

Mayor Patrick L. McCrory

Michael D. Barnes
Nancy Carter
Warren Cooksey
Andy Dulin
Anthony Foxx

Mayor Pro Tem Susan Burgess

Patsy Kinsey
John W. Lassiter
James Mitchell, Jr.
Edwin B. Peacock III
Warren F. Turner

CITY COUNCIL WORKSHOP

Monday, June 2, 2008

Room 267

- | | |
|------------------|---|
| 5:00 p.m. | Dinner |
| 5:15 p.m. | Short Session Legislative Update |
| 5:45 p.m. | Community Safety: Rental Property Study Update |
| 6:15 p.m. | Economic Development: Council Priority: Business Corridor Implementation |
| 6:40 p.m. | Environment: Proposed Tree Ordinance Revisions |
| 7:30 p.m. | Citizens' Forum
Room 267 |

COUNCIL WORKSHOP AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY

TOPIC: Short Session Legislative Update

COUNCIL FOCUS AREA: All

RESOURCES: Boyd Cauble

KEY POINTS:

- City staff will provide an update on the status of the City's legislative agenda and other key issues under discussion by the NC General Assembly.
- Staff will also provide information about Town Hall Day, scheduled for Wednesday, June 4, in Raleigh.

COUNCIL DECISION OR DIRECTION REQUESTED:

This presentation is for information only.

ATTACHMENTS:

None.

COUNCIL WORKSHOP AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY

TOPIC: Rental Property Study Update

COUNCIL FOCUS AREA: Community Safety

RESOURCES: Deputy Chief Ken Miller, CMPD

KEY POINTS:

- CMPD officers have devoted considerable time to addressing crime and disorder issues in rental properties.
- Officers currently work closely with Code Enforcement and Fire Inspectors to address housing standards that foster crime and disorder.
- Both literature and CMPD experience support the idea that the management practices of residential rental property owners represent the single greatest influence on controlling crime and disorder on them. Some of these practices include:
 - Tenant applicant screening, including criminal and credit checks.
 - Creating and applying consistent screening thresholds.
 - Creation and consistent enforcement of rules for behavior.
 - Conducting regular inspections of rental units to address maintenance and tenant compliance problems.
 - Promoting adequate night lighting and other physical security provisions.
- At the March 3rd Council Workshop, CMPD presented findings indicating a disproportionate amount of crime on rental property, particularly single family housing and apartments. Council requested a presentation update to include:
 - The addition of Charlotte Housing Authority managed properties along with the other categories of residential property studied.
 - A brief summary of other city experiences with rental property ordinances.
- CMPD recommends development of a rental property ordinance for Charlotte.

OPTIONS:

- Continue existing police initiatives at rental properties, requiring voluntary compliance of owners and managers.
- Enact an ordinance that places some regulations on rental property.

COUNCIL DECISION OR DIRECTION REQUESTED:

Request that development of a rental property ordinance be referred to the Community Safety Committee.

ATTACHMENTS:

None.

COUNCIL WORKSHOP AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY

TOPIC: Council Priority: Business Corridor Implementation

COUNCIL FOCUS AREA: Economic Development

RESOURCES: Tom Flynn

KEY POINTS:

- On March 24, 2008, City Council adopted implementation of the Business Corridor Strategic Plan as a high priority.
- Progress on key strategic actions to date include:
 - Optioned Belk property at Eastland and in discussions with property owners and lender
 - Greenway Business Park (Belvedere) underway
 - North Tryon Redevelopment Plan completed and referred to Economic Development & Planning Committee
 - Independence Phase II Study underway
 - Staff work underway on Non-residential Building Code
 - Business Corridor Symposium scheduled for June 12
- The City Manager's Recommended CIP includes capital resources to support this high Council priority
 - \$269 million in the five priority corridors over five years
 - \$608 million in the Business Corridor geography over five years

COUNCIL DECISION OR DIRECTION REQUESTED:

This is for information only.

