

Residents Suggestions for Tree Ordinance

- Stated goal of preserving all healthy, mature trees.
- Expand list of protected trees.
- Committee/Board with professional to make recommendations in public meeting.
- Include protecting dripline.
- Improve and expand mitigation for protected trees, replacement sizes, maintenance period, public property, increase canopy, mitigation trust.
- Moratorium for violations.
- Incentives for preservation.
- Replace any tree that is removed.
- Enforce existing ordinance.
- Keep non-protected trees to prevent soil erosion.
- Increase penalties.

Pat Rich

From: Margaret Dutton <peggydutton4@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, May 5, 2023 4:27 PM
To: Jon McCraw; Ronald Jones; Pat Rich; DerekCusick@yahoo.com
Subject: New Tree Ordinance

[EXTERNAL EMAIL] DO NOT CLICK links or attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Gentlemen:

Since you are accepting input on the new tree ordinance, I would like to submit my request for provisions that require:

1. A stated goal of preserving all healthy, mature trees as much as possible.
2. A specific and extended list of protected trees native to the area and the circumference at which they are protected. Gulfport's ordinance, for example, includes: live oak, southern magnolia, swamp chestnut oak, sweet bay, sweet gum, overcup oak, shumard oak, nuttall oak, American holly, bald cypress, red maple, and willow oak that has a single or multiple trunk with a total caliper trunk of 8 inches or a circumference of 25 inches or more.
3. A committee, board, or the like that includes an arborist, horticulturist or other qualified professional to make recommendations and/or decisions on tree permits in publicly held meetings. This would immediately increase transparency in decision making and therefore greater trust. The P&Z would be appropriate if at least one relevant, qualified professional participated as advisor.
4. Trees on public property (including easements) are protected by required permit for nearby construction and regulations concerning required fencing around their dripline and prohibiting paving or soil compaction within it or any cutting or harming during construction.
5. Required mitigation for protected trees removed or harmed either with or without a permit — that is, planting of trees of a certain size on the site with required maintenance for a time or on approved public property so that the overall extent of the tree canopy is not lost, and preferably is increased. Biloxi, for example, requires a 2 to 1 replacement and allows, as one option, payment into a mitigation trust so the city can purchase and plant the trees.
6. A moratorium placed for specified times on any project — subdivision or single lot — during which tree permit regulations are violated to the extent that a protected tree or trees are removed or significantly cut or damaged.
7. Incentives if possible for owners/builders to preserve trees above and beyond regulations.

Many thanks for all you do.

Margaret (Peggy) Dutton

Pat Rich

From: Kim Koppman <kim@grandriverclothing.com>
Sent: Thursday, May 18, 2023 4:06 PM
To: Pat Rich
Subject: Regarding the tree ordinance

[EXTERNAL EMAIL] DO NOT CLICK links or attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Hi, I am Kim Koppman
10418 Malahini Place
Diamondhead

I, like many in Diamondhead left the New Orleans area to enjoy everything the coast offers and we love it here. One of the draws to move here is that Diamondhead reminds us of the beautiful oaks and pines of the Northshore in Louisiana.

It was in our POA guidelines that no trees are removed without replacing it on your property.

Seeing what Elliot Homes has done to our beautiful CITY OF TREES, makes me and so many more sick. Builders are clear cutting spots to build their homes and nobody in the city is monitoring this. It looks awful, seeing cookie cutter homes built on a vast area of trees that were ripped out of our scenery.....And that devalues property valuation.

Doing such to a large piece of Diamondhead property degenerates our Beauty and creates havoc with drainage. The trees themselves absorb so much water that we usually have no worries about flooding like LA.. ...the removal of trees means more drainage problems, besides looking ugly.

I don't know how they get away with killing Live Oaks , but it truly is a black eye on The city of Diamondhead.

The builders should plan reparations by planting new trees around their homes.

In fact, we should return to our former POA rules of not allowing trees to be removed without replacing them.

We are a unique community and it's so well planned....why would we desecrate it?

I pray that this is addressed at the meeting.

Thank you,

Kim Koppman

Sent from my iPad

Pat Rich

From: Piji White <pjipierce45@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, May 19, 2023 2:35 PM
To: Pat Rich
Subject: Wish we could reinforce below
Attachments: 2012-019.4.pdf *Existing Tree Ordinance*

[EXTERNAL EMAIL] DO NOT CLICK links or attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Thanks again for meeting with me the other day about living tree legacy! I really appreciate your input exclamation

Pat Rich

From: Charles Whitmore <nwhitmore1@hotmail.com>
Sent: Saturday, May 20, 2023 2:34 PM
To: Pat Rich; Pat Rich
Subject: Suggestions for Diamondhead Tree Ordinance

[EXTERNAL EMAIL] DO NOT CLICK links or attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Hello. This message from Ned Whitmore. 228-313-3513. 308 Highpoint Dr

It sounded like a lot of work was done in the past on tree preservation ordinance - much of which sounded like it was nixed.

Attached pdf doc is the tree (and other matters) ordinance for Sacramento. Section 4 to end of the doc especially interesting and could contain useful ideas, language and info.

The website link is:

<https://www.cityofsacramento.org/Public-Works/Maintenance-Services/Trees/Permits-Ordinances>

Get [Outlook for Android](#)

Pat Rich

From: Anne Reaver <areaver@aol.com>
Sent: Monday, May 22, 2023 10:51 AM
To: Nancy Depreo; Gerard Maher; Charles "Chuck" Clark; Jon McCraw; Pat Rich
Subject: Tree Ordinance

[EXTERNAL EMAIL] DO NOT CLICK links or attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

I would like to take this opportunity as a citizen of Diamondhead to make a few suggestions/comments on a possible tree ordinance. I thought that in Oct 2019 there was an ordinance for the Protection and Continuance of the Heavy Tree Canopy in Diamondhead enacted. This could be a good starting place.

My suggestions would be

Protect Live Oaks (and additional oak trees) and Magnolias as a minimum. There are some trees such as pine that don't need protection but could stay in place to prevent soil erosion.

Permits should be issued for tree removal and the ordinance should address the process for clearing lots or plating subdivisions with fines. Owners/subdivisions should have to submit a copy of their survey noting what trees they will leave and what will be cut. Then city inspector approves. Protection of tree roots needs to be included (ie fencing/barrier around the roots or tree canopy. Heavy equipment can damage roots and this damage isnt seen for several years.

A tree board of possibly 5 members appointed by the mayor/council and the members should be residents of Diamondhead. At least 2 members should be professionals in related fields (arborist, horticulturalist, forester, landscape architect etc.). Remainder of members from the community. At first appointment have 2 serve for 4 years and the remainder for 5 years so all don't rotate off at the same time.

If protected trees or clear cutting of lots have penalties in place that are severe enough that people will think twice before just cutting. Replacement trees need to be a specific size and a certain number.

We all need to work together to preserve our trees and the open spaces that we have. Thank you for your consideration of my suggestions. Anne Reaver

Sent from my iPad