



TREE & LOW IMPACT DEVELOPMENT
AD HOC COMMITTEE
MEETING NOTES
FEBRUARY 1, 2017
3:00 – 4:30 PM
COUNCIL CONFERENCE ROOM
280 MADISON AVE N
BAINBRIDGE ISLAND, WA 98110

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

COBI Staff: Jennifer Sutton, Peter Corelis

Public: Julie and Mike Smith, Kelsey Laughlin, Charles Schmid

1. Approved meeting notes from the January 18, 2017 meeting.
2. Approved meeting agenda
3. Public Comment:

Julie and Mike Smith from Battle Point Neighborhood: Described how a developer has cut a swath through the forest adjacent to their house, near Battle Point Park, and completely transformed the once peaceful and forested character of the neighborhood. It's an old sub division of three single family lots and exempt from clearing restrictions. They described how storm water flows have been altered and the neighboring trees, including theirs, have been put at risk from wind exposure. They are considering moving. Julie and Mike commended the Tree Committee for their dedication and hope what happened to the forest where they live can serve as an example of something that should not be happening on Bainbridge Island.

4. Low Impact Development Discussion:

Jennifer handed out various sheets of information:

- LID regulations flow charts for new development and redevelopment
- Sheet of policy question regarding chapter 16.22 vegetation management
- Committee member Jon Quitslund's answers to those policy questions
- Phased approach to Issues Surrounding LID
- Pierce County 3 steps to determine if a forest practices permit is required

HIGHLIGHTS OF OUR LID DISCUSSION:

Jennifer: City Attorney, Joe Levan, is reviewing the draft Site Assessment Permit.

Lot Coverage and Location of Buildings

We talked quite a bit about the pros and cons of including driveways in a site assessment's impervious surface total, with Mack questioning the merits of discouraging long driveways when they are lined for trees that mitigate runoff. We discussed how locating buildings on high ground, to take advantage of downslope Green Infrastructure, might require a long Driveway. Kelcey and Peter said we should be penalizing long driveways. Mack felt that recognizing the ability of trees to mitigate driveway runoff could help save trees.

Sarah and Kol wanted a more flexible site assessment that represents a new way of processing development applications. Mack commented that LID rules should distinguish between large and small lots.

Peter, and Kelsey, both mentioned that our regulations don't allow the City to restrict where property owners can locat buildings, except for critical area restrictions. If we want to do that we need regulations that go beyond the minimum state mandated requirements, which is what we have now.

**For special accommodations, please contact Jane Rasely, Planning & Community
Development 206-780-3758 or at jrasely@bainbridgewa.gov**

Jennifer's handouts show three levels of development: major, minor, and sub-minor. Kelcey repeated her belief that projects between 800-2,000 sq ft of new impervious surface should be required to submit a much less detailed drainage plan. Then we got back to talking about long driveways (sort of like the SNL skit where Christopher Walken keeps asking for "more cowbell").

Phase II of LID

Reluctantly leaving the long driveway discussion behind us, Jennifer pointed out that what we now have in our regulations are the minimal LID requirements mandated by the State. Looking to the Tree/LID Committee's work on Phase II, how onerous do we want to be? Mack commented that we want more tree retention, which seemed representative of the Committee. Brief mention of "infiltration vs dispersion", then Sarah commented that LID doesn't seem to be helping us accomplish what we've been hoping for, after all. Kol didn't seem to agree and if I remember correctly expressed that LID can help us preserve the native landscape and we need to make it do that.

My head spinning just a little, I asked about the difference between Site Assessments and Site Assessment Permits: the latter is part of the more involved Site Assessment process. SAP happens before clearing permits are approved but six significant trees/year can still be removed without an SAP. Jennifer made a comment about limiting house sizes. Peter commented that he thought the SAP would serve a purpose, in response to comments questioning its value. Lots of difference aspects of LID coming in and out of the discussion.

Kol commented that the Site Assessment Permit isn't doing what the committee wants it to do. Jennifer mentioned the three sections of the Code we need to be looking at: Ch15 Stormwater; Chapter 16 Clearing/Veg Management; Ch 18 Zoning.

Role of Staff in helping the Committee accomplish general goals

I expressed the desire for Staff, Jennifer and others, to be working more as part of the "team" and wondered if we needed to ask Doug about that. Jennifer replied that the committee really needs to decide on its policies. At about 4:10pm this got us off LID and onto Vegetation Management, and the list of policy questions related to Ch 16.22 Jennifer had handed out (not a new list).

5. Vegetation Management and Clearing

We started out with question #1 regarding the 5,000 sq ft and got into a more far ranging discussion about roadside buffers and the 65% site preservation potentially required under LID. Sarah thought preserving 65% on small lots would be difficult. Someone asked how we might require more than 25% open space for subdivisions. Kelcey suggested focusing on stormwater and native vegetation retention.

6. Next Meeting will be on 2/15/17.

7. Post meeting Note: At the City Council Agenda meeting, right after the Tree/LID meeting, I discussed with CM Doug Schulze and Mayor Tellefson how we might enhance the role of Staff to help our committee make more progress. Val said we need to bring our policies to the entire Council and discuss how Staff can help us accomplish them. Doug agreed.

Notes Approved: February 15, 2017