Action re: None

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

6. Discussion and Possible Action re: Large scale earth moving permitting.

CLOSED MEETING - If Needed

ADJOURNMENT

For Meeting Packets go to: <https://www.utah.gov/pmnn/index.html>

Government: select "Cities", Entity: select "Castle Valley" Body: select "Town of Castle Valley" Select this meeting and click on Meeting Packet to download.

DRAFT MEETING MINUTES
PUBLIC HEARING ON PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO THE DARK SKY LIGHTING ORDINANCE
2021-5

PUBLIC HEARING ON UPDATED LANGUAGE TO ORDINANCE 85-3 DEFINITION OF
“COMBINED SQUARE FOOTAGE” AND THE REGULAR MEETING OF THE PLANNING
AND LAND USE COMMISSION

WEDNESDAY JULY 12, 2023 AT 6:30 P.M.

CASTLE VALLEY TOWN BUILDING - 2 CASTLE VALLEY DRIVE

This meeting was a hybrid meeting held electronically by Zoom and also in person at the anchor site the Town Building.

Chairman Ryan Anderson opened the hybrid (zoom + in-person) public meeting at 6:32 PM Wednesday, July 12, 2023. Clerk Jessica Maw was excused.

PLUC members present: Ryan Anderson, Jeff Whitney, Colleen Thompson in person, and Julie Baird and Marie Hawkins via zoom.

Members of the public present: Mayor Jazmine Duncan and Faylene Roth in person, and Mary Wakeley, Paul Lessig, and Lindsay Lessig via zoom.

Public Hearing on proposed amendments to Dark Sky Lighting Ordinance 2021-5

Introduction by Faylene Roth, a member of the Dark Sky Committee: if we go back to the 2019 survey, 75.9% of the respondents were supportive of strengthening our dark sky ordinance to maintain our dark skies and 74.74% wanted to pursue the Dark Sky certification. Prior to the current Dark Sky Lighting Ordinance adoption on December 15, 2021 we already had a really strong ordinance for dark skies [1991], but the original ordinance didn't address lumens and color temperature, which is the blue to yellow spectrum of lights and how they affect wildlife health and the quality of the night sky. What the 2021 ordinance really failed to do was to delineate how the Town, church, fire department, and other possible public type lots are going to comply with the new ordinance, while providing adequate safe parking lot lights. So we needed to address those issues we were naïve about previously. There were also a couple of changes required for certification, such as changing motion sensor lights from 10 to 5 minutes. They also wanted us to address athletic fields and courts, so one amendment here is to prohibit lighting for those spaces. If such lighting is desired in the future we can deal with it then.

There was some discussion about whether to only take public comment at this time, or to go through the proposed amendments so the public would have some context for their comments. Ryan polled attendees and decided to review the proposed amendments at this time.

Faylene went through the proposed amendments (see meeting packet). She added that perhaps we should consider changing the time period to come into compliance; currently it's two years from the effective date of the ordinance (December 15, 2021). She suggested two years from the adoption of these amendments, or possibly five years from the original date. This would give the Town more time to disseminate this information to the community.

Ryan then asked for any comments from the public.

Mary Wakeley (MW): "this is a question—so on residential, poles can't be taller than 6 foot, is that correct? So if I have a light on a pole it can't be taller than a 6 foot pole? and you said in the parking area, so like if I had a pole outside of a building—I just try and clarify like if I have a pole—and you know, I have a pickup truck that wouldn't even go underneath that pole, or if I had a family [member] that's over 6 foot walking close to that pole—I'm just kind of curious how you came up with the 6 foot height? I don't remember what section it was on it was section IV or something."

Colleen pointed out that the ordinance only addresses light poles in parking areas, and there may be other areas such as livestock handling that this height limitation would not apply to. However these lights would still need to comply with all the other standards like shielding and lumens.

MW: "Correct. It sounds like just if it's 6 foot in a parking area—so your public lights can be 15 feet. A horse trailer or my camping trailer, there would be so many things that would not go underneath the 6 foot light. So that's why I'm just kind of wondering how you come up with that 6 foot for residential in a parking area. It just kind of seems very short."

