

Summary of discussion with the UDC Advisory Committee (Aug 2020 - Jan 2021)

Tree Preservation, Removal and Mitigation

TP.01 Discussion	
<p>Discussion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • UDC requires all species to identify and measure <u>all</u> trees 12" and greater (UDC 8.05). • It takes time to identify and locate every single tree – should not include excluded trees. • All trees are typically required to be identified on the survey to not overlook any trees that may be protected • Another benefit is to know where the "trash" trees are located to know where improvements may better be located as opposed to areas where the protected trees are located. 	<p>Follow Up Needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None
<p>Direction on Draft Solution:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Specify that the "excluded trees" do not need to be measured or identified. • Or, add the word "protected" prior to "trees" in the UDC standard. • Include in the survey if it may be used as some type of credit 	
<p>Direction on Final Terms:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Specify/clarify that the excluded trees include all cedar trees (Ashe juniper, Mountain Cedar, Blueberry Juniper, or Post Cedar) • Codify the method of measurement to determine the multi-trunk trees to be measured • Proceed as proposed (with Option B for TP.05) 	
<p>Direction on Redlines:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No further comment. 	
TP.02 Discussion	
<p>Discussion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stem appears to have 3 different meanings • Hard to distinguish for multi-trunk trees • Height off the ground to consider a trunk v branch 	<p>Follow Up Needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Revised definition of trunk and branch (does not use word "stem")
<p>Direction on Draft Solution:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Add definition of "trunk" 	

TP.02 Discussion

Direction on Final Terms:

- Simple is good
- How will this affect multi-trunk definition?
- Include definition for branches and roots as these terms are included in the trunk definition

Direction on Redlines:

- No further comment.

TP.03 Discussion

Discussion:

- Using terms "hardwood" and "softwood" may be more vague – do not recommend using these terms

Follow Up Needed:

- None

Direction on Draft Solution:

- Do not include these terms in the UDC – maintain current definitions
- Using specific species in defining protected and heritage trees is recommended

Direction on Final Terms:

- Proceed as proposed.

Direction on Redlines:

- No further comment.

TP.04 Discussion

Discussion:

- There are a lot of varieties of cedar
- Better to define the types of trees that we want to keep

Follow Up Needed:

- None

Direction on Draft Solution:

- Maintain current UDC list of excluded trees, which includes cedar trees

Direction on Final Terms:

- Proceed as proposed

Direction on Redlines:

- No further comment.

TP.05 Discussion	
<p>Discussion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Need to be included so they may be counted towards mitigation and credit trees • Identify a way to measure for certain multi-trunk trees (l.e. crepe myrtle) 	<p>Follow Up Needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bring back two options for consideration
<p>Direction on Draft Solution:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • One way to measure ornamental trees may be by looking at the 5 largest trunks • EXAMPLE (Option B) CP with 4 trunks, largest trunk = 6 in $X = \text{largest trunk}, n = \text{no. of smaller trunks}$ $X + 0.5 * X * n$ $6 + ((0.5 * 6) * 3) = 15''$ 	
<p>Direction on Final Terms:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proceed with Option B 	
<p>Direction on Redlines:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Add person to graphic next to DBH height measurement 	

TP.06 Discussion	
<p>Discussion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Look into creating a new tree removal permit so that a SDP would not be required. • Consider using a minimum size to determine when approval is required. 	<p>Follow Up Needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Language that mimics heritage trees in the ROW and easements
<p>Direction on Draft Solution:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Create a new removal permit for protected trees 	
<p>Direction on Final Terms:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proceed as proposed 	
<p>Direction on Redlines:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No further comment. 	

TP.07 Discussion	
<p>Discussion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Include it as an option for new development and at the 5/10 year mark to better plan the site • Inventory also includes location of the tree on the site • Inventory are completed by arborist 	<p>Follow Up Needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identify if and when it will be required •
<p>Direction on Draft Solution:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Good to encourage the inventory and where it is beneficial 	
<p>Direction on Final Terms:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are different stages of oak wilt – it may be difficult for surveyors to identify oak wilt if they do not have that expertise • Staff’s response: Trees identified as “dead” or “deceased” - identify if oak wilt is the reason for the tree health status • Add “if dead” at the end of bullet point no. 5; or additional language to specify when applicable • Consider inventory option for extraordinary conditions • Trees on a survey identified as “dead” or “deceased” need to be further evaluated to determine if it is oak wilt • Need clear definition of “Tree Inventory” and what the requirements are for the inventory • Combine bullet points 1 and 5 • Define/specify how you can reduce mitigation 	
<p>Direction on Redlines:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No further comment. 	

TP.08 Discussion	
<p>Discussion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Heading in the right direction • Address what happens if the tree dies (replenish requirement) 	<p>Follow Up Needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None
<p>Direction on Draft Solution:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More detail 	
<p>Direction on Final Terms:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Definition for “stands” 	
<p>Direction on Redlines:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No further comment. 	

TP.09 Discussion	
<p>Discussion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Floodplain – if not using for credit, do not need to include in survey • Floodplain – cannot be developed in, thus should not be included for mitigation • Floodplain – alternatively, developers may want to include these trees as credits if it allows other portions of the property to be developed 	<p>Follow Up Needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bring back examples for each possible solution to discuss at next meeting. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Alta • South Fork Apt site
<p>Direction on Draft Solution:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Need more info. 	
<p>Direction on Final Terms:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Developer – advantage that there are portions of property that can be counted/credited to allow more development in another portion • Look at option to give developers a choice to do either Option A or B • Another option may be to not count trees in the floodplain, but count double/higher credit within the developable area --> look for ways that incentivizes preservation within the developable area • Bring back Option C for consideration (provide choice it makes sense) • Consider effect it has on cost of housing (for all proposed amendments) 	
<p>Direction on Final Terms:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clarify that the trees in the floodplain can be counted in your total number of trees, but that they cannot be used as credit trees for mitigation • What might happen if a development had an area of dense trees outside of the floodplain? 	
<p>Direction on Redlines:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No further comment. 	

