Notice of Meeting for the
Unified Development Code Advisory Committee
of the City of Georgetown
September 9, 2020 at 3:30 PM
at Teleconference

The City of Georgetown is committed to compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA). If you require assistance in participating at a public meeting due to a disability, as defined under the ADA, reasonable assistance, adaptations, or accommodations will be provided upon request. Please contact the City Secretary's Office, at least three (3) days prior to the scheduled meeting date, at (512) 930-3652 or City Hall at 808 Martin Luther King Jr. Street, Georgetown, TX 78626 for additional information; TTY users route through Relay Texas at 711.

The regular meeting will convene at 3:30 p.m. on September 9, 2020 via teleconference. To participate, please copy and paste the following weblink into your browser:

Webinar ID: 995 3378 5336
Password: 675042

To participate by phone:
Call in number: (Toll Free) 833-548-0276
Password: 675042

Citizen comments are accepted in three different formats:
1. Submit written comments to planning@georgetown.org by 2:30p.m. on the date of the meeting and the Recording Secretary will read your comments into the recording during the item that is being discussed.
2. Log onto the meeting at the link above and "raise your hand" during the item
3. Use your home/mobile phone to call the toll-free number

To join a Zoom meeting, click on the link provided and join as an attendee. You will be asked to enter your name and email address (this is so we can identify you when you are called upon). To speak on an item, click on the "Raise your Hand" option at the bottom of the Zoom meeting webpage once that item has opened. When you are called upon by the Recording Secretary, your device will be remotely un-muted by the Administrator and you may speak for three minutes. Please state your name clearly, and when your time is over, your device will be muted again.

Use of profanity, threatening language, slanderous remarks or threats of harm are not allowed and will result in you being immediately removed from the meeting.
**Regular Session**

(This Regular Session may, at any time, be recessed to convene an Executive Session for any purpose authorized by the Open Meetings Act, Texas Government Code 551.)

A Discussion on how the Unified Development Code Advisory Committee virtual conference will be conducted, to include options for public comments and how the public may address the Commission -- Sofia Nelson, CNU-A, Planning Director

B On a subject not posted on the agenda: Persons may add an item to a future Board agenda by filing a written request with the Staff Liaison no later than one week prior to the Board meeting. The request must include the speaker's name and the specific topic to be addressed with sufficient information to inform the board and the public. For Board Liaison contact information, please logon to http://government.georgetown.org/category/boards-commissions/.

At the time of posting, no persons had signed up to speak on items not on the agenda.

**Legislative Regular Agenda**

C Consideration and possible action to approve the minutes of the August 12, 2020 regular meetings of the Unified Development Code Advisory Committee. - Mirna Garcia, Management Analyst

D Discussion and possible direction on proposed amendments to the Tree Preservation and Landscaping standards of the Unified Development Code (UDC) particularly as it relates to tree preservation, removal and mitigation (UDC General Amendment No. 20-03) -- Steve McKeown, Landscape Planner


**Adjournment**

**Certificate of Posting**

I, Robyn Densmore, City Secretary for the City of Georgetown, Texas, do hereby certify that this Notice of Meeting was posted at City Hall, 808 Martin Luther King Jr. Street, Georgetown, TX 78626, a place readily accessible to the general public as required by law, on the _____ day of __________________, 2020, at ____________, and remained so posted for at least 72 continuous hours preceding the scheduled time of said meeting.

______________________________
Robyn Densmore, City Secretary
SUBJECT:
Consideration and possible action to approve the minutes of the August 12, 2020 regular meetings of the Unified Development Code Advisory Committee. - Mirna Garcia, Management Analyst

ITEM SUMMARY:

FINANCIAL IMPACT:

SUBMITTED BY:
Mirna Garcia, Management Analyst

ATTACHMENTS:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>minutes</td>
<td>Backup Material</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The regular meeting convened at 3:30PM on August 12, 2020 via teleconference at https://bit.ly/3gDRdQ6. Webinar ID: 973-8589-0952. To participate by phone: call in number 833-548-0276. Password: 408310. Public comment was allowed via the conference call number or the “ask a question” function on the video conference option; no in-person input was allowed.

