



**SNOHOMISH
COUNTY**

CY 2018 TREE CANOPY REPORT
JANUARY 1, 2018 THROUGH DECEMBER 31, 2018

January 2019

Snohomish County Planning and Development Services

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The total amount of proposed 20-year tree canopy coverage required under County Code for CY 2018 is 1.68 million sq. ft. Since 2014, we have maintained 8,304,675 sq. ft. of tree canopy coverage. During this same time period, the retention of existing canopy has been 3,611,313 sq. ft., which is 43% of the total canopy coverage requirement. In calendar year 2018, every proposed landscape plan that was approved in met or exceeded the minimum 20-year tree canopy coverage required in SCC 30.25.016(3). This is nearly 222,000 sq. ft., or approximately 15% more, than required.

INTRODUCTION

On October 8, 2014, the Snohomish County Council adopted Amended Ordinance No. 14-073, effective October 27, 2014, modifying development standards for urban residential landscaping to regulate tree canopy requirements rather than individual trees. Included in Amended Ordinance No. 14-073 was a requirement for the Department of Planning and Development Services (PDS) to prepare an annual report on tree canopy. The purpose of the report is to summarize the outcomes from the updated tree canopy regulations on an annual basis to assess their effectiveness and to determine whether any adjustments or refinements should be considered. The report is required to be submitted to the County Council by January 31 of each year.

Per SCC 30.25.014, PDS is required to provide data on the following five topics for the applications it approved within the reporting period:

1. The number of applications exempted from tree canopy requirements by each of the exemptions in SCC 30.25.016(1).
2. The number of applications to which the tree canopy requirements are applied, subtotaled by type of application.
3. The number of applications using the Tree Survey method and the number using the Aerial Estimation method for estimating existing tree canopy (applicable when the retention of existing canopy is to be used – in whole or in part – to meet the requirements).
4. For each application to which the tree canopy requirements are applied:
 - a. The tree canopy required by Table 30.25.016(3) prior to any adjustments.
 - b. Any adjustments to the required tree canopy, the specific type of incentive or other adjustment, and the specific code authority for the adjustment.
 - c. The required tree canopy after all adjustments are made
 - d. The use and effect of applying any other incentives for tree retention.
 - e. The result of the calculation of existing canopy.
 - f. The canopy of trees retained.
 - g. The number of new trees planted.
 - h. The result of the calculation of 20-year canopy.
5. For every allowable type of adjustment, the total number of applications that used it and the total reduction in required tree canopy resulting from it.

METHODOLOGY

Because of the nature of monitoring and reporting, the methodology for data included in the report has evolved over the past five years. The next page contains a summary of how

report methodologies have changed since the first tree canopy monitoring report was prepared five years ago.

Report Title	Data Collection Method
2015 & 2016	Included data for proposed landscaping plans for <i>all</i> residential land use applications within the urban growth area that were either submitted or approved in the prior year.
2017 & 2018	Included only data from landscape plans for approved development activities that were subject to tree canopy regulations in SCC 30.25.016. Data collection time frames varied and generally included the previous year's approved landscape plans (but also included more than a 12 month timeframe)
CY2018	This report follows the same methodology as the 2017 and 2018 reports. The timeframe for data collection is now a calendar-year (CY), and the report title reflects this change.

Due to limited data availability, the first two reports included all submitted landscape plans for all residential land use development applications within the urban growth areas which were either submitted or approved in the prior year. The methodology was substantially revised for the 2017 report, which transitioned to only include approved landscaping plans. In order to capture the effects since the new tree canopy ordinance, the 2017 report included all landscaping plans that were approved from the effective date of Amended Ordinance No. 14-073 (November 1, 2014) through November 30, 2016. In total, the 2017 report included 61 landscaping plans. The 2018 report followed the same methodology and included a total of 58 landscaping plans, which were approved between December 1, 2016 through December 31, 2017.