ATTACHMENTS:

Preliminary FY09-13 CIP Funding for Distressed Business Corridors

**PRELIMINARY FY2009-2013 Capital Investment Plan
Distressed Priority Corridors (five targeted business corridors) ***

PROGRAM BY REVENUE SOURCE	FY2009	FY2010	FY2011	FY2012	FY2013	TOTAL
Eastland Infrastructure	\$8,400,000	\$7,600,000				\$16,000,000
Sidewalk Program	400,000	400,000	400,000	400,000		1,600,000
NE Corridor: Access Improvements	6,000,000					6,000,000
NE Corridor: Sugar Creek Alignment	1,000,000		24,300,000			25,300,000
Business Corridors/Pedscape Infrastructure	1,150,000	1,150,000	1,150,000	1,150,000		4,600,000
Reserve for ED Initiatives			\$20.0 million in debt capacity reserved			20,000,000
Total Bonds	\$16,950,000	\$9,150,000	\$25,850,000	\$1,550,000		\$73,500,000
Business Grant Program (DARF)	200,000	200,000	200,000	200,000	200,000	1,000,000
Business Corridor Revitalization Strategy	6,100,000	2,000,000	2,000,000	2,000,000	2,000,000	14,100,000
Synthetic Tax Increment Financing **	356,000	356,000	356,000	356,000	356,000	1,780,000
Landscape Maintenance and Renovation	250,000	250,000	250,000	250,000	250,000	1,250,000
Police Metro Station (Beatties Ford Road)	820,000					820,000
Police Eastland Station Upfit	1,000,000					1,000,000
Total Pay-As-You-Go	\$8,726,000	\$2,806,000	\$2,806,000	\$2,806,000	\$2,806,000	\$19,950,000
Eastland Fire Station	700,000	6,000,000				6,700,000
Total Certificates of Participation	\$700,000	\$6,000,000				\$6,700,000
Total General Government Funding	\$26,376,000	\$17,956,000	\$28,656,000	\$4,356,000	\$2,806,000	\$100,150,000
CATS: Northeast Corridor ***	4,341,000	7,993,000	20,489,000	51,131,000	71,167,000	155,121,000
West Corridor Transit Improvements	1,135,000					1,135,000
Total Federal, State, and CATS	\$5,476,000	\$7,993,000	\$20,489,000	\$51,131,000	\$71,167,000	\$156,256,000
Water and Sewer NE Transit Corridor	500,000	500,000				1,000,000
Water Main: W.T. Harris/Albemarle Road		3,880,000				3,880,000
Total Water and Sewer	\$500,000	\$4,380,000				\$4,880,000
Storm Water Projects	993,000	2,072,000	963,000	950,000	3,600,000	8,578,000
Total Storm Water	\$993,000	\$2,072,000	\$963,000	\$950,000	\$3,600,000	\$8,578,000
Total Enterprise Operations	\$6,969,000	\$14,445,000	\$21,452,000	\$52,081,000	\$74,767,000	\$169,714,000
Total General and Enterprise Programs	\$33,345,000	\$32,401,000	\$50,108,000	\$56,437,000	\$77,573,000	\$269,864,000

Other Available Funding

- DARF (Development and Revitalization Fund included in Business Grant Program) account balance of \$2.1 million
- ED Revolving Loan Fund account balance of \$2.7 million
- Smart Growth Fund account balance of \$2.8 million
- Storm Water Economic Development account balance of \$2.7 million

Notes

- * Business Corridors are as follows: Eastland Mall area, North Tryon, Beatties Ford Road, Rozzelles Ferry Road, Wilkinson Blvd./Morehead/Freedom.
- ** Also includes General and Municipal Debt Fund payments.
- *** Total project expenditures for the Northeast Corridor within the Preliminary FY2009-2013 CIP timeframe is \$464 million.