**Committee Member(s) in Attendance:** PJ Stevens, Chair; Brian Robinson; Stuart Garner; Jen Henderson; Brian Ortego; Tracy Dubcak

**Committee Member(s) Absent:** Philip Wanke

**Staff Present:** Andreina Dávila-Quintero, Current Planning Manager; Mirna Garcia, Management Analyst; Sofia Nelson, Planning Director; Steve McKeown, Landscape Planner; Ethan Harwell, Senior Planner

Meeting called to order at 3:30 P.M.

**Regular Session**

A. Discussion on how the Unified Development Code Advisory Committee virtual conference will be conducted, to include options for public comments and how the public may address the Commission – Sofia Nelson, CNU-A, Planning Director

B. On a subject not posted on the agenda: Persons may add an item to a future Board agenda by filing a written request with the Staff Liaison no later than one week prior to the Board meeting. The request must include the speaker’s name and the specific topic to be addressed with sufficient information to inform the board and the public. For Board Liaison contact information, please log on to http://government.georgetown.org/category/boards-commissions/.

**Legislative Regular Agenda**

C. Consideration and possible action to approve the minutes of the December 4, 2019 and July 8, 2020 regular meeting of the Unified Development Code Advisory Committee. – Mirna Garcia, Management Analyst

**Motion to approve the minutes of the December 4, 2019 meeting by Henderson. Second by Dubcak. Motion to approve the minutes of the July 8, 2020 meeting by Henderson. Second by Robinson. Approved (6-0).**
D. Update on the Unified Development Code (UDC) amendment process, and the 2020 UDC Annual Review Plan, Schedule and Next Steps. – Andreina Davila-Quintero, AICP, Current Planning Manager

The purpose of this item is to discuss the Unified Development Code (UDC) amendment process and provide an update on the UDC Annual Review Plan, tentative schedule and next steps. In addition, City Staff and members of the UDCAC will discuss the tasks identified at the previous meeting, as well as new tasks to be completed for the next meeting. Feedback and information received on each task will be incorporated when related UDC topics are scheduled and presented for discussion.

Staff seek the Committee’s feedback regarding the applicable sections of the UDC. It is helpful if the Committee members visit sites/areas of the City to see the impact of standards, review old cases, and bring back ideas and possible solutions to share with the Committee and staff for the next meeting.

E. Presentation and Discussion on proposed amendments to the Unified Development Code related to tree preservation and landscaping standards - Andreina Davila-Quintero, AICP, Current Planning Manager

The purpose of this item is to provide an overview of the current ordinances related to tree preservation and landscape standards, identify issues and/or opportunities for improvements, and to overview focus areas for discussion over the review cycle.

Next steps include:
- Review of issues related to:
  - tree preservation and mitigation
    - exclusion of ornamental trees
    - lack of guidance on DBH measurement
    - tree mitigation options
    - boundaries for calculating protected and heritage trees on site additions, floodplain
    - priority of tree protection over certain site design elements
    - address issues with tree preservation/disease control
  - Streetyards, gateways and parking
    - conflicts between signage, utilities and easements, and landscape requirements
    - applicability of Gateway landscape requirements (and how these relate to other landscape requirements)
    - street yard requirements, particularly for projects with buildings at great distance from the road and/or phased projects
    - landscape requirements for inventory lots related to an auto sales use
    - use of artificial turf for single-family residential
  - Screening, buffering and water conservation
    - Screening requirements for alternative waste containers
- Review of current nonresidential landscaping requirements with regard to the City’s water conservation efforts

Staff seek the Committee’s feedback on UDC landscape requirements and identify areas of concern or interest. In addition, staff ask the Committee to observe existing landscapes throughout the city, especially in gateways and provide comments for the next meeting on Chapter 8 and potential solutions or discussion points.