Faylene responded that it may originally had to do with putting a light at the entrance to your driveway where we wouldn't want, say, a 10 foot pole. But there's a point there, because if you had a light above your garage door it would be higher than 6 feet, so this seems like something to discuss.

MW: "Well, I'm just on a hillside so my driveway is very narrow because I am built on a hillside, and so anything that we put up is very close to our driveway, because of that, you know what I mean. And we are very conscious that we don't want to shed light down the hill to our neighbors. So it just seems just very short for what we would need a light bulb for, you know what I mean. That's all."

Jocelyn said we could move it up to 10, and Colleen suggested that we discuss this when we get to that line item in the agenda. Ryan thanked Mary for bringing up that concern.

There was no other public comment, so the public hearing on the proposed amendments to the Dark Sky Lighting Ordinance 2021-5 was adjourned.

Public Hearing on update to language in Ordinance 85-3, Definition of "Combined Square Footage"

Ryan asked Colleen to introduce the subject on behalf of herself, Jazmine, and Jeff, who all worked on the language.

In our land-use ordinance we limit the square footage of buildings on a lot to 7000 ft.², but we have our own definition of "Combined Square Footage" which includes porch roofs and eaves, and counts multiple floors separately. As Building Permit Agent the question has come up about a two-story house with a patio or parking area that's open on the ground underneath all or part of the second floor, which is ambiguous in the ordinance. Should that be counted? In the ordinance the introductory part of our building chapter says that one goal is to protect the viewshed (by limiting the visual perceived size of buildings). In previous discussions there seems to be a consensus that we should come up with a way to count this type of space.

The proposed addition to the definition of Combined Square Footage in Ordinance 85-3 is: "The area of any portion of the building which is not enclosed, but which is directly below an enclosed upper floor, for uses including but not limited to carport or patio, shall also be included in the Combined Square Footage, measured between the supports and the main wall, provided: the average grade of

such area is 6% or less; only those parts of such area with a ceiling height of seven feet or more shall be counted (the lowest point of any joists or other horizontal supports shall determine the ceiling height); and the narrowest horizontal dimension (width) of such area is 8 feet or more, and a total square footage of 200 sq. ft. or more."

Ryan asked for any public comment on this proposed addition to the definition of Combined Square Footage.

Faylene: "I see one area that could cause some confusion; because you say for uses including but not limited to carport or patio, which to me would show that there's going to be some grading underneath— you know you're not gonna drive your car or truck up through the rocks or random rocks or something, but what if (I don't have this situation) but what if I'm going to kind of leave it natural—it could be weedy or whatever—and I'm going to use it for storage? I'm going to put, you know, I shouldn't say lawnmower because I don't have a lawnmower, or my charcoal grill—gonna slide that under there—and just some random storage, the top to my pickup truck, or something like that? So would that person not have that area counted as square footage, because they're not using it in a refined way? If that's not what you want I think you should include storage."

Jazmine and Colleen pointed out that it's "not limited to" carport or patio.

Faylene: "I know, but carport and patio, like I said, indicates that there's some finishing to the area—" Colleen interjected that it does specify 6% grade.

Faylene: "OK. I'm just saying having been the Building Permit Agent, I could just see someone making the argument 'why are you counting that?' I mean, you know, throw some garbage cans or something under there—just random—you know, tires and wheels. I mean they're using it as storage but it has the same visual impact. I think if you want to give some concrete examples to avoid confusion you should include storage, and not enclosed storage, however you want to word that."

Colleen suggested we could just add "storage" along with carport and patio. Faylene agreed.

After thanking Faylene, Ryan asked for any more public comment. There was none, and the public hearing on update to language in Ordinance 85-3, Definition of "Combined Square Footage" was adjourned at 7:05 PM.

REGULAR MEETING OF THE PLANNING AND LAND USE COMMISSION

Ryan called to order the regular meeting at 7:06 PM, saying another roll call and determination are unnecessary.

