

**Ad Hoc Tree Committee
Meeting Notes
October 27, 2015**

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

COBI Staff: Jennifer Sutton, Josh Machen

Public: Olaf Ribeiro

The meeting came to order at 8:40. We discussed the meeting notes from September 29, which were approved, subject to some clarification of a reference to a hypothetical tree unit requirement on subdivision lots. We also reviewed the notes from the Urban Forestry Seminar in Poulsbo on August 25. In that connection, Josh mentioned that we have a street tree inventory for Winslow, and Jennifer mentioned the Community Forestry inventory and management plan from 2007.

Jon raised some questions about the scope of the work remaining for the committee. What will be included in another ordinance revising BIMC 18.15.010? What should be said in a wrap-up report to the Planning Commission and the Council?

Josh was present to offer his perspective on the Committee's interest in considering substantial changes in the Subdivision Design Standards (BIMC 17.22), such as eliminating the "cluster" option and introducing a tree unit requirement, either in addition to or in place of dedicating at least 25% of the subdivision area to open space features.

The Committee heard that Planning Director Kathy Cook is opposed to the Committee's amending the subdivision regulations at this time. In addition, Josh said there were good reasons for having two options. He mentioned a development at Springridge and Hansen, an R-1 property, where the cluster option was chosen.

Josh provided some background on the impact of a WA Supreme Court decision in a case known as *Isla Verde Int'l Holdings, Inc. v. City of Camas*. As a consequence, COBI completed a wide-ranging open space study, resulting in the City able to require that up to 25% of square footage in a development shall be dedicated to open space (including buffers and critical areas if present).

Mack opined that a tree unit requirement might be more effective than the 25% rule. We also discussed the fact that depending on the density determined by zoning, together with characteristics of the site, the 25% rule will be more or less effective in preservation of open space. And there are situations where more than 25% of a property is impacted by critical areas conditions. Josh would make the point that regulating tree preservation on existing lots would be burdensome.

We discussed the need to strengthen provisions for protection of open space. Josh mentioned that as of 2016, LID practices will be required to protect soils from damage in the course of site development.

Notes Approved: December 1, 2015