In last years' 2018 report, PDS staff recommended transitioning to a calendar year (CY) reporting timeframe. This change creates a standardized 12-month reporting period going forward so that the information in each year's report can be more consistently compared over time. This CY 2018 report is the first report that reflects this recommendation. This CY 2018 report uses the same methodology as the 2017 and 2018 reports and includes information from 67 landscape plans that were components of development activity applications that were approved between January 1, 2018, through December 31, 2018. In order to understand the cumulative effects of the regulations, this report also includes information from the 2018 and 2017 tree canopy reports. Due to the revised methodology, information from reports produced prior to the 2017 report is not included, since these reports summarized data from landscaping plans that were merely submitted and would potentially double-count landscape plans that have since been approved.

BACKGROUND

The genesis for the updated 2014 tree canopy regulations was feedback from developers who, in designing projects under the 2009 tree retention regulations, identified a number of issues, including:

- Concerns about survivability of newly planted trees when planted in inappropriate locations or densities to meet the requirements;
- Costs to complete a survey of significant trees on forested parcels;

- Unavailability of off-site replanting areas within the immediate vicinity of many projects (allowed by code when there was insufficient area on-site for replacement trees); and
- Developers bypassing heavily forested sites due to the cost of complying with the 2009 tree retention regulations.

In addition, PDS staff hypothesized that, under the tree retention/replacement regulations, full build-out density of urban residential sites as prescribed by the Growth Management Act (GMA) Comprehensive Plan might not be feasible on some heavily forested parcels. This was noted as a potential conflict with the GMA goals and Puget Sound Regional Council's Vision 2040, which encourage development within UGAs to preserve rural and resource lands.

In 2014, PDS proposed amending the code to focus on the concept of preserving and expanding tree canopy rather than just on retaining and replacing individual trees. The staff proposal included incentives for retaining significant trees. Following Planning Commission review, extensive stakeholder outreach and participation, and several public hearings, the County Council adopted the code amendments in October 2014.

2014 TREE CANOPY REGULATIONS

Tree canopy regulations are contained in SCC 30.25.016. The regulations establish a minimum amount of tree canopy to be provided for each urban residential development on a sliding scale, depending on the type of residential construction (detached versus attached) and the number of lots or units (Table 1). Under this approach, a higher canopy percentage is required for single family than multiple family developments to account for a desire to increase density along transit corridors and to accommodate future population growth in an efficient manner.

Table 1. Tree Canopy Coverage Requirements (SCC 30.25.016(3))

Type of Development	Required 20-Year Tree Canopy Coverage (gross site area)
Subdivisions for Single Family Residential (10+ lots)	30%
Short Subdivisions for Single Family Residential (4 to 9 lots)	25%
Short Subdivisions for Single Family Residential (< 4 lots)	20%
Single Family Detached Units, Cottage Housing, Townhouse, Multi-family (10+ units)	20%
Single Family Detached Units, Cottage Housing, Townhouse, Multi-family (< 10 units)	15%
Urban Center (residential and mixed use projects only)	15%

These tree canopy requirements apply equally to sites which have existing canopy and those that do not, and they can be met through either tree retention or new planting, or a combination of both. This provision is an important change from the 2009 tree replacement regulations which only applied to sites with significant trees. This approach provides an opportunity to expand the urban tree canopy on redevelopment sites or sites that had been cleared in the past, particularly since urban residential sites already have a requirement to landscape 10 percent of the total gross site area, which could be utilized as space to plant trees.

Retaining significant trees remains an objective of the new regulations. Under the revised regulations, incentives exist to encourage developers to retain both individual significant trees and stands of significant trees. The revised regulations also maintain the previous requirements that significant trees in critical areas and perimeter landscaping be retained. The updated regulations now also address species mix, in particular encouraging more native trees to be planted to minimize disease and improve survivability. Finally, the regulations encourage planting the right tree in the right place to ensure long term survivability.

ANNUAL REPORT ON TREE CANOPY: FIVE REQUIREMENTS

The assessment of the five reporting requirements outlined in the Introduction section of this report is based on review of approved residential development activities that are subject to the tree canopy regulations in SCC 30.25.016. Each of the five specific reporting requirements is discussed in the following sections.