1. Adoption of Agenda. Motion to adopt by Jeff, second by Colleen. Roll call vote was unanimous.

2. Open Public Comment. There was none.

3. Reports & Correspondence. Ryan had none. Colleen reported none in Jessica's email.

Town Council Meeting(s)—Thompson. The complete report is rather lengthy and included in the packet. Ryan asked for just the main points. Colleen noted the audio recording will be up on the state notification website soon and recommends listening to it, because there was a healthy discussion with Brian Torgerson of SITLA and an Under Canvas representative, Jamie Schmidt, who is the UC land entitlement person. It was a wide ranging discussion with a lot of good questions.

Building Permit Agent Report—Thompson. There were 4 building permits issued in June (see report in packet).

4. Administrative & Procedural Matters

Discuss Updates to Future Town Survey: Ryan said we may need to consider some of the information that we've heard at public hearings tonight, including sections related to the Dark Sky Lighting Ordinance and changes to Ordinance 85-3 to make sure that we're keeping pace with what the public wants to weigh in on. Other than that we won't be dealing with the survey tonight.

NEW BUSINESS

5. Recommendation for Town Council on clarifying Ordinance 85-3 regarding building setback requirements from Town boundaries.

Colleen noted that as BPA she recently requested clarification from the Town Council on setbacks from Town boundaries, which is rather ambiguous in the ordinance. The Town Council is the Land Use Authority in interpreting Town ordinances. Jazmine discovered that we did not follow proper procedure, and first step should be that the PLUC sends a recommendation on said interpretation to the Town Council, which will then make their decision.

A landowner recently asked the BPA if the setback requirements apply to his property line, which is on the Town boundary with County property on the other side. The owner claims that setbacks are not required from this property line. The BPA found the ordinance ambiguous. Setbacks are defined in two places. In Definitions, setback is measured from the "side property line or back property line". But in Chapter 5 under setback requirements, setbacks are required from the "property line between contiguous lots". Since a Lot is defined as a platted property of 5 acres or more, this implies it's referring to contiguous lots within the Town boundaries.

What we need to do tonight is decide what the ordinance means and then send the recommendation to the Council. If we want to clarify the language in the ordinance later we can propose an amendment.

Jeff brought up the case of when two lots are divided by a roadway, does that count as contiguous? Also that part of the language about setbacks applies to wells and septic tanks, to ensure that those things are far enough apart. Colleen explained that this particular question, and the sections of the ordinance involved, only apply to solar and other alternative energy systems, above ground water cisterns, metal shipping containers, portable sheds, and all other buildings. Wells and septic tanks are dealt with separately. Also, setbacks from road easements are 50 feet and other property lines 30 feet.

Jeff also mentioned the recent case at the top of Pope Lane where there was a setback question. He said that wasn't an adjacent lot, it was BLM. Jazmine said BLM call their land a lot, being platted. Colleen said in that case it was still not a Town boundary, which is the case in question. Jazmine and Ryan said we should focus on the definition of a lot; we have no definition for boundary. If we have a definition in our ordinance, that supersedes anyone else's definition. Jazmine said we only define Lot; a parcel is something different and our ordinance does not say "between contiguous lots and parcels".

Colleen said that since we define Lot as "a legally platted parcel of land of 5 acres or more including easements", it seems that whoever wrote this was referring to lots within Castle Valley Town boundaries; maybe we should clarify that language at some point. She doesn't want to bring up this specific landowner's situation because there are some special circumstances which we probably should not go into here. The question of the moment is just about setbacks, which in the definitions talks about what's generally referred to as the side and back property lines, but the Chapter 5 description of setback requirements talks about property lines between contiguous lots,

and she saw this as a conflict. State law says ambiguity in ordinances must be found in favor of the landowner.

At this point there was crosstalk about lot versus parcel by several people, and whether the Chapter 5 language is assuming Town lots or not. Jeff pointed out that the land on the other side of the boundary in question is zoned RG (Range and Grazing) which is 15 acres or larger. Colleen explained that the parcel in question is much smaller because it's an abandoned irrigation easement.

Jeff brought up Grand County's meets & bounds on a piece of property, which gives you rights as a lot, but that's not necessarily the case inside Castle Valley.