TP.10 Discussion	
<p>Discussion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Requiring vs encouraging – every time something is required it increases price • Specify the value for encouraging tree inventory requirement 	<p>Follow Up Needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Incentive options to discuss at next meeting
<p>Direction on Draft Solution:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bag of options – create incentives 	

TP.10 Discussion

Direction on Final Terms:

- Look at TP.07

Direction on Redlines:

- No further comment.

TP.11 Discussion

Discussion:

- Verify/work with Finance on details for reimbursement process
- Off-site planting on common areas for residential subdivisions an appropriate option
- Other jurisdictions that allow credit for trees planted on street yards of SFR lots

Follow Up Needed:

- Work with Legal team to determine what City can require through deed restrictions
- Options for tier process through an administrative process
 - Options from other cities
 - Examples of projects to evaluate
- Options on different fees for mitigation depending on size

Direction on Draft Solution:

- Need more info.

Direction on Final Terms:

- Clarify that developer pays up front and can get credit later
- Clarify greater than 12 but less than 18
- Georgetown should have a minimum of 3 classes

Direction on Redlines:

- No further comment.

TP.12 Discussion

Discussion:

- Street trees should not be allowed to be planted in front of the sign
- Fee-in-lieu of as an option in the event a tree may not be planted elsewhere on site

Follow Up Needed:

- None

Direction on Draft Solution:

-

TP.12 Discussion

Direction on Final Terms:

- Clarify that it must be planted within the same landscape area (i.e. if in the street yard, it needs to be placed in the street yard)

Direction on Redlines:

- No further comment.

Streetyards, Gateways, and Parking

SY.01 Discussion

Discussion:

- Artificial turf heats up quicker
- No objection to allowance in the rear yard
- Major concerns allowing it in the front yard
- Should not be visible from the street.
- Will not be maintained by property owners.

Follow Up Needed:

-

Direction on Draft Solution:

- Not recommended.
- If allowed, should be limited to the rear yard only.

Direction on Final Terms:

- Include a standard that restricts artificial turfs within an easement
- If limiting it to the rear, may not have any value to add maintenance requirements. Keep preferred turf standards.
- Potential loophole – no permit required. Possible solution - include scope of work in the flat work permit currently issued by the City
- Address how impervious cover may be impacted (what is considered impervious cover)

Direction on Redlines:

- No further comment.

SY.02 Discussion

Discussion:

- Concern that requiring higher level at the street may create conflicts as other phases develop
- Look at limits of construction as an option
- 1 and 2 okay

Follow Up Needed (October 14 Discussion):

- Example of thresholds and possible solutions

SY.02 Discussion	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 3 and 4 not sure 	
Direction on Draft Solution: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Option 2 – results in additional trees for smaller lots. Readjust numbers so that the smaller lots do not result in more trees. Run scenarios to compare requirements. 	
Direction on Proposed Terms: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comparison were helpful – good with revised option 2. • Okay with implementation of option 3 	
Direction on Redlines: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No further comment. 	

SY.03 Discussion	
Discussion: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Goal is to make sure gateway area is heavily landscaped 	Follow Up Needed: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •
Direction on Draft Solution: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proceed as proposed 	
Direction on Final Terms: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proceed with Option 2 for defining the boundary 	
Direction on Redlines: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No further comment. 	

SY.04 Discussion	
Discussion: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does exempting inventory lots meet the goal of the City? • Require shade structures? 	Follow Up Needed: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •
Direction on Draft Solution: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recommend reconsidering exemption in a future UDC amendment • Look at definition of “inventory lot” 	
Direction on Final Terms: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proceed as proposed 	

SY.04 Discussion	
Direction on Redlines: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No further comment. 	

SY.05 Discussion	
Discussion: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> It may take away more developable land May be 75% or may be 10 feet – look at percentage vs feet option (bullet point no. 2) 	Follow Up Needed: <ul style="list-style-type: none">
Direction on Draft Solution: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Recommend having all possible solutions as “or” options 	
Direction on Final Terms: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proceed as proposed 	
Direction on Redlines: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No further comment. 	

Screening, Buffering, & Water Conservation

SBW.01 Discussion	
Discussion: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concern with adding a company name. 	Follow Up Needed: <ul style="list-style-type: none">
Direction on Draft Solution: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proceed as proposed Do not use specific business when referring to locational standards for enclosures 	
Direction on Proposed Terms: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> All good! 	
Direction on Redlines: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No further comment. 	

SBW.02 Discussion	
Discussion: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 	Follow Up Needed: <ul style="list-style-type: none">

SBW.02 Discussion
<p>Direction on Draft Solution:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clarify that "turf" means natural turf or turf grass • Do not add any provision that requires it, but that incentivizes it • No. 4 – look at it functionally
<p>Direction on Proposed Terms:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Good with Term #2 – IC credit • Good with Term 3#, but clarify that sod = turf • Term #4 is good.
<p>Direction on Redlines:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •

Proposed Terms - Validate direction on draft ordinance

Proposed Terms	
<p>Discussion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 	<p>Follow Up Needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •
<p>Direction:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Terms are good, reflect work done. 	

Public Outreach

Public Outreach	
<p>Discussion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 	<p>Follow Up Needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •
<p>Direction:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Groups to Include in Survey: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Chamber of Commerce ○ Development Alliance ○ Think of new groups. Please let staff know before beginning of January. ○ Send reminder in "homework" email. 	