

**5.02: Review Landscape and Tree Preservation Plans Associated with the Preliminary Plat Application for Harvest Estates; case of NIK Management, Inc.**

City Planner Anderson presented the staff report.

Board Member Valentine inquired about storm water compliance.

City Planner Anderson replied that the engineering staff is responsible for storm water compliance but from what he can see, it appears to meet the minimum standards. There would not be tree loss directly related to storm water ponding. He pointed out that the proposed lot sizes are approximately a quarter of an acre and each site would get two front yard trees. He stated that a concern raised by residents that they would like to see more of a buffer has been addressed with the plan. He spoke about reforestation standards and their interpretations.

Board Member Lewis asked about the area between phase one and two.

City Planner Anderson replied that it will be ponding for the site.

Board Member Lewis asked if it was a ponding area or swale.

Community Development Director Gladhill stated his assumption that it is needed for storm water purposes.

Board Member Lewis asked if there is any possibility for additional plantings in that area.

City Planner Anderson replied that it is a possibility and the Board could make a request for additional plantings at the rim of the ponding area.

Board Member Valentine stated it was worth looking at it if it wasn't going to create interference with storm water management.

Community Development Director Gladhill stated this is an excellent example of how the ordinance is being applied and that we have more plantings with the reforestation requirements. He stated that Staff is looking for a policy direction on how the ordinance is interpreted and calculated to make sure the Board is accomplishing what it intended.

Board Member Valentine stated that the ordinance would be unworkable without some flexibility and he is comfortable with the City's interpretation of the ordinance in this case.

City Planner Anderson stated that this is one of the benefits we should see with the Board reviewing proposed development plans.

Board Member Hiatt said he could see the logic of two options and asked if the City is setting a precedent for other developers. He asked if the Board is giving flexibility without giving precedent.

City Planner Anderson stated that every request or proposal is unique and that everything cannot be accounted for in an ordinance. Having flexibility and checking in with various advisory boards protects the City from setting undesirable precedents.

Board Member Valentine stated that he felt another developer would try to take advantage of a precedent if it was advantageous to them, but that checking in with the various advisory boards should protect the City.

City Planner Anderson stated that Staff is supportive of what is being proposed in this case as meeting the City's overall ordinance. He is hoping to get feedback from the Board in terms of policy direction moving forward and would like direct feedback on perimeter plantings in the rear yards of properties. He stated that it is Staff's opinion that it should be a stage one improvement and should be the developer's responsibility to install the trees. He is seeking feedback from the Board on Staff's recommendation that excluding the two front yard trees, the remainder of the plantings be the responsibility of the developer as a stage one improvement. He is seeking a motion to recommend that the landscaping and tree preservation plans are acceptable.

Board Member Lewis would like to get additional feedback on the recommendation. He would like to take a look additional plantings at the perimeter to avoid it being mowed grass and to make sure that these plantings are part of the original plan.

City Planner Anderson stated that Staff is open to additional plantings around the perimeter. He stated that the City's engineering staff would have to determine that the plantings would not cause any additional maintenance issues.

Board Member Lewis stated that his intention is not to interfere, but to enhance the area.

Motion by Board Member Valentine and seconded by Board Member Hiatt to recommend Option 1; to include Staff's recommendation that excluding the two front yard trees, the remainder of the plantings be the responsibility of the developer as a stage one improvement; and to explore the potential for additional plantings around the rim or perimeter of the area between Block One Harvest Estates and Block One Harvest Estates Second Addition.

City Council Liaison LeTourneau suggested adding the recommendation that the plantings be the responsibility of the developer in the phase one improvement clause also.

Board Member Valentine accepted that as a friendly amendment.

Motion carried. Voting Yes: Chairperson Stodola, Board Member Valentine, Hiatt, Bernard, and Lewis. Voting No: None. Absent: Board Member Bentz.