Faylene was curious about the history of the Chapter 5 language, and whether the "side and back property lines" wasn't just inadvertently dropped when the Chapter 5 item was rewritten to include solar energy systems and some of those other things. As the BPA she always interpreted this as the setbacks being 50 feet along the road from the easement line, and 30 feet alongside sides and back. And she thinks if you just follow the Definition and included [in chapter 5?] the front and back property lines, that would cover every situation, and it doesn't matter whether it's at the Town boundary or adjoining another lot; you have to be 30 feet from the property line whether there is BLM or irrigation ditch on the other side. Colleen concurred that this is what she thinks happened—that the Definition was inherited from earlier ordinance versions, whereas the Chapter 5 "contiguous lot" language, which appears in multiple places in the Ordinance, showed up in 2008 or later.

Faylene reiterated it might be helpful to look at previous versions of the Ordinance to see what the intent had been. Colleen said probably the Chapter 5 language is an oversight where they didn't consider the Town boundary. She agreed the Town boundary counts as a property line with regard to setbacks, and emphasized that the current request is not a language amendment but an interpretation. Amending the language can follow later as that is a lengthier process.

Ryan asked for Julie or Marie to weigh in with any ideas. Julie and Marie agreed with Faylene that the side and back property line makes the most logical sense. Faylene repeated that this is how it's historically been interpreted; and if we look at previous copies of the Ordinance probably the Chapter 5 language was an oversight in terms of Town boundaries.

Jocelyn added that she knows we're working on language but she thinks this ambiguity of the ordinance means that it weighs in favor of the landowner in this particular situation.

Julie asked what the ambiguity is again, because she's having trouble hearing some of the conversation over the remote connection. Specifically, is there something ambiguous about "contiguous", perhaps meaning that it has to be a separate landowner on the other lot? Jazmine answered that it's the definition of a lot being "legally platted 5 acres or more". Julie asked if the ambiguity would be anyone that's got a property line abutting something other than what is a platted lot? Answer: yes.

Faylene asked if the person is saying that they own the adjacent lot then they can put whatever they want next to it? Jeff said no, you shouldn't be able to "sell a problem". In other words, one of those properties could be sold to someone else in the future. Faylene pointed out that you couldn't if you merged the lots and then if you did something like that you could never split them. Colleen said she had extensive discussions with this landowner; not to get too far into the weeds, we bounced around a lot of ideas including merging (in which case the Town would have to annex the adjoining property), but there are deed complications that would preclude that anyway. Colleen also visited the County Recorder and the County Planning Office for ideas. In the process of working with this problem she asked the Council to clarify if this setback rule applies to the Town boundary,

because it seems from the Definition that it does. Jazmine interjected that we were out of sync in the order that we took that request for interpretation, but the Council did agree that it should apply to all the property lines. That doesn't mean that this [ambiguity] wouldn't weigh in the owner's favor in the circumstances.

Julie said maybe it's a legalese question, but is "lot" a defined term throughout the ordinance that's capitalized elsewhere, because it's not capitalized here to indicate it's a defined term. Colleen replied that the capitalization of defined terms got added a year or two ago. Somebody went through and tried to capitalize everything that had a definition. "Lot" is a defined term. The fact that this instance of "lot" may have been overlooked getting capitalized should not be legally binding.

Ryan asked for a motion on a recommendation to the Town Council. Colleen: "I move that we recommend to the Town Council that setbacks with regard to buildings should apply to road easements and all other property lines of a lot." Second by Jeff. There was discussion; Julie suggested the motion should include not just buildings but everything in section B. Colleen revised the motion to: "I move that the setbacks listed in 8-3 Chapter 5.2.B, for all of those listed structures the setbacks should be 30 feet from all the other property lines of a lot". Jeff's second still stands. There was more discussion concerning road easements. Colleen pointed out that item a 5.2.A addresses the road easements; and that this is just a recommendation of interpretation to the Town council, and specific language for an amendment can be proposed later. Perhaps at that time the question of "sides and back" with regard to non-rectangular and odd-shaped lots could be addressed. The motion passed unanimously on a roll call vote. The PLUC needs to send this in writing to the Town Council for their meeting next week.

