

**BREVARD COUNTY LANDSCAPING, LAND CLEARING
AND TREE PROTECTION TASK FORCE SUBCOMMITTEE MEETING
TO TEST THE LATEST ARTICLE DRAFT AGAINST ACTUAL PROJECTS**

February 10, 2006 Meeting Minutes DRAFT

Task Force Members Present

Kathleen Burson-Alternate Representative, Florida Native Plant Society
Susan Hall-Alternate Representative, American Society of Landscape Architects
Rochelle Lawandales-Primary Representative, Commission District 2
Brad Smith-Primary Representative, American Society of Landscape Architects

County Staff Present

Sherry Williams-Special Projects Coordinator, NRMO
Dan VanGenechten, NRMO Environmental Specialist
Liz McDuffee-Secretary I, NRMO

Signed-in Citizens

None

Call to Order

The subcommittee meeting came to order at 12:55 pm at Brad Smith Associates, Inc., 2090 W. Eau Gallie Blvd., Suite B, Melbourne, FL. The purpose of the meeting was to test the draft Article against actual projects.

Copies of the latest Article draft (which were mailed out earlier in the week to all Task Force members) were distributed. Sherry Williams stated that Amanda Elmore tested the revised draft against several projects and the results were summarized in an email from Amanda, dated 2/10/2006. Sherry distributed hard copies of this email to the subcommittee. Brad Smith also distributed hard copies of the email from Amanda to him dated 2/9/06 that made recommendations with regard to deleting or reclassifying some species in the appendices. In keeping with the Sunshine Law, Brad did not distribute or discuss this email before the subcommittee's meeting.

The subcommittee reviewed Amanda Elmore's email regarding species reclassifications and deletions and felt that in general, NRMO was on the right track. The subcommittee agreed with Amanda's suggestion to delete the species listed under item 3 from the appendix. (It was noted that while these plants would not be recommended, they could still be planted.) The subcommittee suggested that item #5, "Little Gem" Magnolia, be changed from a small species to a medium species. The subcommittee would like the task force to review and discuss Amanda's memo at the 2/13/06 meeting.

Amanda Elmore's testing summary memo was then discussed. Amanda's original email had a Landscape Requirement Comparison Chart showing current code and proposed code requirements for a typical residential site, for the Target site at Viera and for Aurora Oaks, a residential subdivision. An updated chart was distributed that also included Magnolia Bay, a multifamily site, and attendees were asked to replace the original chart with the updated chart. (The chart was updated again after the meeting and the latest

chart is attached to these minutes. A copy was also distributed at the 2/13/06 LLTP meeting.) Then the subcommittee discussed Amanda's comments. Brad stated that it appeared that Amanda found that the proposed code greatly reduced planting requirements. He suggested that the subcommittee investigate why this occurred. After some discussion and a speaker-phone call to Amanda Elmore, the subcommittee determined that Amanda's calculations did not consider item g. on page 13 of the latest draft: "Canopy coverage achieved through the use of planted trees shall be credited at 25% of the projected canopy at maturity of the species." The memo and chart were set aside and the subcommittee began recalculating some of the NRMO projects that were listed on the chart.

In order to prevent future miscalculations by readers of the Article, the subcommittee members recommended that another column be added to Appendix C showing the required square footage of canopy.

During the meeting, the subcommittee discussed the Palm Casual site where all the trees were removed because they were located in the center of the building site. Brad Smith suggested that the task force might want to consider an alternative to calculating canopy for small sites (5 acres or less) that are in this situation. He suggested multiplying the number of trees removed by some factor. The group was in favor of this. Ms. Burson suggested that the building or improvements could be re-configured. While that might work for some sites, it was decided that for this site, the trees were in the middle and the buildings could not be done differently. The subcommittee also discussed that on tight sites, like Palm Casual, trees are often placed in "leftover" areas where they will not be viable. In this case, trees were planted under power lines and on slopes of retention swales. Under the new code, there is more flexibility (using fewer trees at proper locations is preferable to cramming all of the required trees into undesirable locations). Also, the new code has provision for paying into a tree fund.

