

Minnetonka Beach Tree Preservation Ordinance Work Group

Members:

Jeff Breazeale, Scott Gamble, Bridget Wortman

Staff:

Heidi Honey, City Administrator

Work Group Meeting Agenda Tuesday, March 11, 2025 ~ 5:00 – 6:30 PM

The purpose of the meeting is to review the tree protection ordinance.

Minnetonka Beach Tree Ordinance Review Plan

Updated January 21, 2025

Tree Ordinance Opportunities Plan (pg. 1 of 2)

Area	#	Opportunity	Initial Action	Who
Heritage Trees	1A	Conifer size/age definition: Do we need to adjust definition in the ordinance (i.e. is 30 feet too young?)	Evaluate conifer heritage tree size/age definition compared to hardwoods using DNR and other sources (in combination with Significant conifers)	Jeff
	2	Approval process simplification: How should City council be involved in approval process?	Review resident and city feedback Evaluate how other cities manage heritage tree removal approval. Understand current process. Review with Heidi.	Scott
Significant Trees	1B	Conifer size/age definition: Do we need to adjust definition in the ordinance? (i.e. is 12 feet too young?)	Evaluate conifer significant tree size/age definition (in combination with Heritage conifers)	Jeff
	3	Cottonwoods protection: Should Cottonwoods have the same protections as other significant trees?	Evaluate how other cities manage Cottonwoods	Kevin
Smaller than Significant Trees		None identified	n/a	
Dead, diseased and Dying Trees	4	Approval process simplification: Can we simplify the process for residents and for the city?	Review resident and city feedback Evaluate how other cities manage approval process. Understand current process. Review with Heidi.	Scott

Tree Ordinance Opportunities Plan (pg. 2 of 2)

Area	#	Opportunity	Action	Who
General	5	Arborvitae definition: Have we appropriately defined and classified Arborvitae as trees? How do we manage overgrown Arborvitae that need to be replaced?	Evaluate how other cities define and manage aged and overgrown arborvitae that need to be replaced.	Jeff
	6	Tree density definition: Should we count the size of replacement trees (2.5") instead of significant or larger?	Evaluate how other cities define and manage	Bridget
	7	Tree stump removal process: Do we need city engineer approval if tree stump is not removed (for erosion control) within 75 feet of lakeshore?	Understand current process and implications of changes. Discuss with Heidi	Bridget
	8	Ordinance clarity: Can we make our ordinance more concise?	Evaluate other cities' tree ordinance code for communication brevity and clarity	Scott
	9	Ordinance code duplication: What changes do we need to make to align the tree ordinance and the broader city code? (e.g. Definitions in multiple places in code)	Compare and align revised tree ordinance with current city code	TBD
	10	Appropriate fine structure for enforcement: City Attorney commented on the fine amounts potentially being too high	Compare current fine structure with other cities and review with Heidi and City Attorney	TBD
	11	"Carrots...and Stick" -City Council has asked us to provide a recommendation on how to acknowledge (all) residents' feedback and ideas to inspire broader community support for tree preservation efforts.	Team brainstorming	TBD

Minnetonka Beach Tree Ordinance Review Plan

Status Update from Feb. 18, 2025 work group meeting

Tree Ordinance Opportunities Plan (pg. 1 of 3)

Area	#	Opportunity	Actions under consideration from 2/18 work group meeting	Who
Heritage Trees	1A	Conifer size/age definition: Do we need to adjust definition in the ordinance (i.e. is 30 feet too young?)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Size/age Conifers by DBH vs. current height metric Differentiate trees between Rapid and Slow growth trees. Apply different different size standards based on pace of growth Apply to both Heritage and Significant Trees 	Jeff
	2	Approval process simplification: How should City council be involved in approval process?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No recommended changes to current process 	Scott
Significant Trees	1B	Conifer size/age definition: Do we need to adjust definition in the ordinance? (i.e. is 12 feet too young?)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> See Heritage Tree section 	Jeff
	3	Cottonwoods protection: Should Cottonwoods have the same protections as other significant trees?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> TBD 	Jeff
Smaller than Significant Trees		None identified	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> n/a 	

Tree Ordinance Opportunities Plan (pg. 2 of 3)

