

MATERIAL PREPARED FOR DISCUSSION BY THE URBAN FORESTRY COMMISSION. THIS DELIBERATIVE DOCUMENT DOES NOT REFLECT THE OPINION OF THE URBAN FORESTRY COMMISSION AND MAY OR MAY NOT MOVE FORWARD TO VOTE.

SDCI TIP Observations
Last updated: 6-10-20

TIP	OBSERVATIONS
<p>101: Getting a Single-Family Building Permit from SDCI (last updated 01/07/19) http://www.seattle.gov/DPD/Publications/CAM/cam101.pdf</p>	<p>1) Don't see any reference to the tree planting or protection requirement. Suggest adding reference to SMC 25.11 under "CODES TO HELP WITH SINGLE-FAMILY APPLICATIONS" and TIP 242 under "TIPS TO HELP WITH SINGLE-FAMILY APPLICATIONS".</p>
<p>103: Site Plan Requirements (last updated 3/12/20) http://www.seattle.gov/DPD/Publications/CAM/cam103.pdf</p>	<p>1) Item 18 on page 2 discusses when trees should be included in site plans and states it is only needed if SMC 25.11 applies. This caveat of when trees should or should not be included in the site plans is confusing. SMC 25.11 gives exemptions that includes times when we assume trees will need to be catalogued such as when trees removed as "part of an issued building or grading permit as provided in...". Documenting and cataloguing trees is critical. Suggest eliminating the text "For projects subject to the provisions of SMC Chapter 25.11, Tree Protection". Including trees early on in site plans will help reviewers and applicants understand what code requirements apply to the site. There are multiple references in the code when trees need to be identified for consideration/ review such as under SMC 23.22.020.A.18, 23.22.020.A.20, 23.22.054.A, 23.24.020.f, and 23.24.040.A.7. The retention of trees seems to be deemphasized or ignored even though it is called for in the code.</p> <p>2) Though site trees are listed in the text as item 18, none of the "Checklist" items on the example plans show an example of how to call out a tree on a site plan. Similar to calling for building identifiers in item 12, we suggest calling for tree identifiers. Perhaps the tree information should be given in table form also for ease of reviewers and input. By not including an example, non-standardized versions of the information can be submitted. The staff doing test runs of the input into Accela may be able to say if there is a prefer way for this information to be depicted. Also, by calling the elements depicted next to Figure 1 through 3 "Checklist" it could be construed that this is the checklist of items that need to be included in the different versions of the site plan. Even though more elements are called for in the text of the TIP, that may be confusing. Suggest changing the text from "Checklist" to "Plan Element" for the figures.</p> <p>3) TIP 242 says that the trees on adjacent properties that have canopy or roots extending into the project area needs to be included in the development application. Item 18 on page 2 only discusses trees on the property. Recommend adding text similar to TIP 242 to include adjacent trees that encroach into the parcel.</p> <p>4) There is a typo in the last sentence on Page 1, Section "What is a Site Plan?", last sentence of first paragraph. Assume "ton" should be "to".</p>
<p>103A: Site Plan Guidelines (last updated 2/29/19) http://www.seattle.gov/DPD/Publications/CAM/cam103A.pdf</p>	<p>1) This TIP could be a place to help direct people on how to measure DSH/DBH for existing trees as called for by TIP 103 as other information on how to measure plan elements are included. This information can be included as a reference in "STEP 2: Determine the location of all structures and other physical features to be shown on the site plan."</p>