Report Requirement #1:

Number of Applications Exempt from Requirements

The following activities, which are listed in SCC 30.25.016(1), are exempt from the tree canopy requirements in SCC 30.25.016:

1. Removal of any hazardous, dead or diseased trees, and as necessary to remedy an immediate threat to person or property as determined by a letter from a qualified arborist;
2. Construction of a single-family dwelling, duplex, accessory or non-accessory storage structure on an individual lot created prior to April 21, 2009 or created by a subdivision or short subdivision for which a complete application was submitted prior to April 21, 2009;
3. Construction or maintenance of public or private road network elements, and public or private utilities including utility easements not related to development subject to chapter 30.23A, 30.34A, 30.41G or 30.42E SCC;
4. Construction or maintenance of public parks and trails when located within an urban residential zone; and
5. Pruning and maintenance of trees.

Since PDS does not issue a permit for pruning or for the removal of hazardous trees, there is currently no method to accurately track and report these two activities. Collecting data for the three remaining exempted activities is also very challenging because available permit data does not provide a means to track or report on these activities. As a result, no data has been collected for this or for any past reports. Development of a system to collect, monitor, and assess this information would be a major program effort.

Report Requirement #2:

Number and Type of Applications

During this reporting period (January 1, 2018 through December 31, 2018), a total of 67 development applications subject to the tree canopy regulations were approved. This CY 2018 report compares the 67 approved plans with data from previous reports.

Table 2 summarizes the number and type of applications that are subject to the tree canopy requirements in SCC 30.25.016. It should be noted that some of the townhouse applications also involved land subdivision pursuant to SCC 30.41A.205.

Table 2. Number and Type of Applications

Application Type	CY 2018 Report (12/17 – 12/18)	2018 Report (12/16 – 12/17)	2017 Report (11/14 – 11/16)
Subdivision (10+ lots)	18	10	18
Short Subdivision (4 – 9 lots)	14	7	10
Short Subdivision (< 4 lots)	8	2	3
Single Family Detached Units (10+ units)	7	11	12
Single Family Detached Units (<10 units)	6	8	7
Cottage Housing (10+ units)	0	0	0
Cottage Housing (< 10 units)	0	0	0
Townhouse (10+ units)	5	12	8
Townhouse (<10 units)	3	1	0
Multiple Family (10+ units)	3	2	2
Multiple Family (<10 units)	0	0	0
Urban Center (residential and mixed use only)	3	5	1
Total	67	58	61

Report Requirement #3:**Number of Applications Calculating the Retained Existing Tree Canopy**

Applicants that propose retaining a portion or all of their existing tree canopy to meet the canopy requirement have two options for calculating canopy coverage: tree survey method or the aerial estimation method. Under the tree survey method, the average 20-year canopy is calculated for each tree retained, whereas, under the aerial estimation method, an applicant can calculate the extent of the canopy by using a recent air photo. Table 3 shows the number of applications that used each specific method of requirements.

Table 3. Number of Applications by Method

Tree Canopy Estimation Method	CY 2018 Report (12/17 – 12/18)	2018 Report (12/16 – 12/17)	2017 Report (11/14 – 11/16)
Tree Survey	19	9	11
Aerial Estimation	11	13	22
Total	30	22	33

For this reporting period, 19 applications utilized the tree survey method while 11 applied the aerial estimation method. The remain 37 applications, or over half of those approved, proposed exclusively new tree canopy to meet the canopy requirements and therefore did not utilize a tree canopy estimation method for canopy retention. In several of those cases, the landscape plans indicated that some existing canopy and some significant trees were retained – often to meet other landscaping and retention requirements. However, this information is not included in the canopy calculations relied upon for this report.

The results from CY2018 differ from the 2018 and 2017 report. In previous years, the aerial estimation had been used more than the tree survey method. Past reports suggested that this was because the tree survey method was costlier to produce. In the CY2018 report, the tree survey method was used more often than the aerial estimation.

Due to the limited time span of reported years and the varying data, there is no definitive trend at this point.

Report Requirements #4 & #5:

Data for Each Application & Number and Results of Adjustments Used

These two reporting requirements require additional detailed information about each of the 67 applications approved during this reporting period. The specific data required for each application is enumerated below, and is provided in Attachment 1. Table 4 provides an aggregate overview for the data requirements listed below.

