

LAND DEVELOPMENT REGULATION ADVISORY BOARD (LDRAB) LANDSCAPE SUB-COMMITTEE SUMMARY

MARCH 19, 2014 MINUTES
2300 NORTH JOG ROAD, CONFERENCE ROOM VC-2E-12 – 2ND FLOOR
10:00 AM – 11:30 AM

A. CALL TO ORDER 1:05PM

1. Introduction of Members, Staff and Interested Parties

Subcommittee Members: Michael Zimmerman

Industry/public: Leo Urban

County Staff: Jon Powers, Barbara Pinkston, Rodney Swonger, George Galle, Elliott

O'Roark

2. Additions, Substitutions and Deletions to Agenda:

There were no additions, substitutions or deletions to the agenda.

B. REVIEW SUMMARY FROM 2-19-2014 SUBCOMMITTEE MEETING (EXHIBIT A)

Michael was happy with the result of the bamboo case.

Barbara briefly reviewed PPM ZO-O-058 on recreational parcel buffers within Planned Unit Developments (PDDs).

C. Presentation Of 2014-01 Round of ULDC AMENDMENTS

- 1. Barbara begins by reviewing ULDC amendments in Article 7, Chapter C, inserting the term meandering into Section 1, U/S Tier.
 - -Mike asked about definition of meandering and if it will be placed in the Code. Barbara explained that only ULDC related terms are defined in article one, and all terms used as part of the regular English language unless otherwise defined in article one will maintained the standard English definitions found in Webster's dictionary.
- 2. Michael wants to talk about maximum tree height with canopy trees. He was concerned about the message we are sending out to people about trees to select with regard to pine trees, and distinguishing between planting height and growth heights, including verbiage in the code promoting a greater variety.
 - Rodney and George explained that minimum tree height is clearly represented in the Code, with the minimum residential planting height as 8 feet for pines and 12 feet for canopy trees. They also explained that the Code places an emphasis on placing the right trees in the right place.
- 3. A discussion took place concerning the caliber of trees, and it was agreed that placing limitations on the caliber of trees as well as height would cause too many restrictions.

- 4. Mike suggested changing height restrictions maximum height at maturity, but Jon explained that this would cause difficulties when it came to reviewing landscape plans. Leo agreed and suggested staying with the 12 foot rule.
- 5. Barbara suggested adding a footnote next to plant standards referring them an area promoting flexibility for certain trees and everyone agreed this was a good idea.
- 6. Number 9 in the notes section of table 7.C.3: the term single family is to be inserted reading, "calculations for single family residential lots".
- 7. Chapter D General Standards: Discussion on removing the second sentence on lines 7 and 8 took place. It was decided to remove the sentence discerning between container grown or root pruned against others types of trees as most likely all trees will be one of the two.
- 8. Chapter D Pines: Michael explained that he would like pines to not have such a focus in the Code or at least leave the terminology as just pine, removing the word slash. It is agreed to remove the word slash.
 - -Michael feels the pines do not survive and other options should be much more prominent as suggestions for landscaping.
 - -It was explained that the only reason why pines are listed in the Code is because there were many conditions of approval that had to be written about them and so verbiage was included in the Code.
 - -It was agreed that an asterisk (*) would be placed next to this item of discussion and revisited later.
- 9. Section Three Shrubs and Hedges: Barbara reviewed changes to the text.
 - -Rodney asked about four foot requirement for hedges.
 - -Barbara explained that this is to be consistent with current fence height and setback requirements already in the Code.
- 10. Barbara informed participants that after cleaning up the document, they will receive a copy of the current amendments based on the meeting discussion.

D. DISCUSSION OF MEETING DATES FOR 2014

Zoning staff will be sending out future meeting dates and times.

E. DISCUSSION OF TOPICS FOR 2014

No discussion took place.

F. ADJOURN

The meeting adjourned at 11:05 a.m.