

## Summary of discussion with the UDC Advisory Committee (April – May 2021)

UDCAC April 14, 2021

TP.11.1 Discussion	
<p><b>Discussion:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Georgetown typically has a lot of trees compared to other cities.</li><li>• Generally speaking allowing to go smaller provides additional options and ability to save more natural trees.</li><li>• Should not go smaller than 3 inches.</li><li>• Best to include an either/or option</li><li>• Cost is more to survey additional trees.</li><li>• How often has the development community requested trees smaller than 6 inches to be considered?</li><li>• Alternative approval process to allow smaller than 6 inches and not be permitted by right.</li><li>• Public comments:<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Developer would use option to survey smaller trees to provide more natural environment</li><li>• Additional options to allow existing remaining trees to be counted as credit is supported</li></ul></li></ul>	<p><b>Follow Up Needed:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>•</li></ul>
<p><b>Direction on Proposed Solutions:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Provide an alternative approval process to be considered on a case by case basis</li><li>• Give as an option, if necessary</li><li>• Trees may not be smaller than 3 inches</li></ul>	
<p><b>Direction on Proposed Terms (May 12, 2021):</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Clarify/specify what undisturbed areas mean (CRZ?) and what “near” means (how far are they located from a “group of trees”)</li><li>• Clarify that the trees between 3-6 inches that may be counted as credit trees only include shade trees.</li><li>• Clarify if the 3-in tree needs to be clear other 3-in trees or other specific size</li><li>• Standards:<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>○ 3-6 inches, yes</li><li>○ Good health, yes</li><li>○ Full CRZ, yes</li><li>○ Mitigation ratio 0.5:1, yes</li></ul></li></ul>	

## TP.11.2 Discussion

### Discussion:

- Most lots are designed knowing where the footprint of the building will be located to ensure lot is buildable.
- Generally it appears it would require additional review and tracking by staff, and lack of control
- Tree planted in the ROW could be allowed to be used to meet the landscape requirements of the residential lot.
- What option is more commonly used? How often is the planting option used vs payment of fee?
  - Most common use payment of fee

Planting strip between curb and sidewalk needs to be wide enough to avoid conflicts with public improvements (sidewalks, curbs, utilities) - I.e. Georgetown Village.

City of Leander takes on the additional burden to include in inspection of house.

Agree with comment that more trees are better.

Consider affordability issue.

### Public Comments:

- BM builder standard is to plant 2, 3-in trees on every lot, 4 on corner lots - required in building contracts, deed restrictions
- Option should include property in the ETJ
- Options that encourage more trees and preservation of additional trees should be encouraged.

### Follow Up Needed:

- Explore partial credit
- Case studies – check impact on real world projects
- Review payments into the Tree Fund
- Look at spacing requirements and varieties of trees; prevent colliding canopies; ensure long lasting trees

### 5/12/2021:

- Take one example and run numbers based on proposed direction

### Direction on Proposed Solutions:

- Partial credit for additional trees

### Direction on Proposed Terms (May 12, 2021):

- Standards:
  - 3-in min, yes
  - Half credit for trees above and beyond

## TP.11.2 Discussion

- 30% total mitigation, generally agree. Caveat that trees should be planted on common areas first and then residential lots
- Landscape requirements above and beyond, yes
- Subject to Building Permit review, yes
- Concern that may be "robot looking" or very cookie cutter
- Will it be a benefit if it does not count to meeting landscape requirements? Will it be able to fit on the lots that are being platted today?
  - Look at planting in the backyard as an option
- Look at 18-25 in trees to be counted as credit trees – is this an option?
  - Most commonly seen in PUDs
  - Pro – save large protected trees
  - Con – trees are not protected during construction; incentivizes removal of heritage trees because there are usually more protected trees than heritage
- Public comments:
  - Support a and e; not b-d
  - Code should include language that common areas should be planted first

### Specific Feedback on Proposed Terms:

Term A:

- Good. Remain.

Term B:

- Omit

Term C & D:

- Omit and replace with the below terms.
- Plant in common areas - possible language *"When common areas, open space or landscape lots, amenity lots, or detention lots, are proposed, on-site replacement trees shall be planted on these lots first. Any remaining mitigation inches may be planted on residential lots as follows:..."*
- 50% ratio of inches planted to credit
- Give credit for plants that meet a spacing requirement 15-foot requirements on center (minimum)
- Only give credit for plants that are provided above and beyond the min. landscape requirements.

Term E:

- Good.

**Follow up (to be provided at June 16 meeting):**

#### TP.11.2 Discussion

- Show how changes to terms play out in the examples provided.

## Tree Preservation, Removal and Mitigation

### TP.01 Discussion

#### Discussion:

- UDC requires all species to identify and measure all 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.

#### Follow Up Needed:

- None

#### Direction on Draft Solution:

- 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

#### Direction on Final Terms:

- 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)

### TP.02 Discussion

#### Discussion:

- Stem appears to have 3 different meanings
- Hard to distinguish for multi-trunk trees
- Height off the ground to consider a trunk v branch

#### Follow Up Needed:

- Revised definition of trunk and branch (does not use word "stem")

#### Direction on Draft Solution:

- Add definition of "trunk"

#### 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

### 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.

**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

**TP.05 Discussion****Discussion:**

- Need to be included so they may be counted towards mitigation and credit trees
- Identify a way to measure for certain multi-trunk trees (i.e. crepe myrtle)

**Follow Up Needed:**

- Bring back two options for consideration

**Direction on Draft Solution:**

- 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  
 $X = \text{largest trunk, } n = \text{no. of smaller trunks}$   
 $X + 0.5*n$   
 $6 + (0.5*3) = 7.5"$

**Direction on Final Terms:**

- Proceed with Option B

**TP.06 Discussion****Discussion:**

- 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.

