

**Ad Hoc Tree Committee
Meeting Notes
May 12, 2015**

Committee members in attendance: Roger Townsend, Jon Quitslund, Mack Pearl, Sarah Blossom
COBI Staff: Jennifer Sutton, Josh Machen

The meeting began at 9:15 and ended at 11, approximately. We discussed one detail in the notes from the April 28 meeting: the paragraph beginning “Jennifer briefed the committee” ends with “The ad hoc committee’s discussion of this detail [a difference of opinion that came up in the Planning Commission meeting on April 23] was not conclusive.” Returning to this question, committee members supported Mack Pearl’s opinion that language requiring the survey and valuation of retained trees prior to development should be included in the BIMC chapter as well as in the Administrative Manual.

Josh distributed copies of a brochure he had obtained recently at a conference: *‘Tree Protection on Construction and Development Sites,’* developed by the Oregon State University extension service as a Best Management Practices guidebook for the Pacific Northwest.

We discussed the bonuses allowed for retention of mature trees and heritage trees on the assumption that the trees will remain healthy: there is such a thing as natural tree mortality, while the bonus confers a permanent benefit.

Josh described the current status of planning for Pleasant Beach Village, with the new plans for the Pleasant Beach in, filling the ‘donut hole’ adjacent to the pool. Referring to the need for a buffer at the eastern boundary between multi-family development and the single family residences above, Josh pointed out the need to accommodate a water tank and an existing water line. This project serves as an example of appropriate landscape design within its parts and on the periphery.

With reference to Tree Unit requirements in the NSC zones, we approved the existing language in the draft Ordinance 2015-04 (p. 7): at least 40 tree units per acre, or at least as many as prior to the proposed development or redevelopment.

Some further work may be needed re: non-residential development in residential zones. We agreed that “filtered screen,” as used in BIMC 18.15.010, is not a useful category.

The next meeting is set for May 26: requirements for screening perimeter buffers will be discussed with the help of landscape professionals.

Notes approved: June 16, 2015