Adjournment

Motion to adjourn by Stevens. Second by Garner. Meeting adjourned at 4:39 p.m.

____________________________________  __________________________________
PJ Stevens, Attest  Attest,
SUBJECT:
Discussion and possible direction on proposed amendments to the Tree Preservation and Landscaping standards of the Unified Development Code (UDC) particularly as it relates to tree preservation, removal and mitigation (UDC General Amendment No. 20-03) -- Steve McKeown, Landscape Planner

ITEM SUMMARY:
On July 14, 2020, the City Council directed staff to review the City’s tree preservation and landscaping standards as a part of the 2020 UDC Annual Review Cycle. The purpose of these revisions is to address ambiguity, conflicts with other code sections, and challenges found in its implementation on several development projects. Tree Preservation standards are part of the City’s development standards for subdivisions and development of property. Landscaping standards as part of the City’s zoning standards for development of property.

Relevant sections of the UDC include, but are not limited to:
- Section 4.11, Gateway Overlay Districts
- Section 8.02, Tree Preservation & Protection
- Section 8.03, Residential Landscaping
- Section 8.04, Non-Residential Landscape Requirements
- Section 8.05, Review & Approval Process
- Section 8.06, Plant Selection, Installation, & Maintenance
- Section 11.04, Stormwater Management System Requirements
- Section 16.02, Definitions

The purpose of this item is to specifically discuss the issues identified related to tree preservation, removal and mitigation including but not limited to:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tree Preservation, Removal and Mitigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Issue No.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TP.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TP.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TP.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TP.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TP.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TP.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TP.07</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Consider prioritizing the preservation of protected trees to allow flexibility in site design elements (i.e. parking layout, monument sign location)  

Consider establishing boundaries for calculating protected and heritage trees on projects (i.e. floodplain, ROW, Limit of Construction, Overall project, Phase or Section specific)  

Consider requiring additional information on the health of a protected and heritage tree to address disease control issues as it relates to tree preservation  

Consider additional options for tree mitigation  

Consider altering the situations in which required landscaping trees can be removed – specifically related to signage  

In addition, we will identify possible solutions to address each issue, obtain direction on possible code language based on the solutions identified, and what public outreach or additional information is needed to make a recommendation on proposed amendments. The remaining items pertaining to Streetyard, Gateway and Parking, and Screening, Bufferyard and Water Conservation will be addressed at the next two meetings.

**FINANCIAL IMPACT:**
None studied at this time.

**SUBMITTED BY:**
Ethan Harwell, Senior Planner

**ATTACHMENTS:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Presentation</td>
<td>Presentation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Tree Preservation, Mitigation, & Removal/Pruning
Adjustments and Clean-up

UDC Advisory Committee
September 9, 2020
Purpose

• Review and discuss issues and possible solutions to address conflicts, ambiguity, and alternative standards relating to tree preservation, removal and mitigation.
Agenda

• Review list of issues submitted by UDCAC, Public
• Discussion Tree Preservation Issues
  • Identify new issues
  • Discuss the issues
    • What we are trying to resolve
    • Background on how we got here
    • What we can do to resolve the issue
  • Validate solutions and direction to draft Ordinance
• Next Steps
UDC Annual Review Process

Topics are introduced by City Staff & Public

City Council discussion, P&Z recommends list of amendments

City Council reviews & approves topics to be amended.