**PRELIMINARY FY2009-2013 Capital Investment Plan
Business Corridor Revitalization Geography (Business corridor geography) ***

PROGRAM BY REVENUE SOURCE	FY2009	FY2010	FY2011	FY2012	FY2013	TOTAL
Eastland Infrastructure	\$8,400,000	\$7,600,000				\$16,000,000
Double Oaks Redevelopment	6,000,000					6,000,000
Neighborhood Improvement Program	5,000,000	9,400,000	2,350,000		8,800,000	25,550,000
Sidewalk Program	1,300,000	1,300,000	1,300,000	1,300,000		5,200,000
Road Projects **	24,500,000	22,300,000	6,500,000	6,500,000		59,800,000
NE Corridor: Access Improvements	7,000,000					7,000,000
NE Corridor: Sugar Creek Alignment	1,000,000		24,300,000			25,300,000
Business Corridors/Pedscape Infrastructure	2,300,000	2,300,000	2,300,000	2,300,000		9,200,000
Reserve for ED Initiatives						20,000,000
Total Bonds	\$55,500,000	\$42,900,000	\$36,750,000	\$10,100,000	\$8,800,000	\$174,050,000
			\$20.0 million in debt capacity reserved			
Business Grant Program (DARF)	400,000	400,000	400,000	400,000	400,000	2,000,000
Business Corridor Revitalization Strategy	6,100,000	2,000,000	2,000,000	2,000,000	2,000,000	14,100,000
Synthetic Tax Increment Financing ***	356,000	405,250	962,690	1,366,090	1,030,200	4,120,230
Landscape Maintenance and Renovation	100,000	100,000	100,000	100,000	100,000	500,000
Police Metro Station (Beatties Ford Road)	820,000					820,000
Police Eastland Station Upfit	1,000,000					1,000,000
Total Pay-As-You-Go	\$8,776,000	\$2,905,250	\$3,462,690	\$3,866,090	\$3,530,200	\$22,540,230
Eastland Fire Station	700,000	6,000,000				6,700,000
Total Certificates of Participation	\$700,000	\$6,000,000				\$6,700,000
Total General Government Funding	\$64,976,000	\$51,805,250	\$40,212,690	\$13,966,090	\$12,330,200	\$203,290,230
CATS: Northeast Corridor ****	7,501,000	13,813,000	35,406,000	88,356,000	122,980,000	268,056,000
West Corridor Transit Improvements	1,782,000					1,782,000
Total Federal, State, and CATS	\$9,283,000	\$13,813,000	\$35,406,000	\$88,356,000	\$122,980,000	\$269,838,000
Water Projects	2,450,000	5,685,000	1,300,000	1,300,000	1,300,000	12,035,000
Sewer Projects	20,050,000	68,700,000	550,000	550,000	550,000	90,400,000
Total Water and Sewer	\$22,500,000	\$74,385,000	\$1,850,000	\$1,850,000	\$1,850,000	\$102,435,000
Storm Water Projects	3,273,000	12,606,000	6,013,000	1,150,000	10,000,000	33,042,000
Total Storm Water	\$3,273,000	\$12,606,000	\$6,013,000	\$1,150,000	\$10,000,000	\$33,042,000
Total Enterprise Operations	\$35,056,000	\$100,804,000	\$43,269,000	\$91,356,000	\$134,830,000	\$405,315,000
Total General and Enterprise Programs	\$100,032,000	\$152,609,250	\$83,481,690	\$105,322,090	\$147,160,200	\$608,605,230

Other Available Funding

- DARF (Development and Revitalization Fund included in Business Grant Program) account balance of \$2.1 million
- ED Revolving Loan Fund account balance of \$2.7 million
- Smart Growth Fund account balance of \$2.8 million
- Storm Water Economic Development account balance of \$2.7 million

Notes

- * Business Corridors are as follows: Eastland Mall area, North Tryon, Beatties Ford Road, Rozzelles Ferry Road, Wilkinson Blvd./Morehead/Freedom.
- ** Road projects include Fred D. Alexander, Statesville, and Beatties Ford.
- *** Also includes General and Municipal Debt Fund payments.
- **** Total project expenditures for the Northeast Corridor within the Preliminary FY2009-2013 CIP timeframe is \$464 million.

