

Carla Hoekzema

From: webmaster@shorelinewa.gov
Sent: Thursday, October 7, 2021 8:09 PM
To: Plancom; Carla Hoekzema
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Contact the Planning Commission

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the City of Shoreline. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

A new entry to a form/survey has been submitted.

Form Name: Contact the Planning Commission
Date & Time: 10/07/2021 8:09 pm
Response #: 77
Submitter ID: 44122
IP address: 50.46.195.105
Time to complete: 2 min. , 33 sec.

Survey Details: Answers Only

Page 1

1. Highland Terrace
2. No Response Needed
3. Melody Fosmore
4. melodyfosmoredesign@gmail.com
5. 10.7.2021
6. Amendment #2
7. October 7, 2021
Planning Commission Meeting comment

My name is Melody Fosmore, a Shoreline resident. I am a member of the Tree Preservation Code Team.

I am speaking about Amendment 2, regarding tree measurements and definitions.

In the midst of our climate change crisis, WHY has the City staff recommended NOT to designate the size of a Landmark Tree as 24" dbh (instead of the current 30") and significant conifer trees to 6" dbh (instead of the current 8")? In the recommendation Staff wrote, (quote) "Staff does not support lowering the diameter of a Landmark Tree from 30" to 24". Industry standards for a Landmark Tree is 30" and a query of jurisdictions in the region use 30" as the standard for a Landmark Tree." (end quote)

However, Redmond, Issaquah, Lake Forest Park and Lynnwood have defined their significant trees as 6" dbh. Moreover, Lake Forest Park and Maple Valley are examples of cities who have designated Landmark trees at 24" dbh.

There are compelling reasons to change the measurements for Significant and Landmark trees. Amendment 2 will protect more of Shoreline tall trees, as recommended in the City's Climate Impacts & Resiliency Study in 2020.

Cities across the country are looking at the value of trees as we should in Shoreline. We can help lead the way. In the Staff recommendation it seems there was more concern about revising permitting than the necessity of saving more trees. And, if the City staff does not recommend the word "viable" to describe a tree, at the very least include the word "healthy". There is the recent example of two trees on a Richmond Beach development lot and the owner chose to save the dying tree and remove the healthy tree. We objected to this removal but the City Planner said "we have to go by code" and the code does not differentiate between viable and dying.

Now is the time to change the code, change the tree measurements, and save more trees.

Thank you,
City of Shoreline

This is an automated message generated by Granicus. Please do not reply directly to this email.