UDCAC and City Staff begin to prepare draft amendments

Public Outreach

UDCAC, P&Z Make Recommendation

Council Approval

5/26 06/16 07/14 08/2020

Given the COVID-19 pandemic the UDC Advisory Committee has not been meeting and have not been included in the review of the annual list of amendments.
# Issues Submitted

## Tree Preservation, Removal, and Mitigation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue No.</th>
<th>Relevant UDC</th>
<th>Issues</th>
<th>Requestor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TP01</td>
<td>8.02.020</td>
<td>Consider establishing a threshold for identifying which multi-trunk trees must be included on a survey based on the DBH of the largest trunk</td>
<td>UDCAC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TP02</td>
<td>16.02</td>
<td>Add a definition for tree branch and tree trunk</td>
<td>UDCAC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TP03</td>
<td>16.02</td>
<td>Add a definition for “hardwood” and “softwood” trees as some might have different interpretations</td>
<td>UDCAC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TP04</td>
<td>8.02.020</td>
<td>Exclude all cedar (ash-juniper and mountain cedar) trees from the protected trees definition.</td>
<td>UDCAC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TP05</td>
<td>8.02.020</td>
<td>Consider excluding ornamental trees from the definition of protected trees.</td>
<td>UDCAC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TP06</td>
<td>8.02.030, 8.02.040, 8.06.040, 3.23</td>
<td>Clarify applicability of City approval for the removal of protected trees within a right-of-way or public utility easement and assessment of mitigation fees.</td>
<td>Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TP07</td>
<td>8.05</td>
<td>Consider requiring a Tree Inventory for new projects and phased projects whose surveys need to be update after 5 and 10 years.</td>
<td>Staff</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Tree Preservation, Removal, and Mitigation, cont’d.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue No.</th>
<th>Relevant UDC</th>
<th>Issues</th>
<th>Requestor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TP08</td>
<td>8.02.050</td>
<td>Consider prioritizing the preservation of protected trees to allow flexibility in site design elements (i.e. parking layout, monument sign location).</td>
<td>Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TP09</td>
<td>8.04.040, 8.05</td>
<td>Consider establishing boundaries for calculating protected and heritage trees on projects (i.e. floodplain, ROW, Limit of Construction, Phase or Section specific)</td>
<td>Staff, Public</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TP10</td>
<td>New, 8.02, 8.05</td>
<td>Consider requiring additional information on the health of a protected and heritage tree to address disease control issues as it relates to tree preservation.</td>
<td>Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TP11</td>
<td>8.02.040</td>
<td>Consider additional options for tree mitigation.</td>
<td>Staff, Public</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TP12</td>
<td>8.06.060</td>
<td>Consider altering the situations in which required landscaping trees can be removed – specifically related to signage.</td>
<td>Staff</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Streetyards, Gateways and Parking

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue No.</th>
<th>Relevant UDC</th>
<th>Issues</th>
<th>Requestor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SY.1</td>
<td>8.03.030</td>
<td>Use of artificial turf for single-family residential</td>
<td>Public</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SY.2</td>
<td>8.04.030</td>
<td>Street yard requirements, particularly for projects with buildings at great distance from the road and/or phased projects</td>
<td>Public</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SY.3</td>
<td>4.11, 8.04.030, 8.04.050</td>
<td>Applicability of Gateway landscape requirements (and how these relate to other landscape requirements)</td>
<td>Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SY.4</td>
<td>8.04.040</td>
<td>Landscape requirements for inventory lots related to an auto sales use</td>
<td>Staff, Public</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SY.5</td>
<td>8.05, 8.06, 10, 13.03</td>
<td>Conflicts between signage, utilities and easements, and landscape requirements</td>
<td>Staff, UDCAC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Screening, Buffering, & Water Conservation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue No.</th>
<th>Relevant UDC</th>
<th>Issues</th>
<th>Requestor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SBW.1</td>
<td>8.04.070</td>
<td>Screening requirements for alternative waste containers</td>
<td>Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SBW.2</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>Review current nonresidential landscaping requirements with regard to the city’s water conservation efforts</td>
<td>Public, UDCAC, P&amp;Z</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Tree Preservation, Removal and Mitigation

• New issues that we have not identified?
Tree Ordinance Purpose & Essential Terms