COUNCIL WORKSHOP AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY

TOPIC: Proposed Tree Ordinance Revisions

COUNCIL FOCUS AREA: Environment

RESOURCES: Laura Brewer
Jeb Blackwell

KEY POINTS:

- The Tree Ordinance was adopted in 1978, and has been revised several times.
- It currently has provisions for tree preservation and tree planting on both commercial and residential development.
- After the most recent revision, which added a single-family component to the ordinance, the Tree Advisory Commission requested staff look at revising the ordinance to model the commercial tree preservation after the single-family tree preservation requirements.
- Additional minor and technical changes were identified and included for review.
- A stakeholders group was formed in December 2005 to consider recommendations for revisions to the Tree Ordinance.
- Volunteers were solicited to cover the various groups affected by revisions including professionals and citizens. Members of the group are listed on page 8 of the attachment.
- The three major revisions being proposed are:
 - Require 15% of a commercial site be preserved as tree canopy
 - Increase the number of trees in parking lots
 - Require the removal of invasive species from areas being preserved as tree canopy
- The stakeholders group reached consensus on thirteen recommendations.
- The Tree Advisory Commission reviewed and approved the proposed revisions to the Tree Ordinance.

COUNCIL DECISION OR DIRECTION REQUESTED:

Council is requested to refer this item to the Environment Committee for review and recommendation.

ATTACHMENTS:

Summary report and detailed descriptions of proposed changes

Proposed Tree Ordinance Revisions 2008

The Tree Advisory Commission requested staff look at revising the Tree Ordinance to model the tree preservation requirements for commercial development after those required in single family development. A stakeholders group was formed to consider that and other recommended revisions to the Tree Ordinance. In all, eighteen recommendations were suggested and discussed over a 21 month period. Consensus was met on thirteen suggestions, and the other five were removed from further consideration.

Below are the suggested changes with detailed descriptions of what they mean, followed by the suggestions that were removed from consideration. Also included is the list of stakeholders that participated, and the current listing of Tree Advisory Commission members, who have reviewed and approved the suggested recommendations.

1. Require a minimum percentage of tree preservation area, similar to single family requirement.

Why? The tree ordinance only requires tree preservation of trees 8" diameter and larger that fall in the front setback on private property of a commercial property. Many factors impact these trees not only during construction, but years after the project is complete including installation of driveways, existing and future utilities, sidewalk location, and future road widenings. The increasing number of 'urban' zones, which only require a 14 ft setback, do not allow any significant tree preservation since 6 ft of that setback is also used for sidewalks.

It is proposed that all sites will be treated equally, by requiring 15% tree preservation on each site. A typical one acre commercial site would be required to preserve 6,534 square feet of the site in trees, or would have to plant additional trees if no trees exist. This gives the developer more flexibility as the tree save can also be used for swim buffers or post construction open space requirements. However, sites in transit station areas, mixed use centers, corridors, and redeveloped sites in wedges have options of how to meet this requirement since space can be limited. The wording that was agreed upon by the stakeholders is as follows:

A minimum of 15% of the overall site must be preserved as tree preservation area. If less than 15% of the site has existing trees, additional trees shall be planted at a rate of 36 trees per acre to meet the 15% requirement. If any portion of the required 15% tree preservation area is removed, trees will be re-planted at 150% of the area removed. The following exceptions apply:

UMUD & UMUD-O within the I-277 loop and any TOD, MUDD or UMUD zoned parcels in Station Areas, as designated in a Station Area Plan, are exempt. If no Station Area Plan has been adopted, the Station Area will be designated as the

property within ¼ mile of an existing or proposed station location identified on the approved Metro Transit Commission (MTC) System Plan.

In Transit Station Areas, or designated Mixed-Use Centers*, the developer can –

1. Replant 100% of the original tree save requirement (as opposed to 150%); or
2. Mitigate off-site¹, at the rate of 100% of the original tree save requirement; or
3. Provide payment in lieu², at the rate of 100% of the original tree save requirement; or
4. Install and maintain a living green roof on the project.

