

## Village of Pinehurst

### Proposed Buffer Development Standards/Modifications Document

There are five (5) key areas where staff would like to reach Council consensus on potential changes to the buffer development standards. These are the same issues included in the March 17<sup>th</sup> staff memo that was part of the March 23<sup>rd</sup> work session agenda item. Please review the DRAFT ordinance (see email attachment) and each of the five issues described below where staff needs Council consensus and direction. After evaluating alternative options, please indicate with an “X” which option you personally prefer. **Submit your response to [Darryn Burich](#) no later than 5:00 pm on Monday, April 12<sup>th</sup>.** Staff will accumulate individual Council preferences and present the consolidated “votes” for Council to review and discuss in the April 13<sup>th</sup> work session.

<b>Issue No. 1: Tree Spacing/Grouping (Section 9.5.1.4 &amp; 9.14.6 C)</b>			
<b>Concerns Raised:</b> Adequate room for required plantings, impact on building footprint, and grading.			
<b>Staff Recommendation:</b> Option 2			
<b>Option</b>	<b>Pros</b>	<b>Cons</b>	<b>Indicate Preferred Option with an “X”</b>
<b>Option 1:</b> Leave Unchanged	More uniformity in buffer yards	Less design flexibility	
<b>Option 2:</b> Allow for grouping and spacing of newly planted trees	Increases design flexibility	Less “uniformity” for buffers	
<b>Option 3:</b> Increase the 35 foot linear foot maximum to allow “vistas” to be created.	Increases design flexibility	Less “uniformity” for buffers	
<b>Option 4:</b> No spacing requirements just plant required number of trees.	Increases design flexibility	Less “uniformity” for buffers	

<b>Issue No. 2: Linear street frontage ratio of 1/15 feet</b>			
<b>Concerns Raised:</b> Would result in too many trees on street frontage that would screen homes			
<b>Staff Recommendation:</b> Option 1			
<b>Option</b>	<b>Pros</b>	<b>Cons</b>	<b>Indicate Preferred Option with an “X”</b>
<b>Option 1:</b> Leave Unchanged	Maintains street tree lined corridors	Higher numbers for planted or preserved trees	
<b>Option 2:</b> Decrease Ratio	Less costly and flexibility to plant	Less trees along street frontages	
<b>Option 3:</b> Additional Driveway credit of 20 feet to reduce ratio	Less costly and flexibility to plant	Less overall number of street trees	

<b>Issue No. 3:</b> 50% of planted trees to be Longleaf Pines (Section 9.14.6-C2) <b>Concerns Raised:</b> Plant/tree selection is a personal choice and potential loss rate <b>Staff Recommendation:</b> Option 1			
Option	Pros	Cons	Indicate Preferred Option with an "X"
<b>Option 1:</b> Leave Unchanged	More Longleaf Pines in the community	Less design flexibility, higher costs, and subject to loss from disease.	
<b>Option 2:</b> Apply to front and street side yards only	More pines along streets	Less pines in the community	
<b>Option 3:</b> Allow any tree listed on Appendix F of PDO	More design flexibility	Less pines in the community	

<b>Issue No. 4:</b> Tree survey requirements for clearing and grading applications (Section 9.5.1.3) <b>Concerns Raised:</b> Cost of surveys and constrains who can document compliance <b>Staff Recommendation:</b> Option 2			
Option	Pros	Cons	Indicate Preferred Option with an "X"
<b>Option 1:</b> Leave Unchanged (require a tree survey)	More precise inventory of conditions for future design	More costly and constrains who can document compliance with standards to a licensed surveyor	
<b>Option 2:</b> Eliminate tree survey requirement in lieu of a landscaping plan that does not have to be prepared by a licensed surveyor	Less costly and opens up more parties to provide plans other than just surveyors (e.g. landscapers)	Property owners may be less educated on overall site conditions & potential impacts on future development	

<b>Issue No. 5: Trees removed in Violation (Section 9.5.1.7)</b> <b>Concerns Raised:</b> Penalty may be too punitive when goal is compliance <b>Staff Recommendation:</b> Option 2			
Option	Pros	Cons	Indicate Preferred Option with an "X"
<b>Option 1:</b> Use <u>original</u> proposed language: "When trees of 8 inches DBH or greater have been removed in violation of this Ordinance, replacement trees shall be planted in the same general area according to a replacement schedule approved by the Village Planner in a ratio not to exceed 2:1 of two inches of caliper per inch removed. As an example, if six 8" trees are removed, 96 inches of caliper shall be planted. No tree planted shall be smaller than 3" caliper. The size of the tree removed shall be determined from the size of the remaining base or stump or an existing tree survey on file for the property. If the size of the tree cannot be determined but its removal can be documented by photographic evidence or the use of aerials, then the violator shall replant three 3" trees for every tree removed."	Disincentive to remove trees without a permit or verifying with staff regarding tree removal	More costly and could be viewed as being too "harsh"	
<b>Option 2:</b> Use <u>modified &amp; simplified</u> proposed language: "Replacement trees shall be planted according to Section/Table 9.5.1.4"	No real penalty other than having to comply could require planting and costs	Not much of a "penalty" for illegal removal	