• **Purpose:**
  • Adopted February 13th 2007, with the intent to provide environmental protection within the City’s jurisdiction through the protection of natural and ecological resources essential to the City’s health and community character.
Tree Ordinance Purpose & Essential Terms

• **Chapter 8 Essential Terms:**
  - **Residential:** Single-family & Two-family
  - **Non-residential:** All other uses
  - **Exempt Properties:** Single & Two-family lots platted prior to Feb 13, 2007
  - **Diameter Breast Height (DBH):** A tree measurement at four and one-half feet above ground
  - **Critical Root Zone (CRZ):** Circular region measured outward from the tree trunk identifying the essential root area that must be protected
  - **Protected Tree:** 12” - >26”, non-excluded species
  - **Heritage Tree:** 26”+, Varieties of Oak, Pecan, Walnut, Bald Cypress, Am. Elm, Cedar Elm, Texas Ashe, Southern Magnolia
  - **Credit Tree:** 6” – >12”, non-excluded species
  - **Excluded Species:** Hackberry, Chinaberry, Ashe Juniper (cedar), Chinese Tallow, Mesquite
ISA Regulated DBH Measurement Std.
**TP.01 – Multi-trunk Tree DBH Threshold**

**Issue:**
Consider establishing a threshold for identifying which multi-trunk trees must be included on a survey based on the DBH of the largest trunk.

**Possible Solutions:**
1. Continue current practices.
2. Establish scale based on number of trunks and the size of the largest trunk that could easily facilitate the process to ID these trees, but require a certified arborist to complete surveys.
3. Educational materials to explain and facilitate the tree survey process.

**Background:**
- No minimum DBH threshold established for what must be measured.
- UDC measurement practices are consistent with the industry standard.

**UDC Sections Affected:**
8.02.020
ISA Regulated DBH Measurement Std.
**TP.02 – Trunks, Branches, & Stems**

**Issue:**
Consider adding a definition for tree branch and tree trunk.

**Background:**
- Standard definitions from the International Society of Arboriculture

**Possible Solutions:**

1. **Trunk**
   a. The main woody stem of a tree, from which its branches grow.
   b. The main woody part of a tree beginning at the ground and extending up into the canopy from which primary branches grow.

2. **Primary Branches** - Branches attached directly to the trunk.

3. **Branch**
   a. A secondary shoot or stem arising from the main stem of a trunk.
   b. A stem arising from a larger stem; a subdominant or subordinate stem; the pith in true branches has no connection to the parent stem.

4. **Stem** - Slender woody structure bearing foliage and buds that gives rise to other stems.

**UDC Sections Affected:**
16.02
**TP.03 – Hardwoods vs. Softwoods**

**Issue:**
Consider adding a definition for “hardwood” and “softwood” trees as some might have different interpretations.

**Background:**
- “Hardwood” and “softwoods” are not referenced in the UDC.
- Protected Trees are not restricted to certain species, but Heritage Trees are determined by species.

**Possible Solutions:**
1. Maintain current definition of Heritage Trees which designates by species.
   - Varieties of Oak:
     - Live, Post, Shumard, Bur, Chinquapin, Monterey
   - Bald Cypress
   - American Elm
   - Cedar Elm
   - Pecan
   - Walnut
   - Texas Ash
   - Southern Magnolia.
2. Consider expanding Heritage Tree species list

**UDC Sections Affected:**
16.02, 8.02.020, 8.02.030
**TP.04 – Tree Species Excluded**

**Issue:**
Exclude all cedar (ash-juniper and mountain cedar) trees from the protected trees definition.

**Possible Solutions:**
1. Maintain current UDC list of excluded trees. These include:
   - Hackberry
   - Chinaberry
   - **Ashe Juniper (cedar)**
   - Chinese Tallow
   - Mesquite

**Background:**
- Cedar trees are not considered protected trees.
- This is a standard practice in Central Texas.

**UDC Sections Affected:**
8.02.020
TP.05 – Ornamental Trees as Protected Trees

**Issue:**
Consider excluding ornamental trees from the definition of protected trees.

**Possible Solutions:**
1. Continue to include ornamental trees in the definition of protected trees to allow them to be credited toward mitigation when site appropriate.
2. Exclude only ornamental trees identified under Georgetown’s ‘Preferred Plant List’ as Prohibited species.