1. The tree canopy required by Table 30.25.016(3) prior to any adjustments;
2. Any adjustments to the required tree canopy, the specific type of incentive or other adjustment, and the specific code authority for the adjustment;
3. The required tree canopy after all adjustments;
4. The use and effect of applying any other incentives for tree retention;
5. The result of the calculation of existing canopy;
6. The canopy of trees retained;
7. The number of new trees planted; and
8. The result of the calculation of 20-year canopy.

Table 4. Aggregate Data for Approved Applications

Reporting Requirement		CY2018 Report (12/17 – 12/18)	2018 Report (12/16 – 12/17)	2017 Report (11/14 – 11/16)	Total (11/14 – 12/18)
Number of applications		67	58	61	186
Tree canopy required by code (sq. ft.)		1,464,513	1,721,248	3,559,525	6,745,286
Adjustments to canopy requirements (sq. ft.)		-15,560	-9,770	-9,562	-34,892
Existing Canopy Retained	Tree Survey (sq. ft.)	58,519	32,706	50,005	141,230
	Aerial Estimation (sq. ft.)	259,713	654,672	2,555,698	3,470,083
Total number of trees planted		4,297	5,417	6,219	15,933
Final 20-year tree canopy calculation (sq. ft.)		1,686,790	2,247,516	4,370,369	8,304,675

For this reporting period, a total of fifteen applications utilized canopy bonuses available for significant tree retention in SCC 30.25.016(5), compared from the seven bonuses used in the past year's report. The application of those bonuses had the effect of reducing the canopy requirements for those projects by an aggregate 15,560 sq. ft., or, on average, about 1,000 square feet per application.

Every proposed landscape plan that was approved in CY 2018 met or exceeded the minimum 20-year tree canopy coverage required in SCC 30.25.016(3). The total amount of proposed 20-year tree canopy coverage for CY2018 is 1.68 million sq. ft. This is nearly 222,000 sq. ft., or approximately 15% more, than required by code for CY2018. Twelve of the 67 landscape plans had at least five percentage points more canopy than necessary to meet their requirement. Of those twelve, three are satisfying their canopy requirement

entirely through retention of existing canopy (usually found predominantly within critical areas, where removal of trees is not permitted).

A total of 4,297 new trees are proposed to be planted, including trees planted to meet other landscaping requirements, such as parking lot landscaping and street trees. This is less than in previous years' reports, continuing a downward trend of total number of new trees planted. In many applications, those trees are not included in the canopy calculations (although they would be eligible) because of the species mix requirements applicable to canopy trees. For this reason, the actual tree canopy provided by urban residential development is often under-reported by the canopy calculations provided by the applicants and compiled into this report. Similarly, the actual retention of tree canopy and existing significant trees is under-reported and is often greater than is indicated by the canopy calculations. Since such retention is still required within perimeter landscaping and critical areas, there is often no tree survey performed in those areas where no land disturbance is planned.

As in last year's report, none of the projects sought a reduction in their canopy requirements as allowed for certain situations by subsections 30.25.016(8) and (9). This could suggest that the tree canopy requirements are not overly burdensome to applicants. In the future, the County may consider reviewing why the reductions have not been utilized as frequently, and whether or not they should be revised.

Overall, five projects are meeting their canopy requirements exclusively through retention of existing canopy. Thirty-six projects meet their requirements entirely through planting of new trees. The remaining twenty-six projects use a combination of canopy retention and new trees to meet the canopy requirements. This diversity of approach suggests that the regulations are flexible enough to accommodate different site conditions within the urban growth areas. It also indicates that the regulations are producing both canopy retention and new canopy creation within urban residential areas to help mitigate the inevitable loss of tree canopy from development on previously undeveloped urban sites.