TIP	OBSERVATIONS
<p>103B: Environmentally Critical Area Site Plan Requirements (last updated 2/29/19) http://www.seattle.gov/DPD/Publications/CAM/cam103B.pdf</p>	<p>None</p>
<p>220: Lot Coverage, Height, Yard, and Garage Standards for homes in Single Family Zones (last updated 4/24/12) http://www.seattle.gov/DPD/Publications/CAM/cam220.pdf</p>	<p>1) Under the section “Additional Information for Yard Requirements And Exceptions”, suggest adding reference to SMC Section 23.44.020 Tree Requirements as site element that will need to be worked into the layout of the site for new houses and alterations.</p>
<p>242: Tree Protection Regulations in Seattle (last updated 5/3/19) http://www.seattle.gov/DPD/Publications/CAM/cam242.pdf</p>	<p>1) In TIP 103, only the term DSH is used and not DBH. Using two terms under “CATEGORIES OF TREES AFFECTED”, may be confusing. If the term DSH is to be used then suggest that the definition be used consistently across all documentation (Director’s rules, ordinance, TIP).</p> <p>2) Under “CATEGORY OF TREES AFFECTED”, suggest adding “Significant trees” before the “trees over six inches in diameter” for clarity and to add a definition. The ordinance will need to also be updated to include this definition.</p> <p>3) Suggest adding the following text or something similar to the end of the definition of Hazardous trees under CATEGORY OF TREES AFFECTED: “as determined by a qualified professional”. The same definition of “qualified professional” as included in TIP 331B should be included in this TIP for consistency. The UFC is available to discuss this definition. As a general rule, using the same definition in the TIPs would be helpful to minimize confusion.</p> <p>4) In the first paragraph, under “IDENTIFYING TREE TYPES ON YOUR PROPERTY”, suggest that the wording be updated to state that “in some circumstances, to hire an ISA certified arborist with experience ..”.</p> <p>5) In the first paragraph, under “IDENTIFYING TREE TYPES ON YOUR PROPERTY”, tree health should be determined by an ISA certified arborist. If the owner is submitting documentation stating that a tree is in poor health, this declaration should be made with the backing of an ISA certified arborist. The language in the paragraph does not make it clear that the health of the tree must be determined by a ISA certified arborist and suggests that a homeowner can state that the tree is in poor health.</p> <p>6) In the second paragraph, under “IDENTIFYING TREE TYPES ON YOUR PROPERTY”, suggest changing the last sentence so it reads “through a risk assessment undertaken by a qualified professional”. The same definition of “qualified professional” as included in TIP 331B should be included in this TIP for consistency.</p> <p>7) Under the subheading “Developed Land” under “SUMMARY OF TREE PROTECTION CODE REQUIREMENTS” the sentence “SDCI approval (a permit) is required to remove an exceptional tree, tree(s) in environmental critical areas or more than three trees six inches or greater as noted above.” could be further clarified by</p> <p>8) Under “PROTECTION OF TREES AND EXCEPTIONAL TREES DURING DEVELOPMENT”, the meaning of the following sentence is unclear. “It is also required in any zone when trees are being retained, and the project is receiving credit for retention, are foreseeably within the area of construction and could be damaged by construction activity.” Suggested rewording the statement. “In all zones, trees that are not to be removed must be protected as needed to ensure their survival during construction, especially those trees being retained and used to receive development credit for retention.”</p>

TIP	OBSERVATIONS
	<p>9) In the second sentence under “SINGLE FAMILY ZONES”, suggest adding “from achieving the maximum allowed lot coverage <u>even after considering available development standard adjustment, departures, and code modification.</u>” This will reinforce the first sentence of the second paragraph.</p> <p>10) In the second paragraph under “SINGLE FAMILY ZONES” the sentence “Protection of non-exceptional trees over two feet in diameter is optional but encouraged and” is misleading. SMC 25.11.090 says the replacement of trees over 2-feet DBH is required. Suggest deleting this sentence.</p> <p>11) Under “Midrise and All Commercial Zones” the sentence “Protection of other non-exceptional trees over two feet in diameter is optional but encouraged and” is misleading. SMC 25.11.090 says the replacement of trees over 2-feet DBH is required. Suggest deleting this sentence. Also this goes against code language that calls for maximizing retention of existing trees.</p> <p>12) On Page 6 the second row in the table for lowrise and midrise zones is out of date. MHA legislation moved Landscaping/Tree Planting Regulations from SMC 23.45.015 to SMC 23.45.524. The legislation also moved Tree Protection Regulations. Suggest editing the last column of the third row to state “Ch. 25.11, specifically 25.11.070 for lowrise, 25.11.080 for midrise, and 25.11.090 for replacement.</p> <p>13) In the first paragraph, the coma should be a period so it reads “Seattle Municipal Code (SMC) 25.11”</p>
<p>303: Applicant Responsibilities and Plan Requirements for Single-Family and Two-Unit Dwellings (last updated 12/26/17) http://www.seattle.gov/DPD/Publications/CAM/cam303.pdf</p>	<p>1) To assist in the input of tree data into Accela, the coversheet referenced in the section below “PROVIDING PLANS AND COVERSHEETS” could be updated to include the data. A Tree Inventory Data Sheet for all projects will help consolidate and standardize the information.</p> <p>2) The coversheet could not be found from the given site address (http://www.seattle.gov/sdci/permits/forms). Instead found a copy here: http://www.seattle.gov/documents/Departments/SDCI/Forms/Coversheet.pdf</p>
<p>303A: Common Seattle Residential Code Requirements (last updated 5/22/17) http://www.seattle.gov/DPD/Publications/CAM/cam303A.pdf</p>	<p>1) Under TIP Section 9 “MISCELLANEOUS REQUIREMENTS”, suggest adding reference to the required trees for single family properties. References could include SMC 23.44.020, SMC 25.11, Director’s Rule 16-2008.</p>
<p>316: Subject-to-Field-Inspection Permits (last updated 6/11/19) http://www.seattle.gov/DPD/Publications/CAM/cam316.pdf</p>	<p>1) Under “Projects that Qualify for STFI Permits”, the first bullet is regarding demolition. Suggest including that the excavation will not encroach into the critical root zone of trees. If the excavation will encroach into a critical root zone, and the tree is exceptional, it will damage this tree that is to be protected. Additional review may be needed for demolition near trees.</p> <p>2) Under “Projects that Qualify for STFI Permits”, second page has a bullet regarding Rockeries. Similar to the demolition bullet, if the rockery is placed within the critical root zone of a tree, that tree could be damaged. Additional review may be needed for rockeries in this scenario.</p> <p>3) On page 2 under SITE PLAN, suggest adding the type of site plan that will be needed (preliminary, basic, or enhanced).</p> <p>4) Add discussion for impact of a rockery is going in near, or demolition is taking place close to, the critical root zone of a tree. (include in TIP 321 and 337)</p>