**Background:**
- All trees greater than 12 inches in DBH, including ornamental trees, are considered protected trees.
- In review of other cities it is not standard to consider the classification of a tree to determine if it is Protected or Heritage.

**UDC Sections Affected:**
8.02.020
**TP.06 – Removals of Trees within a ROW or PUE**

**Issue:**
Clarify applicability of City approval for the removal of protected trees within a right-of-way or public utility easement and assessment of mitigation fees.

**Background:**
- City approval is required to remove Heritage Trees from a City right-of-way and public utility easements.
- Current UDC is silent on the procedures for removal of Protected Trees in the ROW. Currently, can be processed through SDP or CON plan.

**Possible Solutions:**
1. Add language to address the removal of Protected Trees for utility work. This may include:
   - Making a recommendation that removal should be allowed for Protected Trees (current process)
   - Making a recommendation that removal should be allowed for Protected Trees and mitigation fees assessed.
   - Making a recommendation that stand tree protection practices should be observed around Protected Trees

**UDC Sections Affected:**
8.02.030, 8.02.040, 8.06.040, 3.23
**TP.07 – Tree Inventory Option**

**Issue:**
Consider requiring a Tree Inventory for new projects and phased projects whose surveys need to be update after 5 and 10 years.

**Background:**
- Only a Tree Survey is required on applications. This only includes information on the location, size, species, and status of each tree.
- Currently, every 5 and 10 years a survey is required to update only tree sizes.
- Existing phased projects are beginning to experience tree health decline which affects previously established tree preservation requirements.

**Possible Solutions:**
1. Require a Tree Inventory in lieu of a Tree Survey. This would allow for a better understanding of:
   - The health of a tree
   - Canopy cover
   - Site feasibility
   - Disease hotspots in the City
   - The tree’s aesthetic and environmental value
   - Requests for removals
2. On long term multi-phase projects require a tree inventory to verify health of all trees originally identified as protected (i.e. Credit, Protected, & Heritage)

**UDC Sections Affected:**
8.05
**TP.08 – Tree Protection as a Priority**

**Issue:**
Consider prioritizing the preservation of protected trees to allow flexibility in site design elements (i.e. parking layout, monument sign location). Clarify the existing process for Heritage Trees.

**Possible Solutions:**
1. Clean up Heritage Tree Priority Determination process to allow to be processed as an Administrative Exception. Current UDC provision is unclear on the process and review authority.
2. Protected Trees over 20” could take priority over site features, site layout, and building design. Triggers may be determined by DBH size and groves of protected.
3. Incentives:
   a. Square inch of canopy to square foot impervious cover. (Must meet approved installation specifications)
   b. Allowing of overlap between streetyard and gateway requirement (i.e. 20-25 inch protected, or grove of protected trees count toward gateway requirement)

**Background:**
- Preservation of heritage trees take priority over conflicting UDC development standards (i.e. setbacks, sidewalks, signage, parking, drainage criteria, etc).
- Protected Trees may take priority over the design and construction of public sidewalks.

