



TREE & LOW IMPACT DEVELOPMENT  
AD HOC COMMITTEE  
REGULAR MEETING NOTES  
WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 7, 2018  
3:00 – 4:30 PM  
COUNCIL CONFERENCE ROOM

---

**Committee Members in Attendance:** Jon Quitslund, Rasham Nassar, Mack Pearl, Ron Peltier, Sarah Blossom

**COBI Staff and BIFD:** Jennifer Sutton, Luke Carpenter

**Public:** Mike Juneau, Charles Schmid

**Agenda Items 1 & 2:** Notes from the previous meeting were reviewed approved as distributed. The Agenda was not modified.

**Agenda Item 3:** Charles Schmid brought several past issues of the ABC's publication, *Scotch Broom*, in which instances of clearcutting and the woeful lack of adequate regulations had been documented. He distributed copies of an especially shocking instance from 1997. Enough said?

**Agenda Item 4, Revisions to BIMC 16.18:** Chairing the meeting, Ron first brought up the dilemma presented by Paul Bonham's interest in a remedy for overgrown and view-blocking hedges. The Committee had been advised against attempting to craft regulatory language in this area. Jennifer said that there are regulations for fences and hedges in the zoning setback, but not beyond it. Several comments were offered. The issue arises between neighbors, and there is a conflict between one person's right to privacy and another's interest in an unobstructed view. A hedge is meant to be trimmed, but sometimes a hedge is formed by trees that should not be topped. Mike pointed out that the SMP includes regulation of hedge height, but they apply to side yards. Jon said that hedges are out of place on Bainbridge; Sarah countered that they are common in Eagledale. Any regulation of existing hedges would have to be complaint-based, and perhaps the City Attorney finds no solid basis for adjudicating such a complaint.

At 3:35 we turned to other business in the Code chapter. Ron proposed that we leave the perfecting of language in the chapter to Jennifer, and he turned attention to her latest list of outstanding policy questions.

**1<sup>st</sup> bullet point:** "Should there be an upper limit to tree removal or canopy change on a developed SFR in Winslow (R-14 through R-2.9)?" Jon asked whether BIMC 18.15.010 was adequate, as that might be the proper place for such a regulation. Mack suggested following the example of Lacey and/or Olympia. We didn't settle the question conclusively. Jennifer's digest of regulations from other jurisdictions deserves study.

**2<sup>nd</sup>:** Outside of NVPA's, should the City limit significant tree removal without regard for species? For instance, alders of any size might not count as significant unless they are in a critical area or buffer. Are there other 'undeserving' species? Mike observed that species diversity is important. We didn't settle this matter conclusively.

**3<sup>rd</sup>:** Should the current definition of significant tree within the MUTC & HS districts (8" dbh) be applied Island-wide? On this, we decided "NO," sticking with the established criteria of 10" dbh for deciduous and 12 dbh for evergreen species.

**4<sup>th</sup>:** New “exceptional tree” category. We agreed that the simple definition (48” dbh or greater) is not adequate, but did not craft a better one. The committee discussed the Heritage Tree Program, which is managed by the Historic Preservation Commission, and the merits of creating the new exceptional tree category compared compared to the voluntary heritage tree program. The Committee agreed that the Heritage Tree Program should be better promoted.

We struggled with the question of how to define the criteria for granting a permit – which may come down to how to deny a permit, or to grant it with conditions attached. Jon said it would help to know what information is required in the application for a permit, and what form the approval takes. At this point we were running out of time.

Jon expressed some frustration, as he had come in with a marked-up copy of the latest draft, including points where there’s a policy decision to be made and other places where the language could be improved. Jennifer assured him that they could work together on the next iteration.

The next meeting will be on the 21<sup>st</sup>.

**Notes Approved: February 21, 2018**