In some cases, items 3 and 4 could be used, in combination, to achieve the 15%. In all cases, any perimeter tree and parking area planting requirements must still be met.

In Corridors, outside of Station Areas, and existing commercial sites or redevelopment of commercial sites in Wedges, the developer can -

1. Replant 150% of the original tree save requirement; or
2. Mitigate off-site¹, at the rate of 150% of the original tree save requirement; or
3. Provide payment in lieu², at the rate of 150% of the original tree save requirement; or
4. Install and maintain a living green roof on the project.

In some cases, items 3 and 4 could be used, in combination, to achieve the requirement. In all cases, any perimeter tree and parking area planting requirements must still be met.

* Designated Mixed-Use Centers are those shown on the Centers and Corridors map as part of the Transportation Action Plan (adopted in 2006), or any adopted updates to this map.

- * ¹ Off-site mitigation. The developer will purchase an equal amount of land which has existing trees and convey that property to Charlotte-Mecklenburg Park and Recreation if it is contiguous to an existing or proposed greenway, or to a land conservation organization
- * ² Payment in lieu. The developer will contribute to a Tree Preservation Fund an amount equal to 15% or 22.5% of their property at the average cost of land based on current land values across the City of Charlotte

2. Increase the number of trees in parking lots.

Why? Shade from trees reduces the temperature of pavement, and associated volatile organic compounds from cars. Shade has also been proven to help pavement last longer requiring less frequent resurfacing. The current ordinance

requires every parking space be within 60 ft of a tree which means trees are approximately 120 ft apart and will never fully shade the lots. The wording that was agreed upon by the stakeholders is as follows:

All parking spaces must be within 40 feet of a tree unless the parking lot has continuous islands running the length of the parking lot with minimum 8 feet width; then the requirement will increase to 60 feet.

3. Set spacing requirement for parking lot trees for tractor-trailers and busses.

Why? Tractor-trailers and busses have difficulty maneuvering around tree islands and the Ordinance requirement for them to be within 60 ft of a tree/island doesn't work well. Staff had been allowing 120 foot spacing to reduce the number of trees and islands, but need to specifically address these types of parking. The wording that was agreed upon by the stakeholders is as follows:

Bus and tractor-trailer lots will be required to plant trees 40 feet apart around the perimeter of the parking lot in a minimum 10 foot wide planting strip. If there is parking on the perimeter of the bus and tractor-trailer lots, bollards or wheel stops are required.

4. Require the removal of invasive species from areas being used for tree preservation or tree save areas in both commercial sites and single family subdivisions

Why? Certain invasive plant species are detrimental to trees because they grow over the entire tree and can eventually kill the tree. The wording that was agreed upon by the stakeholders is as follows:

Quality natural areas, free of invasives, should be used for tree preservation and tree save whenever possible. If an area proposed for tree preservation or tree save contains invasive species* at the time of such proposal, such species must be removed prior to issuance of the final Certificate of Occupancy for commercial and multi-family properties or at final plat approval for sub-divisions. Invasive species are considered removed if they are no longer living in the tree canopy. Subsequent property owners are required to maintain this condition for compliance with the ordinance.

Definition section to read:

Invasive species are:

English Ivy - *Hedera helix*

Chinese Wisteria - *Wisteria sinensis*

Japanese Wisteria - *Wisteria floribunda*

Japanese Honeysuckle - *Lonicera japonica*

Kudzu - *Pueraria Montana*

5. Set specific distances between tree save and utilities

Why? While utilities have specific widths for their easements, they sometimes go outside that area to remove vegetation that could potentially cause problems. Additional area is needed to ensure trees will not be removed that were counted towards tree save requirements. The wording that was agreed upon by the stakeholders is as follows:

Tree Save areas may not be located within a utility right of way, a construction easement, within 50 ft of the centerline of any overhead electrical transmission line, or within 20 ft of the centerline of any overhead electrical distribution line.