Area	#	Opportunity	Actions under consideration from 2/18 work group meeting	Who
Dead, diseased and Dying Trees	4	Approval process simplification: Can we simplify the process for residents and for the city?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Include user friendly table similar to city's chart of situations to address misunderstanding by residents as to what situations require a permit or not. • Leave dead trees as is with no permit. • Diseased, dying and hazard trees still requires a permit with the property owner plus the tree inspector or city forester inspection but waive the fee. 	Scott
General	5	Arborvitae definition: Have we appropriately defined and classified Arborvitae as trees? How do we manage overgrown Arborvitae that need to be replaced?	TBD	Jeff
	6	Tree density definition: Should we count the size of replacement trees (2.5") instead of significant or larger?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Keep the code as is, requiring only trees significant or larger counting towards minimum density. 	Bridget
	7	Tree stump removal process: Do we need city engineer approval if tree stump is not removed (for erosion control) within 75 feet of lakeshore?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Leaving the stump doesn't require a city engineer review, saving costs. If the homeowner wants it removed, an engineer's opinion is needed. 	Bridget

Tree Ordinance Opportunities Plan (pg. 3 of 3)

Area	#	Opportunity	Actions under consideration from 2/18 work group meeting	Who
General	8	Ordinance clarity: Can we make our ordinance more concise?	TBD after #1-7 are complete <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Maintain current structure to align with rest of code Include user friendly table similar to city's chart of situations Streamline each section striking balance with necessary detail for enforcing the nuisances of the code; use red line tracking feature in Word for team to review Condense application section details Eliminate escrows section; city does not have capacity to manage complexity of escrows Remove fee schedule; maintain outside of code Add all permits are responsibility of homeowner – per Heidi 	Scott
	9	Ordinance code duplication: What changes do we need to make to align the tree ordinance and the broader city code? (e.g. Definitions in multiple places in code)	TBD after #1-7 are complete <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Compare and align revised tree ordinance with current city code 	TBD
	10	Appropriate fine structure for enforcement: City Attorney commented on the fine amounts potentially being too high	TBD after #1-7 are complete <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Compare current fine structure with other cities and review with Heidi and City Attorney 	TBD
	11	“Carrots...and Stick” -City Council has asked us to provide a recommendation on how to acknowledge (all) residents' feedback and ideas to inspire broader community support for tree preservation efforts.	TBD after #1-7 are complete <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Team brainstorming 	TBD

SORTED FOR AGE	Signif 6" DBH Age	Heritage 30" DBH Age (yrs per in)	Growth factor	Minne- tonka	Edina	Mintka Beach	Wood- land	Green- wood	Way- zata	Excel- sior	Shore- wood
Hickory	42	210	7.5					hard			
Ironwood	42	210	7.0					hard			
Redbud	42	210	7.0								
Oak (Bur)	39	195						hard			
Oak (White)	39	195	5.0					hard			
Pine (Red)-- 6" and 30" dia	33	165	5.5					conif			
Birch (White)	30	150	5.0					hard			
Cherry	30	150	5.0								
Maple (Sugar)	30	150	5.5					hard			
Pine (White)-- 6 " and 30" dia	30	150	5.0					conif			
Maple (Red)	27	135	4.5					hard			
Walnut	27	135	4.5					hard			
Ash	24	120	4.0		excl		excl green, pric	hard	rapid		
Elm	24	120	4.0				excl siberian	hard	rapid		
Oak (Red)	24	120	4.0					hard			
Basswood/Linden	18	90	3.0								
Maple (Silver)	18	90	3.0		excl			soft	rapid	excl	soft
Oak (Pin)	18	90	3.0					hard			
Aspen	12	60			excl			soft	rapid	excl	soft
Cottonwood	12	60	2.0		excl		excl	soft	rapid	excl	excl
Willow	12	60			excl		excl	soft	rapid	excl	excl
Mulberry					excl				rapid	excl	
Box Elder					excl		excl		rapid	excl	excl
Locust (Black)					excl					excl	
Fruit Tree Species					excl						
Pine (Red)-- 12' and 30' tall	13	30	ISSUE?								
Pine (White)-- 12' and 30' tall	13	30	ISSUE?								
				significant decid 4"	protected Decid 5"	significant: decid 6"	significant any 6"	significant: hard 6" soft 10" conifer 8"	significant: std 6" rapid 12" conif 12"/12 ft	significant: any 8"	significant: hard 8" soft 12" conifer 8 ft
				high priority decid 10"	heritage 30"	heritage decid 20"	landmark any 30"		heritage std 25" rapid 30" conif 25"	landmark any 30"	
				conf 15 ft	conif 30 ft	conif 30 ft					