TIP	OBSERVATIONS
321: Rockeries: Prescriptive Design and Installation Standards (last updated 10/06/04) http://www.seattle.gov/DPD/Publications/CAM/cam321.pdf	1) Under the section “Location of Rockery”, suggest adding language stating that rockeries should not be installed within critical root zones of trees without consulting an ISA certified arborist.
331: Environmentally Critical Areas: Tree & Vegetation Overview (last updated 6/30/14) http://www.seattle.gov/DPD/Publications/CAM/cam331.pdf	1) Within the first paragraph suggest editing the sentence that begins “Consequently, the City of Seattle protects...” to the following. “Consequently, the City of Seattle has a higher level of protection for trees and vegetation..”. It may be construed that Seattle only protects trees within ECA areas. 2) Under “Normal and Routing Maintenance”, suggest adding “topping” in the last sentence of the first paragraph as actions that are not considered normal and routine maintenance. Also add reference to the “Clarification of Terms”. 3) Table 1, note 3 misspelled “require”. 4) In Table 1, unsure the intent of the two headings “Plan FILED with SDCI” versus “Plan REVIEWED by SDCI”. Looking at the noted sections, don’t understand when a plan would be filed but not reviewed by SDCI. 5) Suggest discussing with Staff whether the application form included should be updated to include information regarding trees for ease of data input into Accela. 6) Under “Tree and Vegetation Restoration Without a Building Permit” the phrase “...to promote a naturally function condition” is unclear. Suggest rephrasing to say “...to enhance conditions that prevent erosion...”
331A: Environmentally Critical Areas: Vegetation Restoration (last updated 2/28/07) http://www.seattle.gov/DPD/Publications/CAM/cam331a.pdf	None
331B: Hazard Trees (last updated 2/28/20) http://www.seattle.gov/DPD/Publications/CAM/cam331b.pdf	1) In the second paragraph suggest replacing “qualified tree risk assessor” with “qualified professional, see Clarification of Terms). Keeping terms consistent will help clarify the document. Include Tree Risk Assessment (TRAQ) qualification as part of the definition of “qualified professional” to avoid ambiguity. 2) Suggest adding “,if not replacing the tree.” to the last sentence of the paragraph above “Hazard Trees and Wildlife Habitat in ECAs and ECA Buffers”.
337: Demolition and Deconstruction (last updated 8/19/19) http://www.seattle.gov/DPD/Publications/CAM/cam337.pdf	1) Under the “Foundation Demolition” section, suggest adding text that allows the foundation within critical root zones to remain. The floor can be broken up, but this will help to not damage trees close to existing foundations.

SDCI would benefit from creating a document similar to SDOT’s Street Tree Manual. Such a manual would capture all tree related information in one place where people can easily access it. It will be important to increase awareness of such a document. An example would be to include tree preservation/protection information for home buyers through the MLS system.