6. Require a minimum width of 30 feet for tree save area if site is well wooded.

Why? There are no minimum width requirements for tree save areas. When narrow slivers of trees are saved, often large trees within the area won't survive. The wording that was agreed upon by the stakeholders is as follows:

Any tree save area less than 30 feet must be marked by a surveyor prior to the first submittal of plans (including the marking of the property line). Trees that do not meet the tree save specifications will not be accepted.

7. Specify what can be done in tree save areas.

Why? The Ordinance does not specify what, if anything, can be done in a tree save area. Often times, these areas may contain vines, poison ivy, or dead trees that make the area undesirable to a neighborhood. Additionally, passive use of tree save areas is a benefit to a community and Home Owners Associations may want to install paths, etc for passive use. The wording that was agreed upon by the stakeholders is as follows:

In tree save areas, tree removal will only be allowed by approval of City staff. Invasive species and hazard trees can be removed without the City approval. Any alterations to the Tree Save area must be accomplished without mechanized equipment and made of organic, environmentally friendly materials, unless otherwise approved by City staff.

8. Require a minimum distance between tree save area and building envelope.

Why? A subdivision plan clearly shows where the building envelope is on the lot, but not what the actual footprint of the building will look like. If the footprint is equal to the building envelope there would not be room to construct the house if tree save area is allowed to abut the building envelope. The wording that was agreed upon by the stakeholders is as follows:

In rear yards, no tree save area shall be within 10 feet of the building envelope. For side yards, no tree save area shall be within 6 feet of the building envelope.

9. Clarify exact triggers for tree ordinance compliance on commercial property

Why? Staff has had a threshold for compliance so very minor changes or additions to sites wouldn't require compliance. While this has been published in the guidelines document, it was thought it should also be changed in the Ordinance for clarification. The wording that was agreed upon by the stakeholders is as follows:

Compliance to the Ordinance will be required for new development, additions to existing sites of 5% or 1000 square feet. If 5 or more parking spaces are added (with no building), only the new parking has to comply. Alterations to the facade of a building will mandate compliance with the ordinance if 10% of the façade is changed.

10. Add requirement that tree islands cannot accommodate site lighting. Where large maturing trees are planted in parking lots, lights must be outside the island and a specific distance from required trees.

Why? Parking spaces are required to be within a certain distance of a tree which means tree islands are scattered throughout a parking lot. When site lighting is later designed there are often conflicts between light poles and trees. Specifying a required distance will prevent conflicts in the future. The wording that was agreed upon by the stakeholders is as follows:

Site lighting must be a minimum 30 feet away from a tree. If pedestrian scale lighting is being used, the lighting and tree must be at least 15 feet apart unless approved by City staff.

11. Amend Section 21-124 Penalties to include fines and mitigation for destruction of tree save areas in single-family subdivisions.

Why? When the single family portion of the Ordinance was written, fines and penalties were not addressed. That section of the ordinance only refers to commercial property. The wording that was agreed upon by the stakeholders is as follows:

Fines for single family tree preservation violations will be same as those in commercial development. The ordinance will be amended to reference both. Sections 124 Penalties, 125 Injunctive Relief, and 126 Hearings and Appeals will reference commercial and residential portions of the Ordinance.

12. Require a variety of tree species based on number of trees required.

Why? Monocultures (large numbers of one tree species) are bad for overall tree health, but there is no authority within the Ordinance to require more diversity. A large population of one species is more susceptible to insect and disease infestation such as the fall canker worms attacking our stately oaks, or bacterial leaf scorch that destroyed hundreds of trees at a Southpark office complex. The wording that was agreed upon by the stakeholders is as follows:

A minimum of 35% of new trees must be native species, and sites with more than 20 trees required will have to install multiple species per the guidelines.

13. Amend Section 21-93 Tree Save Requirements for single-family development to clearly spell out the incentive limits as provided by the Planning Department.

