

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

**COBI Staff:** Mike Michael, Jennifer Sutton

**Public:** Norm Down, Bre Ganne (Parks), Dana Coggon (Kitsap Noxious Weed Board), Maxwell Gordinier (Let's Pull Together), Stephanie Foster, Charles Schmid, Kelsey Laughlin, Mike Juneau

**Items 1 & 2:** Notes from the April 19 meeting were approved as distributed; the Agenda was reviewed and approved.

**Item 3:** Norm Down spoke from a long acquaintance with development on Bainbridge, and expressed concern over the impact of subdivisions in the R-1 zone, saying that hemlock and Douglas fir especially are not comfortable with development.

**Item 4.A:** Mike reported that Staff are close to an agreement with Herrera on a schedule for the LID Phase II work; he made reference to a table describing tasks in four categories. The fourth of these ("Assist Planning," which by implication includes the Committee) makes reference to SMP Amendments, Vegetation Management, Critical Areas, plus "etc." Jon asked for the inclusion of Subdivision Design Standards in the list.

It is to be understood that Herrera's work will be completed in 2017. At the next meeting (5/17) or the first meeting in June we will see the details of the schedule and have an opportunity to coordinate our workplans.

**Item 4.B:** Jennifer presented a proposal to amend BIMC 18.15.010, establishing tree retention requirements for single family residential lots. In the Open Space Residential zones (R-0.4, R-1, & R-2), the norms refer to the extent of **tree canopy**, and in zones from R-2.9 and up, the norms refer to **tree units**, with 40 TU/Acre as the basis for calculations. For the OSR zones, the Committee preferred the "alternative option," which sets standards for tree canopy based on square footage of the lot, recognizing that many lots in R-0.4 are less than (and some may be greater than) 2.5 acres.

For example: on a lot that is greater than 100,000 sq ft, the extent of tree canopy to be retained would be 70%; on a lot size between 40,000 and 70,000 sq ft, the tree canopy retained would be 50%. However, if prior to development the tree cover on a lot is less than the standard, planting to meet the standard is not required. Mike Juneau pointed out that requiring the preservation of tree canopy will be problematic if it means that trees with limited long-term value, such as Scouler's willow and alder, cannot be removed and replaced.

To Jon's question about applying these standards to long and short plat subdivisions, Jennifer said that the requirements should be similar; the SFR regulations will establish a starting point.

Jennifer then asked what limits should apply if a lot is being cleared for an agricultural use, or if an existing farm is being expanded. At a minimum, LID and stormwater management regulations would apply, and critical areas are off limits, but the BIMC treats agriculture

(including gardening for one's own use) as a permitted use in all zones. Clearing forested land for farming, as was done in the old days after timber had been harvested, seemed objectionable to the Committee in the present day. Perhaps farming (with a farm plan approved by the Kitsap Conservation District) should be permitted only if the land had previously been used for farming and/or the trees are immature. Presumably, a cursory site assessment could determine if a lot is rendered unsuitable for farming due to shade from the trees on its perimeter or on an adjoining lot.

We also discussed the fact that City policies and public opinion favor the use of solar panels and building designs that require generous provisions for access to sunlight. Jennifer will work on language to provide some leeway.

**Item 4.C:** Jennifer spoke of the Committee's long-term "repeal / replace" project, BIMC 16.18 & 16.22 (Land Clearing & Vegetation Management), observing that the new chapter will be, in essence, a description of the processes of applying for and carrying out either a **minor** or a **major** clearing permit. We need to define the thresholds for distinguishing one from the other. Jon said that in addition, the chapter should include a list of activities that are allowed, even encouraged, without a permit.

**Item 5:** There were no closing comments by members of the public.

**Item 6:** Regarding the agenda for May 17, it is assumed that we will return to each of the items of Ongoing Business. Jon asked the Committee members to examine the ***Community Forest Management Plan*** that was completed in 2006, to see if (or how) it might be used in public outreach and as a foundation for the Code revisions we are working on.

**Notes Approved: May 17, 2017**