**UDC Sections Affected:**
3.16, 8.02.050
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>TP.09 – Project Boundaries for Tree Preservation</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Issue:</strong> Consider establishing boundaries for calculating protected and heritage trees on projects (i.e. floodplain, ROW, Limit of Construction, Phase or Section specific)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Possible Solutions:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Exclude trees located within the 100-year floodplain from Credit Tree calculations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Evaluate tree removal criteria to consider areas along existing and proposed roadways. Determine whether or not these trees should be considered toward mitigation credits.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Limit only trees located within the Limit of Construction (LOC) to be included in tree preservation and mitigation calculations, when the project boundary is larger than the LOC.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Phased projects are required to meet tree preservation and mitigation calculations independently per phase.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Background:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Boundaries may be determined by the project or property line.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Leander prohibits the counting of trees within the floodplain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>UDC Sections Affected:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.05.010, 8.05.020</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## TP.10 – Information on Tree Health

**Issue:**
Consider requiring additional information on the health of a protected and heritage tree to address disease control issues as it relates to tree preservation.

**Background:**
- Currently, collected tree information does not include health of the tree.
- Generally considered an industry best practice

**Possible Solutions:**
1. Consider a scalable requirement for providing additional information based on:
   - Acreage, lot size, project type, tree density
   - Residential, Commercial
   - Location within the subdivision (e.g. public parkland, along trails)
   - Negotiated agreements
2. Include a requirement for a geo-referenced CAD file of tree survey required to be submitted with all projects (if applicable).
3. Trees on-site identified with Oak Wilt are required to be evaluated for survivability, impact to surrounding trees, and properly handled in accordance with ISA disease control standards.

**UDC Sections Affected:**
8.05.010
TP.11 – Tree Mitigation Options

**Issue:**
Consider additional options for tree mitigation.

**Background:**
Current options include:
- On-site replacement
- Fee-in-lieu
- Aeration & Fertilization
- Off-site replacements (not commonly used)

**Possible Solutions:**
1. Divide Protected Trees into two classes for the mitigation & reevaluate fees. Revaluate Heritage Tree mitigation fees.
2. Increase ratio at which trees are replaced on site by inch. Currently at 2:1.
3. Revise administrative process to allow removals over min. percentages of trees to remain. Consider additional fees for these removals.
4. Encourage more on-site mitigation in residential subdivisions. Planting in common spaces maintained by an HOA or other community organization or in residential streetyards.
5. Allow developers to pay mitigation fees in advance, issue reimbursement for fees after on-site plants are installed/inspected.

**UDC Sections Affected:**
8.02.040

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Avg. Tree Density</th>
<th>Min. % of Protected Trees to be Saved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-10 Trees per Acre</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11+ Trees per Acre</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## TP.12 – Tree Mitigation Options

### Issue:
Consider altering the situations in which required landscaping trees can be removed – specifically related to signage.

### Background:
Current code allows for trees to be removed in four situations, including “[when] blocking existing signage”.

### Possible Solutions:
1. Remove and replace with a tree that will reach a similar size as the removed tree in the same general area.

### UDC Sections Affected:
8.02.040
### TP.X – ?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue:</th>
<th>Possible Solutions:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Background:

#### UDC Sections Affected:
UDC Annual Review Process

Given the COVID-19 pandemic the UDC Advisory Committee has not been meeting and has not been included in the review of the annual list of amendments.
Next Steps

UDCAC and City Staff begin to prepare draft amendments.

- Confirm direction on tree preservation, removals, and mitigation
- Discuss Streetyards, Gateways, & Parking

9/9

- Confirm direction on Streetyards, Gateways, & Parking
- Discuss Screening, Buffering, & Water Conservation

10/6

- Confirm direction on Screening, Buffering, & Water Conservation
- Discuss Group Homes, Signage, UDC/IFC Conflicts on Street Sections

- Confirm direction on Group Homes, Signage, UDC/IFC Conflicts on Street Sections
- Review Draft Ordinance, Public Outreach Efforts
Call to Action (Homework)

• Review UDC landscape requirements and identify areas of concern or interest
• Observe existing landscapes as you move around the city – especially in gateways
• Bring with you to our next meeting:
  • Comments on Chapter 8 (section specific)
  • Potential solutions or discussion points
Requested Feedback

• What additional information/resources do you need for the next meeting?
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