Because pre-development tree canopy calculations are not required, except for projects and site areas where retention is used to meet the canopy requirements, it is not possible to measure the overall net change in the urban tree canopy using only the data available for these monitoring reports. Even if such canopy measurements were made, other factors, such as changes to landscaping after development approval despite requirements in code to retain proposed landscaping, would hamper efforts to accurately monitor changes in the overall canopy. As mentioned above, even at the project level the canopy calculations do not accurately reflect new canopy because they frequently exclude trees used to meet other landscaping requirements where species mix is not also required. The best tool for overall canopy monitoring remains the satellite imagery available from the federal government approximately every five years. New imagery is anticipated to be available in 2019.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR CALENDAR YEAR 2019 AND BEYOND

PDS staff intends to continue to refine administrative processes in an effort to make the documentation and review steps associated with the canopy regulations streamlined for both the customer and PDS staff. Staff has also explored ways to better utilize its permit tracking system (AMANDA) to complete the data collection and compilation processes required to complete this annual report. There is an opportunity for PDS staff to continue

improvements to promote efficiency in the collection of tree canopy calculations and the preparation of the annual report.

Staff are exploring the options to better streamline the methods for Tree Canopy Reports data reporting and collection.

In the future, PDS recommends continuing the transition to a calendar year reporting timeframe, which will create a standardized 12-month reporting period so that the information in each year's report can be more consistently compared over time.

Page Intentionally Left Blank

ATTACHMENT 1

Detailed Information by Application for Approvals from January 1, 2018 through December 31, 2018

Application	Tree Canopy Required	Reductions to the Required Canopy (per 30.25.016(8) or (9))	Code Authority for Reduction and Type	Required Tree Canopy After Adjustment	Required Tree Canopy Area After Adjustment (sq. ft.)	Use and Effect of Applying Incentives for Tree Retention (sq. ft. of bonus canopy)	Calculation of Existing Canopy to be Retained (% of site area)	Calculated Canopy of Trees Retained (including bonuses) (sq. ft.)	Number of New Trees Planted	20 Year Canopy Area Proposed	Total Tree Canopy Proposed
Aalseth	20%	0	N/A	20%	0	0	0%	6,750	0	6,750	23.9%
Alden Place	25%	0	N/A	25%	14,010	0	0%	-	38	14,010	25.1%
Allegro at Ash Creek Phase II	20%	0	N/A	20%	28,007	0	0%	-	122	28,007	23.0%
Bartlett Short Platt	25%	0	N/A	25%	10,560	0	0%	-	22	10,560	26.0%
Bellflower Woods I	30%	0	N/A	30%	46,350	843	3%	4,476	112	47,587	30.0%
Bellflower Woods II	30%	0	N/A	30%	42,690	167	1%	836	106	43,170	36.4%
Belmont Court SFDU	20%	0	N/A	20%	39,748	0	0%	-	124	39,748	20.7%
Belmont Court SFDU	20%	0	N/A	20%	39,748	0	0%	-	124	39,748	20.5%
Bind Road SFDU	15%	0	N/A	15%	2,400	0	0%	-	7	2,400	20.2%
Castlewood	30%	0	N/A	30%	28,910	0	0%	21,259	86	50,229	30.3%
Cold Creek 7th Ave. Condos	20%	0	N/A	20%	5,390	0	0%	-	26	5,390	20.3%
Coyote Trails	30%	0	N/A	30%	38,880	579	2%	3,006	98	41,886	32.0%
Deol Short Plat	25%	0	N/A	25%	13,957	0	0%	-	38	13,957	37.4%

