



Huntersville Planning Board
Tree/Canopy Save Subcommittee
Minutes

July 10, 2019

5:30 p.m. – 7:00 p.m.

Large Conference Room
Town Center – 3rd Floor
105 Gilead Road, Huntersville

Subcommittee Members: Frank Gammon, Jennifer Davis, Catherine Graffy, Dan Boone

Staff Members: Brad Priest, Meredith Nesbitt

- A. Comments from Audience (5 minutes per person allocation): None
- B. Approval of Minutes: Members voted to approve the minutes from the June 12 meeting.
- C. Other Business
1. Review and discuss staff examples of variables that may positively impact tree and canopy save, if modified.
 - i. Brad Priest presented two commercial site plan examples with the variables that were discussed at the last meeting.
 1. 18" caliper specimen trees
 2. 100% caliper mitigation
 3. Tree Preservation within developable area (removed buffers, floodplains, etc.)
 - ii. Feedback from subcommittee members for the layout of the data provided by staff:
 1. Add 24" Caliper to the Existing Ordinance box for clarification.
 2. Move 100% Caliper Mitigation row under the row for existing ordinance because the specimen trees used are based on the existing definition (24").
 - iii. Committee asked to see what the calculation of 100% mitigation would be if using 18" specimen tree scenario.
 - iv. Staff take aways from calculating the information above:
 1. Qualifying 18" DBH as specimen trees does not increase tree preservation for all sites. Some sites have a large amount of 18" trees and others do not. This variable will only have an impact on sites with a large number of 18" trees. In finding the two commercial sites to use as an example staff found several sites that had no 18" trees and there would be no change shown.
 2. Staff recommends 100% caliper mitigation as the variable to change (existing Ordinance requires 30% specimen tree caliper be mitigated).
 - v. Subcommittee discussed the variables at length. Discussion included:
 1. Changing the definition of specimen tree to 12" DBH
 2. New term for young maturing tree – 12" DBH is small for a large maturing tree. The transition from 24" to 12" is a big leap. Young maturing tree offered as an

alternative. Would require a definition and add a their variable to the definition of specimen tree (small maturing, young maturing, and large maturing).

3. Increasing Tree Preservation Requirements (table in Article 7.4)
4. Changing references in the Tree Preservation table from “site area” to “developable land”. This would require a definition of developable land.
5. Breaking up the requirement for caliper mitigation to require 30% of the large maturing trees be mitigated and 30% of the small maturing trees be mitigated.
6. Staff added changing the definition of specimen tree or restricting tree preservation to only developable land at the root is seeking to increase tree preservation as a whole. This goal could be achieved by increasing the tree preservation requirements. Reminding the committee to keep in mind an overly complicated tree preservation ordinance could be difficult to interpret and administer. The subcommittee was formed and tasked to review tree preservation mitigation.

2. Define next steps to prepare subcommittee proposal

- i. Continue to confirm that recommendation supports critical issues with both tree and canopy save. Subcommittee agreed on the following action/focus items:
 1. Creating a review process/criteria for mitigation
 2. Increasing tree preservation requirements (table in Article 7.4)
 3. Modify specimen tree definition from 24” to 12”
 4. 100% Caliper required mitigation
 5. Changing “site area” to “developable area” and understanding the effects
 6. Dan Boone to contact Jay Henson to the next subcommittee meeting for some feedback from the development community.
- ii. Discuss meeting schedule and ability to complete recommendation
 1. Decide whether or not to reschedule the cancelled meeting – no decision was made to schedule additional meetings.

D. Adjourn – 6:50pm

Meeting Schedule

Upcoming Meetings	
July	Thursday, July 25 5:00 pm