Why? The incentive limits listed in section 21-93(f) are general and do not provide the details that designers need to submit complete plans. They have to refer to another document for the specifics. Planning department provided the following wording, which the stakeholders agreed upon inserting into the Ordinance for clarification:

Attachment #1 Incentive Limits for Residential Tree Ordinance

Reduced Yards

For single family residential lots requiring a Tree Save Area, setback requirements as specified in Section 12.805(3)(a), (b), (c) of the Zoning Ordinance are reduced as follows:

- Front setbacks can be reduced to a minimum of 15 feet for all lots except front loaded garages must maintain a minimum setback of 20 ft.
- Rear yards can be reduced to 30 feet on all internal lots. Rear yards forming the outer boundary of a project must conform to the minimum rear yard of subsection 9.205 (1)(g) for the zoning district in which the development is located.
- Internal side yards can be reduced to a minimum of 3 feet provided all fire code requirements are satisfied.

Front Setbacks	15'/20' for front loaded garages
Rear Yards	30' for interior lots
Side Yards	3' for interior lots

Density Bonus:

- Single-family development projects may be granted a density bonus provided the entire Tree Save Area is dedicated as common open space. Such dedication must be to a homeowners' association or a public or private agency that agrees to accept ownership and maintenance responsibilities for the space. The density bonus is calculated as follows:

The entire dedicated tree save area in acres multiplied by the maximum residential density number of the underlying zoning district.

Reduced Lot Sizes:

A development need not meet the minimum lot area and lot width requirements set forth in the Table 9.205 of the Zoning Ordinance if it complies with one of the following incentives:

- Site with more than 10%, and up to 25% of Tree Save Area or Areas in Common Open Space may apply the Cluster provisions for lot size and lot width of that zoning category.
- Sites with greater than 25% of Tree Save Area or Areas in Common Open Space may apply the Cluster provisions for lot size and lot width of the next lower zoning category.

	R-3	R-3 Cluster	R-4	R-4 Cluster	R-5	R-5 Cluster	R-6	R-6 Cluster
Min. Lot Area	10,000	8,000	8,000	6,000	6,000	4,500	4,500	3,500
Min. Lot Width	70'	60'	60'	50'	50'	40'	40'	40'

The following suggestions were removed either because consensus wasn't reached, or the item didn't fit in the Tree Ordinance (should be addressed elsewhere):

1. Require all parking lots to comply with the Ordinance by a certain date.
2. Allow mitigation banking.
3. Work with Planning/Zoning to require tree buffers rather than berms between properties. Zoning ordinance allows reduction of buffer width for installation of berms/fences.
4. Require replanting of tree save/tree preservation areas at a 1:1 ratio when permitted utility work is conducted in designated tree save areas.
5. Clarify where a 'transitional' setback has been designated – require tree preservation in existing and transitional setbacks, and any new tree planting in the transitional setback only.

Stakeholders

The following persons served on the stakeholder committee:

Chris Buchannan	Tree Advisory Commission
Tom Dorsey	Real estate appraiser/broker/general contractor
Lisa Hagood	Designer/engineer
Lee McLaren	Subdivision Steering Committee
Bob Miller	Architect
Tim Morgan	REBIC, Home Builders Assoc
Chatham Olive	Sierra Club
John Porter	Developer/Charlotte Apartment Assoc
Mary Stauble	Environmental
Henry Wallace	Utilities

City Staff for technical assistance and to ensure compliance with PCCO and Environmental GDP:

Laura Brewer	Sr. Urban Forestry Specialist
Tom Drake	Planning
Don McSween	City Arborist
Kam Merrell	Zoning
Tracy Newsome	CDOT
Nan Peterson	Land Development
Christa Rogers	Meck County Park and Rec
Shad Spencer	Planning
Urban Forestry Staff	

Current Tree Advisory Commission members

Chris Buchanan
Bill Clark
Judy Goda
Landrum Henderson
Craig Madans (chair)
Erin Oliverio
Dexter Snead (vice chair)
Martin Sondey
Dede Wilson
Carrie Winter