The following projects were brought to the meeting by the attendees for possible testing purposes:

- NRMO: Palm Casual Furniture store, Anchorage Condominiums (An additional four sites were tested by NRMO and included in a Landscape Requirement Comparison Chart that was distributed to the subcommittee.)
- Susan Hall: ACN (a small commercial project), Eagle Crest
- Brad Smith: a Wickham Road tree survey site, Port St. John Clinic, Parrish Medical Office

Formula Development

Brad Smith developed the following formula that the subcommittee used to test the proposed code:

The area of a tree equals πr^2 .

1 acre equals 43,560 sq. feet.

The Total Planted Canopy allowance = Total square feet of buildable acreage multiplied by the total percentage of planted canopy allowed for that specific type of buildable area

per the chart on pages 12 and 13, Section 62-3639 (for example, a multifamily, residential site is allowed 10% of the buildable area to be canopied with planted trees).

Since no more than 50% of the planted trees may be of any one species, the committee selected Live Oaks and Maples to use in its testing. **A** divided by 2 equals **B** in the formula below.

A tree's area multiplied by 25% (per item g., Section 62-3639, Canopy and Tree Preservation Performance Standards section on page 13 of the latest draft) equals the required canopy area per planted tree.

The area of a Live Oak with a 45-foot radius = 6359 sq. ft.
6359 sq. ft. x 25% = 1590 sq. ft. required canopy per tree

The area of a Maple with a 15-foot radius = 707 sq. ft.
707 sq. ft. x 25% = 177 sq. ft. required canopy per tree

B divided by C1 or C2 = number of trees that must be planted for that species

Testing the Proposed Code

Commercial, Target Viera

18.25 buildable acreage

A = Planted canopy allowed = 79,497 sq. ft (10% of 18.25 acres)

B = Divide 79,497 by two since, for testing purposes, 50% will be planted in Live Oaks and 50% will be planted in Maple.

C1 = Total Live Oak planted canopy requirement = 39,749 sq. ft. divided by 1590 (sq. ft. required canopy per tree) = 25 trees

C2 = Total Maple planted canopy requirement = 39,749 sq. ft. divided by 177 = 225 trees

Under the proposed code, a total of 250 trees (**C1** + **C2**) would be required to be planted. Under the current code (not counting the heat islands) 360 trees were required to be planted.

The subcommittee also tested the proposed code against the following projects:

- *Magnolia Bay*
- *Port St. John Medical Center*
- *Casual Palm*
- *Eagle Crest*
- *Wickham Tree Survey Site*

Subcommittee's Conclusion

The subcommittee could find no "fatal flaws" in the proposed code. Brad Smith, Rochelle Lawandales, Susan Hall and Kathleen Burson concluded that the proposed code would result in larger, more diverse and better quality of planted material. The visual impact will be bigger because trees will be larger at the time of planting. (The proposed

code requires the planting of larger trees.) It will also provide more flexibility and more mechanisms to address different situations. It may be more costly for developers; however, the developer can save planting costs by preserving more canopy. The proposed code will also provide a new revenue stream that will benefit preserved lands. Susan Hall was selected to present the findings to the task force at the 2/13/06 meeting.

The subcommittee discussed that sites currently under review could continue the process to get permitted. Then if no engineering plans are changed, the developer can apply for an amended permit under the new code.

Citizen's Comments

There were no citizen's comments.

Next meeting

The next scheduled LLTP task force meeting will be held on Monday, February 13th from 1 PM to 5 PM at the Agriculture Center

Please check the Natural Resources web site at http://natres.brevardcounty.us/landscaping_meetings.cfm to review material before the next meeting.

Please let staff know if you will be unable to attend any scheduled task force meeting. If a quorum of eight members is not present for the meeting, then no official business can be conducted. Staff will continue to make reminder calls to task force members the day before meetings.

The subcommittee meeting was adjourned at 4:00 PM.