6. Discussion & Possible Action re: proposed amendments to Dark Sky Lighting Ordinance 2021-5

Ryan asked for any further discussion or questions for Faylene, Jocelyn, or Colleen (all members of the Dark Sky Committee) regarding this Dark Sky Lighting Ordinance. Julie had a question about the new Commercial Building section. She noticed there was a deletion of permitted lighting in V.I.1 for garages and barns, and wonders if garages should be reinstated because of the fire house and other garages on the Town lot. Jeff pointed out that lights at all entrances to building are required by state law, so just the general inclusion of "buildings" would be sufficient. "Barns" was removed because there are unlikely to be barns on the Town lot. There was general agreement on this point.

Ryan brought up Section IV Residential Standards and Conditions, item D, that's orphan language which is no longer needed or is redundant, so we need to delete item D and then renumber the subsequent items.

Asking for any further areas of concern or items that we need to revisit, Ryan was reminded by Jeff about raising the allowed height of a residential pole-mounted light to 10 feet; Ryan agrees that this is the proper time to discuss it. Marie said she thought that Mary Wakeley had made a good point that 6 feet is not practical. Colleen commented that if you're going to put a light on a pole you're just illuminating the ground so you can park or walk to your car in the dark, but if you want to put a light somewhere else, according to a strict reading of this you can have taller poles as long as they're not in your parking area; and so maybe we should just not even limit the height of parking lights. As long as the light complies with the rest of the standards in terms of shielding and visibility from downhill, maybe there shouldn't be a height limit. Or change the height—that's the other option. Marie commented that without a limit some idiot will put a light on a 20 foot pole. Colleen pointed out that the taller it is, the harder it will be to shield it. General consensus agreement.

Faylene mentioned that the parking lot lights at the Town building actually have an aftermarket metal piece around them which helps to shield that light from the side, but because it's 15 high we still get complaints. There are regulations addressing second-story lights needing

additional shielding. She understands that example of parking lot lights with horse trailers or trucks—you want to make sure there's adequate clearance without getting too high. I don't know whether 10 feet or 8 feet, but maybe a light pole at the end of your road, maybe that should still be lower at 6 feet. Colleen: we don't allow those, do we?

Ryan asked about the purpose of this illumination? Faylene answered that we realized we didn't even mention (pole-mounted lighting?) in the original ordinance. The IDA (International Dark Sky Association) model ordinance allows light at entrances but no architectural lighting. We didn't consider that there would be a reason for pole mounted lights. Colleen said she could imagine lights for a chicken yard or a corral to work with your animals; we do already have some agricultural exemptions in our ordinance. The point of the parking light is so you can walk to your car without tripping, or walking around your car without tripping. Faylene added it was assumed that in other areas you would just have pathway lights.

Jeff said we're getting way into the weeds. We can just change one number from 6 to 10 feet. Marie commented that a tall person could bump their head on a 6 foot light. Jeff said it's not unreasonable to ask for taller parking lot lights, as long as the light still complies with the shielding and other requirements. Jocelyn added that there's lots of language elsewhere that says that lighting has to be in compliance, so if they want to put a pole light up, they're just going to have to do extra shielding. Ryan asked what number – he's heard 8 and he's heard 10. Some comments that their camper or horse trailer won't fit under either, and some RVs are very tall.

Jeff moves that we adopt proposed changes, additionally changing the height from 6' to 10' on residential parking lights, and delete item IV.D, and renumbering subsequent items. Seconded by Colleen. Roll call vote was: Julie aye, Marie nay (because of the 10 foot height, she prefers 8 feet), Jeff yes, Colleen yes. Ryan explained that he doesn't have to vote. The motion passes. Faylene asked for clarification that we just passed all the proposed amendments as well as the two additional corrections. Answer was yes.

