



TREE & LOW IMPACT DEVELOPMENT
AD HOC COMMITTEE
REGULARLY SCHEDULED MEETING
WEDNESDAY, APRIL 19, 2017
3:00 – 4:30 PM
COUNCIL CONFERENCE ROOM
280 MADISON AVE N
BAINBRIDGE ISLAND, WA 98110

AGENDA

- | | | |
|----|--|------|
| 1. | Review and Approve Notes from March 29, 2017 Meeting | 3:00 |
| 2. | Review and approve meeting agenda | 3:05 |
| 3. | Public comment on agenda-related items | 3:05 |
| 4. | Ongoing Business | |
| | A. Discuss Phase 2 Low Impact Development
<i>City Staff</i> | 3:15 |
| | B. Discuss Creating New Tree Retention Standards for Single-family Lots
<i>City Staff</i> | 3:30 |
| | C. Discuss Staff Proposal for Modifying BIMC Chapters 16.22 & 16.18
<i>City Staff</i> | 4:00 |
| 5. | Public comment on agenda-related items | 4:15 |
| 6. | Discuss Agenda for Next Meeting: May 3 | 4:25 |
| 7. | For the Good of the Order | 4:30 |



TREE & LOW IMPACT DEVELOPMENT
AD HOC COMMITTEE
MEETING NOTES
MARCH 29, 2017
3:00 – 4:30 PM
COUNCIL CONFERENCE ROOM
280 MADISON AVE N
BAINBRIDGE ISLAND, WA 98110

Committee Members in Attendance: Jon Quitslund, Ron Peltier, Kol Medina, Mack Pearl, Sarah Blossom

COBI Staff: Barry Loveless, Heather Wright, Mike Michael, Gary Christensen

Public: Jonathan Davis, Kelsey Laughlin, Robert Dashiell, Charles Schmid, Mike Juneau

Item 1: Notes from the meeting of March 15 were approved as distributed. Kol remarked that the notes from a previous meeting had prompted some discussion in a City Council meeting: it appeared that the committee had not been making much progress on its workplan. Sarah's view was that we need a consultant with experience in other jurisdictions to work, with us or independently, on updating parts of the BIMC. Ron suggested that reconstituting the Forestry Commission could be part of the solution.

Item 2: Agenda. Adding an item to the agenda, Kol mentioned Council discussion of prescriptive perimeter buffers; questions had arisen from planning for development of the Suzuki property. Sarah thought that modification, if permitted, could be proposed in the Site Assessment Review.

Item 3: Charles reminded the committee that long ago, Olaf Ribeiro had recommended hiring a consultant to get the job of Code revision done. Robert asked about implementation of LID standards for all sorts of development and re-development: are we in compliance with state standards now, or are we lagging behind?

Item 4 A.: Tree retention standards for single-family lots. BIMC 18.15.010, subsection B. 1., states that the regulations in this section apply to "All new development, except single-family residential building permits" (emphasis added). But Heather said that striking the underlined clause won't be sufficient. What tree retention standards for such lots in the Open Space Residential zones (R-2, R-1, R-0.4) should be added to 18.15.010, to inform the Site Assessment Review? And what standards for the more dense residential zones?

Jennifer's bullet points, distributed with the agenda, propose two norms for the OSR zones: a) at least 25% of the lot set aside as "open space" or "existing vegetation preservation"; b) retain at least 40 tree units per acre, or if fewer than 40, as many after as before development. In the more dense single-family residential zones (R-2.9 to R-5), option b) would apply.

{While we understood the need for fixes, the committee didn't discuss the specifics of these proposals. Are they practical? Would it be feasible and preferable to conduct a Site Assessment Review without a tree-related quota? (After all, the stated purpose of LID standards is management of surface water, which typically involves limiting clearing, soil disturbance, and impermeable surfaces. Preservation of trees and other vegetation would be a collateral benefit in most cases, but

maybe tree units don't fit in the calculation. Also, there will be lots and proposals for development for which 25% of vegetation preservation won't be enough to meet the LID goals.}}

Kol called on Jon to provide a brief summary of what he had learned from the Urban Forest Management Plan completed in 2013 by the City of Lacey. (Lacey is a suburb of Olympia; it appears to be a bedroom community, somewhat as Bainbridge Island is in relation to Seattle. In acreage, it is half our size, with double our population.) Planning and community development in Lacey in response to the Growth Management Act resemble the pattern on Bainbridge, up to a point: Comp Plan completed in 1994, updated in 2002-04; in 2003-04, "a much accelerated rate of private property development . . . in areas with second-growth forest species."

The Urban Forestry Plan was adopted in 2006, updated in 2013, "adding regulations for administering Class IV Forest Practices applications" and several other measures, including provisions for an Inventory of street trees and forest canopy conditions, with an evaluation of hazard trees in all Lacey Parks. Lacey has a City Forester on staff. A policy in the Management Plan: "Develop specific urban forestry landscape expectations and standards for each land use zone." A goal: "Integrate urban forestry concepts and preferences with development design." (Policies A through G follow – pp. 25-26.)

Jon observed that Lacey's follow-through after 2006, from planning to implementation, sets an example for Bainbridge; he wants to see how their municipal code provides for retention of trees and urban forest stands.

Heather has already investigated regulations in some other jurisdictions; she will compile information for the committee. Sarah observed that we need to know how other jurisdictions handle both single-family lots and subdivisions. How do other cities use tree units and/or limits on clearing and lot coverage? Mike observed that the site assessment process is crucial. Heather observed that the zoning classification and lot size are crucial factors.

Item 4 B.: Moving to another part of Jennifer's memo, "Major Tree Removal Permit for creation of Farms." Sarah referred to the part of the BIMC devoted to Agriculture. Does it need revision? The hearing examiner's decision in the case of Crystal and Yurie Rich identifies some problems, to which Jennifer responds.

Item 4 C.: Work for a consulting firm familiar with our Code and issues, and process in Phase 2 of LID standards. We need to plug some apparent holes in the Code (in 2 months' time?), and we need to manage the big picture. Heather asked when the committee will be ready to involve the development community and citizens in a public setting; we should expect some push-back but it can be constructive, as with the March 2nd meeting on LID and Site Assessment Review. Barry and other staff will work on a scope-of-work description and some language for plugging holes.

Next meeting, April 19th; typically, the committee will meet on 1st and 3rd Wednesdays.