

**Ad Hoc Tree Committee
Meeting Notes
March 10, 2015**

Committee members in attendance: Roger Townsend, Jon Quitslund, Sarah Blossom, Mack Pearl

COBI Staff: Jennifer Sutton

Public: Terry Samilson, Randy Rotter, Charles Schmid

As scheduled, the meeting took place in Council Chambers between 9 and 11 a. m. Most of the discussion pertained to Ordinance 2015-04 (formerly 2014-07), which amends some provisions of the 'Interim Tree Protection Ordinance' (BIMC 18.15.010). Jennifer noted that action on this ordinance is scheduled for the Council meeting on April 21, and plans call for referring it to the Planning Commission for discussion on March 26.

Jon distributed copies of two pages pertaining to the Vegetation Management chapter (BIMC 16.22), relevant to discussion at a later meeting.

Jennifer observed that regulations for subdivisions and Business/Industrial zones have not yet been discussed, and requirements might be added that apply to Single Family Residential development.

We discussed the various uses for B/I space and the appropriate perimeter buffers and screening.

Sarah had questions about a passage on p. 8 of the Ordinance, pertaining to the bonus for tree stands voluntarily retained in a development: why is the bonus 1.2, not 1.5 as in other instances?

Charles raised a question about the penalties (and the lack thereof) for clearing without a permit: there's a difference if a permit would have been granted, versus clearing that is flat out illegal. Mack and Jennifer discussed the problem of trees that die because they are unprotected from development. Roger had questions about penalties, and Sarah called attention to a place on p. 2 of the Ordinance that needs fixing: the paragraph on 'Enforcement and Penalties' should mention "failure to retain."

Randy Rotter spoke from his experience as a resident in the Fletcher Bay neighborhood, saying that some of the small lots platted long ago by Mr. Fletcher are now being developed, and clearing is going on that is contrary to the established neighborhood aesthetic. What can be done?

Buffer requirements were discussed, with reference to p. 14 of the Interim Tree Protection Ordinance. At one point Mack asked, "What are we trying to achieve with buffers?" He suggested that in some situations landscaping should be required

rather than a screen. The rules for 'clustered' housing in subdivisions were mentioned, and the alternative, 'open space' planning: do these regulations produce good results?

Aquifer recharge was discussed: where are the specific places ("lenses" was the term Mack used) that are most important for recharge? Jon mentioned that wetlands are protected for good reason, but he understood that they are not responsible for aquifer recharge. Jennifer mentioned that protection of aquifers will be the focus of attention when revision of the Critical Areas Ordinance is taken up in the not too distant future.

Notes Approved: April 14, 2015