



TREE & LOW IMPACT DEVELOPMENT
AD HOC COMMITTEE
SPECIAL MEETING NOTES
WEDNESDAY, MARCH 14, 2018
3:00 – 4:30 PM
PLANNING CONFERENCE ROOM

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

COBI Staff and BIFD: Jennifer Sutton, Peter Corelis

Public: Mike Juneau

Agenda Items 1, 2 & 3: Notes from the previous meeting were reviewed and approved as distributed. The Agenda was approved, with modifications proposed by Ron. With reference to BIMC 16.18, attention to the Stewardship Plan as described in BIMC 16.20; and some attention to LID standards. Answering the call for public comment, Mike urged the Committee to “keep it simple.”

Agenda Item 4: Retention requirements in BIMC 18.15.010 pertaining to single-family residential lots in R-2.9, R-3.5, and R-4.3: At the previous meeting the Committee had decided that Tree Unit standards should be applied in those zones, and Jennifer had worked up tables for review and approval.

As a rule, in BIMC 18.15.010, the retention standard is 30 tree units per acre, and Jennifer’s table establishes proportional amounts for properties of different sizes (for example, between 12,001 and 16,000 sq. ft., the requirement would be 12 tree units). While the rule applies within the three zones termed “suburban” in the zoning code, property size rather than the zoning designation is determinative. Presumably, for a property being subdivided, the retention standard applies to the entire property. Also, no more units are required than are present on the property prior to development or redevelopment.

Jennifer explained that these amendments to BIMC 18.15.010 will be included with the new BIMC 16.18 in the draft Ordinance that will be presented to the Planning Commission, likely towards the end of April. In Jennifer’s draft, the new retention requirements apply only to “New and Replacement Single-family Residences,” but after discussion, the Committee decided that they should apply also to what is allowed, in accordance with BIMC 16.18, on already-developed residential lots. (As it stands, Table 18.15.010-1 does not use the phrase “New and Replacement,” but the preceding “Applicability” statement (B.1) begins by saying, “All new development . . . shall be subject to the requirements of this section . . .”)

Agenda Item 5, Questions about LID standards: Peter Corelis popped in to discuss several questions with the Committee. Ron had been intrigued by some things that the architect Jim Cutler had said in a presentation to the Planning Commission. He claims that aquifer recharge can happen on the large lot being developed on the NE corner of the Madison / Wyatt intersection, and he plans to use permeable pavement and to send roof runoff into a pool at the corner of the property. Peter said that there will be some provisions for collecting and draining excess stormwater offsite. Jon had some questions about the functionality of Site Assessment Reviews: do they have determinative authority over a property owner’s or a developer’s

decisions as to the location and the extent of hard surfaces, and the management of water to the extent it is affected by development? The answer seemed to be “not exactly.” Mack commented that the SARs he had seen had been very well done.

Agenda Item 6: BIMC 16.18, formerly known as *Land Clearing*: Jennifer observed that, given the extent to which the chapter deals with the processing of land use permits, it might be moved to Title 2 (Administration, Personnel and Land Use Procedures). As it happens, BIMC 2.18 is vacant since the chapter that once filled that slot was repealed, and in that place our *chef d’oeuvre* would come right after 2.16 (Land Use Review Procedures). Jon took exception to this idea, but he endorsed Jennifer’s suggestion, at an earlier meeting, that Title 16 (Environment) should be retitled *Natural Resources and Conservation*.

Discussion of the Draft dated March 6 began with brisk attention to some details on pp. 3, 4, and 5: places where the NVPA references will be changed to ARPA, and a place (in .050 A) where new should be struck from the reference to *single-family residences*.

Subsection .040 F, devoted to “existing farmed areas,” needed discussion. The reference to “this Chapter” was vague, and “subsection I below” would be better. But why say “existing,” thereby neglecting farms that are just getting started? And is it necessary to refer to farms at all in this chapter since approved farm management plans (like stewardship plans) allow for a “dynamic” development process?

Ron’s question, “What are we trying to avoid?” asked us to stop and reflect, but nobody had a direct answer. (“Loopholes” comes to mind, although the classic loophole is not inadvertent, but deliberately inserted to suit a special interest.)

Discussion also got hung up on subsection .050 C, having to do with solar panels, after Jon asked whether “required to be retained” was needed as a qualifier. Since Jennifer had said that installation of solar panels required a building permit, Jon thought that the application for that permit should include disclosure of any plans to remove trees; at that point it would become clear if a permit (with, perhaps, replacement trees) would be needed.

With time running out, Mack observed that he remained unsure about the City’s criteria for granting a permit. Jon had complained earlier that he was still in the dark about the kinds of information called for in permit applications: he has wanted applicants to demonstrate, in some fashion, how their plans are consistent with the chapter’s Purposes (subsection .025) where they are relevant to the activity being proposed.

Ron said that we should come to the next meeting prepared to discuss the matter of Stewardship Plans: Do we need something different from the ARPA Stewardship Plan described in the CAO?

Our next meeting, on March 21, will return us to the regular schedule.

Notes Approved: March 21, 2018