**Follow Up Needed:**

- Language that mimics heritage trees in the ROW and easements

**Direction on Draft Solution:**

- Create a new removal permit for protected trees

**Direction on Final Terms:**

- Proceed as proposed

**TP.07 Discussion****Discussion:**

- 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

**Follow Up Needed:**

- Identify if and when it will be required
- 

**Direction on Draft Solution:**

- Good to encourage the inventory and where it is beneficial

**Direction on Final Terms:**

- 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

**TP.08 Discussion****Discussion:**

- Heading in the right direction
- Address what happens if the tree dies (replenish requirement)

**Follow Up Needed:**

- None

**Direction on Draft Solution:**

- More detail

**Direction on Final Terms:**

- Definition for "stands"

### TP.09 Discussion

#### Discussion:

- 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

#### Follow Up Needed:

- Bring back examples for each possible solution to discuss at next meeting.
  - Alta
  - South Fork Apt site

#### Direction on Draft Solution:

- Need more info.

#### Direction on Final Terms:

- 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)

#### Direction on Final Terms:

- 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?

### TP.10 Discussion

#### Discussion:

- Requiring vs encouraging – every time something is required it increases price
- Specify the value for encouraging tree inventory requirement

#### Follow Up Needed:

- Incentive options to discuss at next meeting

#### Direction on Draft Solution:

- Bag of options – create incentives

#### Direction on Final Terms:

- Look at TP.07

### 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

#### Follow Up Needed:

- Work with Legal team to determine what City can require through deed restrictions
- Options for tier process through an administrative process



<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Other jurisdictions that allow credit for trees planted on street yards of SFR lots</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Options from other cities</li> <li>Examples of projects to evaluate</li> <li>Options on different fees for mitigation depending on size</li> </ul>
<b>Direction on Draft Solution:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Need more info.</li> </ul>	
<b>Direction on Final Terms:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Clarify that developer pays up front and can get credit later</li> <li>Clarify greater than 12 but less than 18</li> <li>Georgetown should have a minimum of 3 classes</li> </ul>	

TP.12 Discussion	
<b>Discussion:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Street trees should not be allowed to be planted in front of the sign</li> <li>Fee-in-lieu of as an option in the event a tree may not be planted elsewhere on site</li> </ul>	<b>Follow Up Needed:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>None</li> </ul>
<b>Direction on Draft Solution:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>	
<b>Direction on Final Terms (Nov 11, 2020):</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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)</li> </ul>	

## Streetyards, Gateways, and Parking

SY.01 Discussion	
<b>Discussion:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Artificial turf heats up quicker</li> <li>No objection to allowance in the rear yard</li> <li>Major concerns allowing it in the front yard</li> <li>Should not be visible from the street.</li> <li>Will not be maintained by property owners.</li> </ul>	<b>Follow Up Needed:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>
<b>Direction on Draft Solution:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Not recommended.</li> <li>If allowed, should be limited to the rear yard only.</li> </ul>	
<b>Direction on Final Terms:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Include a standard that restricts artificial turfs within an easement</li> <li>If limiting it to the rear, may not have any value to add maintenance requirements. Keep preferred turf standards.</li> <li>Potential loophole – no permit required. Possible solution - include scope of work in the flat work permit currently issued by the City</li> </ul>	

- Address how impervious cover may be impacted (what is considered impervious cover)

### 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
- 3 and 4 not sure

#### Follow Up Needed (October 14 Discussion):

- Example of thresholds and possible solutions

#### Direction on Draft Solution (November 11 Discussion):

- 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 (December 9 Discussion):

- Comparison were helpful – good with revised option 2.
- Okay with implementation of option 3

### SY.03 Discussion

#### Discussion:

- Goal is to make sure gateway area is heavily landscaped

#### Follow Up Needed:

- 

#### Direction on Draft Solution:

- Proceed as proposed

#### Direction on Final Terms:

- Proceed with Option 2 for defining the boundary

### SY.04 Discussion

#### Discussion:

- Does exempting inventory lots meet the goal of the City?
- Require shade structures?

#### Follow Up Needed:

- 

#### Direction on Draft Solution:

- Recommend reconsidering exemption in a future UDC amendment
- Look at definition of “inventory lot”

#### Direction on Final Terms:

- Proceed as proposed

### SY.05 Discussion

**Discussion:**

- 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:**

- 

**Direction on Draft Solution:**

- Recommend having all possible solutions as “or” options

**Direction on Final Terms:**

- Proceed as proposed

### Screening, Buffering, & Water Conservation

### SBW.01 Discussion

**Discussion:**

- Concern with adding a company name.

**Follow Up Needed:**

- 

**Direction on Draft Solution (November 11 Discussion):**

- Proceed as proposed
- Do not use specific business when referring to locational standards for enclosures

**Direction on Proposed Terms (December 9 Discussion):**

- All good!

### SBW.02 Discussion

**Discussion:**

- 

**Follow Up Needed:**

- 

**Direction on Draft Solution (November 11 Discussion):**

- 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

**Direction on Proposed Terms (December 9 Discussion):**

- Good with Term #2 – IC credit
- Good with Term 3#, but clarify that sod = turf
- Term #4 is good.

## Proposed Terms - Validate direction on draft ordinance

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

## Public Outreach

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