



Huntersville Planning Board
Tree/Canopy Save Subcommittee

Minutes

July 25, 2019

5:00 p.m. – 6:30 p.m.

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

Attendance: Commissioner Boone, Planning Board Members: Susan Thomas, Frank Gammon, Jennifer Davis, Catherine Graffy, Staff Members: Brad Priest, Meredith Nesbitt

- A. Comments from Audience (5 minutes per person allocation)
- Kim Aichele (9511 Cennetta Circle):
Expressed a desire to see tree loss quantified for each development and that data reviewed quarterly or annually as a whole. Quoted a news report that there is +/- 36 million trees lost in cities in the US each year.
- B. Approval of Minutes
- D. Boone motioned to approve the minutes from the July 10, 2019 meeting. J Davis seconded the motion. Motion passes – minutes approved.
- C. Other Business
- Committee invited Jay Henson to speak and provide feedback from the development community standpoint on current tree save requirements, proposed changes, etc. Mr. Henson began by introducing himself. Committee members asked specific questions leading into general discussion summarized below:
 - Would changing the definition of specimen tree from 24" to 18" cause concern? What are your opinions on defining "non-developable land" and not allowing trees within this area to count towards tree preservation requirement?
 1. Comments from Mr. Henson: These would be very site-specific changes. It could make a big difference on some sites and little difference on others. Mr. Henson to review files for recent projects done in Huntersville and evaluate some of the impacts these variables would have on those sites. Mr. Henson recommended adding flexibility into the tree save ordinance; this flexibility is hard to define. Committee re-reviewed the calculations and data provided by staff during the July 10 meeting. Mr. Henson expressed that 100% caliper mitigation with 18" specimen trees would be a significant change. Mr. Henson also explained that the size of the site also has a role in site planning. On large sites, you have more room to move elements around to meet requirements. On smaller sites, every little bit of space counts. You have to meet the clients demands for the project (building size, parking needs, etc.) while providing tree save and stormwater

features.

2. Committee discussed creating tree preservation requirements based on size of the site. Example: if site is more than 100 acres 50% tree preservation is required. If the site is 10 acres, 30% of tree preservation is required.
 3. Committee asked Mr. Henson how tree save requirements are planned for during the design process. If a design is going below the minimum, requirements of the Ordinance do design firms advocate for re-designs. Mr. Henson explained that options are presented to the client. It is ultimately up to the client to decide if they wish to seek mitigation or would like to rework the plans. Design firms provide all options for clients and help them work through Ordinance requirements but it is the developers decision.
- Define next steps to prepare subcommittee proposal
 - Discuss meeting schedule and ability to complete recommendation
 1. Decide whether or not to reschedule the cancelled meeting – two additional meetings were scheduled. Committee will meet on August 22 @ 5:00 pm and September 12 @ 5:00pm. Both meetings will be held in the Large Conference Room at Town Center (105 Gilead Road).
 2. D. Boone to invite Dave Cambell to attend the next meet. Mr. Cambell is working with the Town of Davidson on tree preservation.
 3. F. Gammon to continue to look at Article 7 and provide red-lines and draft proposed language defining and clarifying existing Ordinance language.

D. Adjourn: Meeting adjourned at 6:25pm