



TREE & LOW IMPACT DEVELOPMENT
AD HOC COMMITTEE
MEETING NOTES
MARCH 15, 2017
3:00 – 5:00 PM
COUNCIL CONFERENCE ROOM
280 MADISON AVE N
BAINBRIDGE ISLAND, WA 98110

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

COBI Staff: Barry Loveless, Jennifer Sutton, Marilyn Guthrie; Rebecca Dugopolski & Julia Munger from Herrera (consultants)

Public: Pat Fuarer, Nina Cousins, Jim Laughlin, Deb Rudnick, Spencer Evans, Robert Dashiell, Kelsey Laughlin

Item 1: Notes from the meeting of February 15 were approved as distributed.

Item 2: The agenda was approved with the addition of an item regarding the “Celebrate Trees!” Resolution, under discussion by the City Council.

Item 3: Public Comment. Kelsey Laughlin spoke briefly about the Site Assessment Review, and Pat, Nina, Jim, and Robert added their comments.

Item 4A: Barry led off the debriefing from the meeting held on March 2 to explain the intent of the Site Assessment Review in connection with LID standards. (A tabulation of questions, comments, and responses from the meeting has been prepared, running to 5 pp.) Feedback received in the meeting has contributed to further shaping of the policies. Barry noted that the S A is now presented as a “review,” not a “permit”; it can be understood as the first step or phase in the pre-app process. A Public Hearing on the enabling Ordinance is scheduled for the Council meeting on April 11. Approximately 300 pending projects will involve a site assessment review, and it’s estimated that each will involve approximately 4 hours of staff time. Development of the B I policies has involved study of policies in Jefferson Co. and in Olympia. In Olympia the equivalent instrument is termed a “stormwater scoping report.”

{In its current form, the Site Assessment Review is the subject of Ord. # 2017-03, to be found in the City Council agenda packet for March 21, pp. 17-27. It’s accompanied by Resolution # 2017-08, which sets a fee for the SAR at \$400.}

Item 4B: We discussed Tree Clearing regulations with reference to single-family residential development; Herrera consultants can contribute to revision of those policies. Questions arose about the allowance for removing “6 significant trees within a 12-month period”? It is clear that for some undeveloped lots, clearing single-family residential development ought to be more carefully regulated. Will LID standards and the SAR process meet the need? Julia from Herrera said that she could contribute to policies in this area.

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

Jennifer's sheet of bullet points should be the focus for discussion at the next meeting.

Item 4C: Scope of Phase II in development of LID policies. Applicability: If any development above 800 sq ft triggers LID requirements, there is no incentive to design a mid-size house, say between 1200 and 2000 sq ft. There was general agreement that development of small and mid-size houses (rather than boxy and big-footprint houses and excess impervious surface) should be incentivized however possible in LID policies.

Kol asked if LID-related policies could provide a rationale for expanding open space requirements beyond the current limit of 25% (including vegetated buffers). Rebecca said that the City of Lacey provides a precedent in their code, which emphasizes the value to the community of preserving and promoting an urban forest. Jon suggested that protected open space should not be limited to the streams, wetlands, steep slopes, and frequently flooded areas where the Critical Areas ordinance (BIMC 16.20) limits development. Julia observed that the Phase II gap analysis should look at small lot / single-family regulations; regulations can be zone-specific. Ron mentioned that the overriding aim of LID standards is preservation or mimicking of pre-development hydrology. We need to look closely at BMP off-ramps, not to be too liberal in allowing technological 'solutions.' Another consideration: policies ought to allow tree removal as needed for agriculture, gardens, and solar energy panels.

Work on the Phase II policy changes will take between 6 months and a year. We will get help from the City of Lacey and other already-adopted model codes. Our own Community Forestry report from 2006 is relevant.

Item 4D: The Committee page on the City website is there to be looked at.

As a final item, the Committee discussed a resolution that had been introduced by Ron, on behalf of several citizens, making "**Celebrate Trees!**" COBI's slogan for the month of April, and affirming a number of policies as priorities for implementation. Councilmember Roth had offered an amended draft that removed much of the resolution's substance; committee members affirmed their support for the uncut version.

Notes Approved: March 29, 2017