7. Discussion & Possible Action re: Update to language in Ordinance 85-3 Definition of "Combined Square Footage"

Colleen said since it was already discussed in the public hearing part of the meeting earlier, hopefully we don't have to do that again. She's perfectly happy implementing Faylene's suggestion to include storage as one of the example uses. This makes the proposed addition to the definition of "combined square footage" as follows: "The area of any portion of the building which is not enclosed, but which is directly below an enclosed upper floor, for uses including but not limited to carport, patio, or storage, shall also be included in the Combined Square Footage, measured between the supports and the main wall, provided: the average grade of such area is 6% or less; only those parts of such area with a ceiling height of seven feet or more shall be counted (the lowest point of any joists or other horizontal supports shall determine the ceiling height); and the narrowest horizontal dimension (width) of such area is 8 feet or more, and a total square footage of 200sq. ft. or more."

Ryan asked if there is anyone who has anything further to add or say about this updated language as proposed by Colleen, amended by Faylene. Julie moved "that we approve the amended language to the Combined Square Footage definition in Ordinance 85-3 as shown on the screen and as amended by Colleen." Jeff seconded. Roll call vote: Julie aye, Marie aye, Colleen yes, Jeff yes, Ryan aye. Ryan said the motion passes, the language has been amended, and will be sent to the Town Council. Thanks to Colleen, Jeff, and Jazmine for working on that language—well done.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

8. Potential Informational Updates on FEMA Flood Insurance

Ryan noted that we will be getting some informational updates from FEMA but it will be with an organized meeting in September, including FEMA representatives, which we will advertise when there are more people around and we can generate some interest in attending.

CLOSED MEETING

Not needed.

ADJOURNMENT

Ryan asked for a final motion to adjourn. Jeff Whitney so moves, seconded by Colleen. Vote to adjourn was unanimous. Meeting was adjourned at 8:03 PM.

—submitted by Colleen Thompson

APPROVED:

ATTESTED:

Ryan Anderson, Chairperson

Date

Jocelyn Buck, Town Clerk

Date

TOWN OF CASTLE VALLEY - Building Permits Report

Approval Date Between 7/1/23 And 7/31/23

Approval	Lot	Road	Owner	Type	Purpose	Description	Height	Sq Ft <=19	Sq Ft >19
7/19/2023	141	Buchanan Lane East	Rappaport, Elizabeth	Building	Garage	garaage	18	1136	0
7/25/2023	100	Pace Lane West	Gustin, Wendy & Bill	Building	Shed	pre-fab shed	9.5	203	0
7/26/2023	135	Buchanan Lane West	Pataki, Diane & Holo	Building	Other	Certificate of Occupanc	0	0	0
7/28/2023	260.1	Pace Lane West	Mlynaric, Peter & Ban	Building	Residence		22	0	4641

TOWN OF CASTLE VALLEY - Building Permits Report

Approval Date Between 8/1/23 And 8/31/23

Approval	Lot	Road	Owner	Type	Purpose	Description	Height	Sq Ft <=19	Sq Ft >19
8/17/2023	193	Shafer Lane East	Mitchell, Stephen & R	Building	Residence	3BR 2 BA res	23	0	2743

TOWN OF CASTLE VALLEY - Building Permits Report

Approval Date Between 9/1/23 And 9/30/23

Approval	Lot	Road	Owner	Type	Purpose	Description	Height	Sq Ft <=19	Sq Ft >19
9/12/2023	141	Buchanan Lane East	Rappaport, Elizabeth	Electrical	Solar	Roof mount solar on ne	0	0	0
9/13/2023	448	Rimrock Lane	Wilson, Glen	Electrical	Other	200 amp svc for well	0	0	0

TOWN OF CASTLE VALLEY - Building Permits Report

Approval Date Between 10/1/23 And 10/30/23

Approval	Lot	Road	Owner	Type	Purpose	Description	Height	Sq Ft <=19	Sq Ft >19
10/2/2023	032	Rim Shadow Lane East	Barnhart, Scott & Mal	Building	Other	Certificate of Occupanc	0	0	0
10/4/2023	443	Firecliff Lane	Ambrose, Robert & Fl	Building	Residence A	Residence addition & r	17.5	2418	0