

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 Edits

Last updated: 04/28/20

TIP	Suggested Edits	Resolved ?
<p>103: Site Plan Requirements (last updated 3/12/20) http://www.seattle.gov/DPD/Publications/CAM/cam103.pdf</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) 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. 2) 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. 3) 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”. 	
<p>103A: Site Plan Guidelines (last updated 2/29/19) http://www.seattle.gov/DPD/Publications/CAM/cam103A.pdf</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) This TIP is a place to help direct people on how to measure DSH 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>103B: Environmentally Critical Area Site Plan Requirements (last updated 2/29/19)</p>	<p>None</p>	

TIP	Suggested Edits	Resolved ?
http://www.seattle.gov/DPD/Publications/CAM/cam103B.pdf		
<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>2) In the first paragraph, the coma should be a period so it reads “Seattle Municipal Code (SMC) 25.11”</p> <p>3) 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>4) 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.</p> <p>5) In the first paragraph, under IDENTIFYING TREE TYPES ON YOUR PROPERTY, suggest that the wording be updated to stated that “in some circumstances, to hire an ISA certified arborist with experience ..”.</p> <p>6) 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 this clear and suggests that a homeowner can state that the tree is in poor health.</p> <p>7) 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</p>	

TIP	Suggested Edits	Resolved ?
	<p>definition of “qualified professional” as included in TIP 331B should be included in this TIP.</p> <p>8) Under PROTECTION OF TREES AND EXCEPTIONAL TREES DURING DEVELOPMENT, the meaning of this 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 statement. “In all zones, trees that are not to be removed must be protected as needed to ensure their survival during construction, specifically those trees being retained and used to receive development credit for retention.”</p> <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>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 date.</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.</p>	
<p>316: Subject-to-Field-Inspection Permits (last updated 6/11/19)</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</p>	

TIP	Suggested Edits	Resolved ?
http://www.seattle.gov/DPD/Publications/CAM/cam316.pdf	<p>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>321: Rockeries: Prescriptive Design and Installation Standards</p>	<p>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.</p>	
<p>331: Environmentally Critical Areas: Tree & Vegetation Overview (last updated 6/30/14) http://www.seattle.gov/DPD/Publications/CAM/cam331.pdf</p>	<p>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.</p> <p>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”.</p> <p>3) Table 1, note 3 misspelled “require”.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>	
<p>331A: Environmentally Critical Areas: Vegetation Restoration (last updated 2/28/07)</p>	<p>None</p>	

TIP	Suggested Edits	Resolved ?
http://www.seattle.gov/DPD/Publications/CAM/cam331a.pdf		
331B: Hazard Trees (last updated 2/28/20) http://www.seattle.gov/DPD/Publications/CAM/cam331b.pdf	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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. 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	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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. 	