Hi Mona,

As you know we work in a number of different jurisdictions which all have different tree preservation requirements ranging from the ability to remove virtually all the trees on a site with an obligation to replace the removed trees at certain ratios to retaining a fixed number of trees. The jurisdictions to some degree also define significant trees differently.

Snohomish County’s tree regulations are found in SCC30.25.016 and generally all trees that are not located in critical areas and their buffers or in required open space/recreation tracts can be removed but they must be replaced in accordance with a tree replacement schedule. Snohomish County’s goal is to re-establish a tree canopy after development recognizing that it can be impractical to save trees in higher density urban developments. Snohomish County does not count alders of any diameter as a significant tree.

Kirkland is another jurisdiction that focuses on re-establishing tree canopies rather than trying to save a fixed number of trees on each site. They try to encourage the retention of “high value” trees, which are trees located in building setback areas, but these trees can be removed if the trees’ no disturbance zone adversely affects that ability to place a home on a lot. However, Kirkland requires that a certain tree density is met on every lot which can be achieved by either the retention of existing trees or the planting of new trees and more weight is given to larger trees. Kirkland, to my knowledge is also the only local jurisdiction looks at the no disturbance zone around a tree rather than the drip line. This is an area that may be within the drip line within which area soil disturbance can occur without damaging the tree. This area is defined by an arborist in the arborist’s report. Although Kirkland is the only jurisdiction that has codified this definition this no disturbance zone is recognized in all of the local jurisdictions.

King County, Bellevue, Redmond and Sammamish all require a minimum number of trees be retained on sight. The retention requirements range from 5% or 10 trees /ac, which is greater in King County to 35% of healthy trees in Redmond to 25% of all trees in Sammamish. Bellevue goes a slightly different direction by requiring a retention of 30% of diameter inches of healthy trees with a 50% reduction in the diameter inches of alder and cottonwood trees. The effect of Bellevue’s retention requirement is to save larger trees.

If any change is made to Sammamish’s tree retention ordinance it should look at only healthy trees while maintaining a retention of 25% to 30% of healthy trees on site.
From: Mona Davis [mailto:mdavis@sammamish.us]
Sent: Tuesday, August 05, 2014 4:26 PM
To: Mike Miller
Subject: RE: tree retention

Hi, Mike...
At this point, I’m just soliciting comments. Haven’t had a chance to start a draft ordinance. I think we’ll wait for further direction from the Planning Commission/City Council.
Thanks!
Mona

From: Mike Miller [mailto:MikeM@murrayfranklyn.com]
Sent: Wednesday, July 30, 2014 10:35 AM
To: Mona Davis
Subject: RE: tree retention

Hi Mona, I will get something to you next week. Do you have a draft ordinance you’re working on or are you just soliciting comments at this point?

Mike Miller
Murray Franklyn Family of Companies
14410 Bel-Red Rd
Bellevue, WA 98007
Office 425-649-8129
Cell 206-369-2289
Murray Franklyn

From: Mona Davis [mailto:mdavis@sammamish.us]
Sent: Monday, July 21, 2014 4:38 PM
To: Mike Miller
Subject: RE: tree retention

Hi, Mike...following up with you to see if you ever had a chance to put your comments in writing on tree retention? I’m presenting this to Planning Commission in September. September looks to be a busy month! 😊
Thanks!
Mona

From: Mona Davis
Sent: Monday, May 12, 2014 2:22 PM
To: 'mikem@murrayfranklyn.com'
Subject: tree retention

Hi, Mike...when you receive this e-mail, a welcome back is probably in order from your vacation! Hope you had a great time!

You and I discussed tree retention briefly on the telephone one afternoon, but I’d also like to capture your comments in writing. I sent an e-mail out a few weeks back and am sending out to you again in hopes to obtain your written comments upon your return.

The City of Sammamish is beginning review and update of the code requirements relating to tree retention. As directed by the City Council, review of the regulations will include the standards for
significant trees retained in new developments, incentives, replanting, penalties, and tree retention for existing single-family lots.

City staff appreciates your input on our current regulations in the Sammamish Municipal Code (SMC) and would like to obtain input from developers and/or consulting firms that regularly work in our City and are familiar with the tree retention requirements in SMC Chapter 21A.35.210.

Do you have any comments pertaining to what is currently in place for tree retention? Do you have recommendations to improve the current code? What should the tree retention requirements be for new developments?

The input received will inform the materials presented to the planning commission later this year. If you are interested in participating in the process and receiving updates, be sure to sign up for “e-mail alerts”. Your comments and participation at future meetings are appreciated. For more information, contact Senior Planner Mona Davis at TreeRetention@sammamish.us. As available, more information and updates will be posted to the tree retention web page.

Mona Davis, Senior Planner
City of Sammamish
Community Development Department
801 228th Avenue SE
Sammamish, WA 98075
Direct: 425-295-0529
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