

**Ad Hoc Tree Committee  
Meeting Notes  
June 16, 2015**

Committee members in attendance: Roger Townsend, Mck Pearl, Jon Quitslund

COBI Staff: Jennifer Sutton

Public: Charles Schmid

The meeting took place in the Council Conference Room between 9 and 11 a. m. We discussed a few additions / corrections to the notes from the previous meeting, and these have been entered in a revised draft of the notes. The comments of Peter Perry at the May 28 Planning Commission meeting were mentioned; Jennifer noted that he is currently a member of the Design Review Board, and all agreed that he should receive notices of future meetings.

Jennifer distributed copies of Tables (3, 4, 5, and 6, pertaining to perimeter and roadside buffers, screening, and landscaping) from BIMC 18.15.010, with the recommendations discussed to date highlighted. She also distributed the text of BIMC 18.15.010.D.4 (Perimeter Buffer Descriptions), with recommended changes indicated in ~~strikeout~~ / underline format.

Discussion focused first on multifamily development in R-1, abutting single-family residential. An example at Valley Rd. and N. Madison was cited. Mack asked why the rule deals only with R-1: should the full screen requirement also apply in R-0.4 and R-2, or in all zones? Mack observed that having an ADU creates potential for multi-family use.

In the category of Nonresidential Uses in residential areas outside Winslow, where the abutting use is residential, a full screen buffer is required; where the abutting use is not residential (e. g., a church or community center), something less than a full screen might be required. In R-14 etc., landscaping rather than a full screen should be required between like uses. There should be landscaping between parking areas or lots.

Where the recommendations to date indicate striking a line pertaining to NSCs, we thought the line should be retained, with the perimeter raised from 10 to 15, with 'Filtered Screen' replaced by 'Landscaping,' and again on p. 2 for the roadside buffer.

We discussed the purpose(s) to be served by a Conditional Use Permit process.

Roger asked that we use the last 15 minutes of the meeting to check in on what remains to be done with the draft ordinance before returning it to the Planning Commission and on to the Council. In the section devoted to Enforcement and Penalties, we need the City Attorney's review and advice. Generally speaking, committee members are leery of soft language giving the Director broad discretion in the penalty area. Roger thought we need language that makes fines absolute in specific circumstances. Further, although it need not be construed as a penalty, there should be some sanction when, in the Site Plan Review, specific trees are marked to be retained and they turn out to be casualties of the site development.

**Notes Approved: July 14, 2015**