Meeting Summary

April 11, 2007
City Hall South, Winston-Salem, NC

DRAFT (Do not circulate)  APPROVED (For general distribution)
Draft Date:  5/02/07  Approval Date:  05/02/07

Handouts Provided
1. Winston-Salem / Forsyth County Tree Ordinance Committee Discussion Agenda, 3/21/07
2. Winston-Salem / Forsyth County Tree Ordinance Committee Substantive and Procedural Interests (previously handed out Nov. 2006)

Attendance
Glenn Cobb  Winston-Salem Regional Association of Realtors
Melynda Dunigan  Winston-Salem Neighborhood Alliance
Fred Holbrook  Winston-Salem/Forsyth County Inspections Division
Keith Huff  Winston-Salem Stormwater
Glynis Jordan  City-County Planning Board
Evie Katsoudas  Winston-Salem Chamber of Commerce
Paul McGill  McGill Realty
James Mitchell  City of Winston-Salem, Vegetation Management
Jamie Moore  Community Appearance Commission
Elizabeth O’Meara  Sierra Club
Bob Ragland  Forsyth County Environmental Affairs

Alternates
Nancy Gould  Winston-Salem Homebuilders Association
Kaila Hires  Winston-Salem Neighborhood Alliance
Robert Vorsteg  Winston-Salem Neighborhood Alliance
Steve Lyda  Forsyth County Environmental Affairs

Others
Malcolm Brown  Treasure Tree Committee
??  Centex Homes

Meeting Agenda
1. Agenda review; approval of meeting summary, information sharing
2. Review and discuss development sites ordinance evaluation
3. Review, evaluate, and prioritize options under Objective #2
4. Next steps and agenda for next meeting

Actions and Future Tasks

Tasks Remaining from previous meetings:
1. Report from Keith Huff on stormwater impact of existing ordinances

New Actions & Tasks
1. Reviewed two ongoing development sites to evaluate how proposed tree conservation options and existing landscape and buffer yard ordinances affect tree conservation at each site.
I. Introductions, Agenda Review, Information Sharing

A. The facilitator, Steve Smutko, welcomed the committee members and reviewed the day’s agenda.

B. The committee approved the March 21, 2007 meeting summary with no changes.

II. Review Development Plans for Ordinance Evaluation

A. Mark Geda, Director of Design for Stimmel Associates, PA, presented plans for a mixed residential development at Romera Drive. Mr. Geda described the site design and site plan review process generally, covering aspects of location, density, and physical, market, and regulatory constraints. He described in detail the site design plan and grading plan for the Romera Drive development.

B. During Mr. Geda’s presentation, the committee asked questions related to the specifics of the planned development, the potential for conserving trees on the site, replanting trees, buffer protection and other related issues.

C. John Beeson, a site design engineer presented site plans for residential site at Jonestown and McGregor known at the Beacham Place. Mr. Beeson described the site design with respect to the physical constraints presented at the site weighed against the developer’s needs for a financial return.

D. Much of Mr. Beeson’s presentation focused on how the site was designed to reduce stormwater runoff.

III. Review and Evaluate Options Under Objective #2: Conserve Trees to Prevent (Reduce) Loss or Depletion

A. Smutko asked the committee members to review and prioritize their own interests prior to any discussion about evaluating proposed options. Each member should evaluate options with respect to how well the option satisfies his or her interests and meets the primary objective of conserving trees.

B. Because the meeting had been devoted mostly to site plan review and discussion, Smutko gave the committee instructions on how to evaluate the options between meetings. Smutko stated that he would send out an evaluation worksheet via email and requested that the worksheet be completed and returned by April 25. He will present the results at the May 2 meeting.

C. Options can be evaluated on three basic criteria:

1. Legal feasibility: Eliminate those options that will be difficult or impossible to implement because they are unconstitutional or requires new legislation;

2. Interest satisfaction: how well the option meets your interests;

3. Effectiveness: how well the option meets the objective

IV. Next Steps

A. The committee will review and discuss the results of the option evaluation exercise at the May 2 meeting.

Meeting was adjourned at 6:15 p.m.