Application	Tree Canopy Required	Reductions to the Required Canopy (per 30.25.016(8) or (9))	Code Authority for Reduction and Type	Required Tree Canopy After Adjustment	Required Tree Canopy Area After Adjustment (sq. ft.)	Use and Effect of Applying Incentives for Tree Retention (sq. ft. of bonus canopy)	Calculation of Existing Canopy to be Retained (% of site area)	Calculated Canopy of Trees Retained (including bonuses) (sq. ft.)	Number of New Trees Planted	20 Year Canopy Area Proposed	Total Tree Canopy Proposed
Eller SFDU	15%	0	N/A	15%	0	0	0%	-	0	2,089	17.1%
Fan SFDU	15%	0	N/A	15%	3,508	0	0%	1,511	16	3,508	18.3%
Funston Short Plat	20%	0	N/A	20%	3,990	1,100	6%	-	10	5,501	20.4%
Glen Cove Estates	30%	0	N/A	30%	79,259	0	0%	-	232	79,259	30.1%
Greater Residence Apartments	15%	0	N/A	15%	11,331	0	0%	-	125	11,331	17.8%
Greenstone Estates	30%	0	N/A	30%	23,614	0	0%	-	66	23,614	30.7%
Greenstone Estates	25%	0	N/A	25%	23,614	0	0%	-	66	23,614	30.7%
Griffin Place Townhomes	20%	0	N/A	20%	8,628	0	0%	-	52	8,628	20.2%
Grove South	25%	0	N/A	25%	10,140	1,330	9%	5,318	27	15,458	25.0%
Harbour Crossing	20%	0	N/A	20%	14,409	0	7%	7,107	44	21,516	20.3%
Harmony II	20%	0	N/A	20%	17,145	0	0%	-	110	17,145	21.9%
JAC Consulting, LLC Short Plat	25%	0	N/A	25%	1,060	1998	23%	9,105	6	10,165	25.4%
Jonathan Road	30%	0	N/A	30%	35,212	0	0%	-	80	35,212	30.3%
Julie's Junction SFDU	15%	0	N/A	15%	5,486	0	0%	-	16	5,435	15.0%

Application	Tree Canopy Required	Reductions to the Required Canopy (per 30.25.016(8) or (9))	Code Authority for Reduction and Type	Required Tree Canopy After Adjustment	Required Tree Canopy Area After Adjustment (sq. ft.)	Use and Effect of Applying Incentives for Tree Retention (sq. ft. of bonus canopy)	Calculation of Existing Canopy to be Retained (% of site area)	Calculated Canopy of Trees Retained (including bonuses) (sq. ft.)	Number of New Trees Planted	20 Year Canopy Area Proposed	Total Tree Canopy Proposed
Keller Short Plat	20%	0	N/A	20%	0	0	0%	8,311	0	8,311	42.5%
King Short Plat	25%	0	N/A	25%	9,005	0	0%	-	26	9,005	25.1%
King Short Plat	25%	0	N/A	25%	9,005	0	0%	-	26	9,005	25.1%
Lake Stickney PKWY	20%	0	N/A	20%	54,025	0	0%	-	139	54,025	20.2%
Lake Stickney Trails	20%	0	N/A	20%	0	0	0%	160,733	0	160,733	47.1%
Logan's Wood	30%	0	N/A	30%	32,715	1,365	4%	5,458	72	38,173	30.1%
Long Short Plat	25%	0	N/A	25%	19,800	626	2%	1,252	4	21,052	25.1%
Manchester Court	30%	0	N/A	30%	53,900	0	0%	-	194	53,900	31.1%
Manchester North SP	25%	0	N/A	25%	14,291	0	0%	-	58	14,291	25.0%
Manor Way Apts	20%	0	N/A	20%	60,170	0	0%	9,953	181	70,123	78.2%
Maple Estates SFDU	20%	0	N/A	20%	15,745	0	0%	-	61	15,745	20.2%
Maple Glenn	15%	0	N/A	15%	3,254	0	0%	-	8	3,254	19.1%
Maple Glenn Townhomes	15%	0	N/A	15%	3,254	663	0%	663	8	3,254	19.1%
Milagro	30%	0	N/A	30%	25,024	0	11%	7,679	62	32,703	39.9%

Application	Tree Canopy Required	Reductions to the Required Canopy (per 30.25.016(8) or (9))	Code Authority for Reduction and Type	Required Tree Canopy After Adjustment	Required Tree Canopy Area After Adjustment (sq. ft.)	Use and Effect of Applying Incentives for Tree Retention (sq. ft. of bonus canopy)	Calculation of Existing Canopy to be Retained (% of site area)	Calculated Canopy of Trees Retained (including bonuses) (sq. ft.)	Number of New Trees Planted	20 Year Canopy Area Proposed	Total Tree Canopy Proposed
Mustach Short Plat	20%	0	N/A	20%	4,360	113	2%	565	8	4,925	20.5%
Outlook at Miner's Corner North PRD	25%	0	N/A	25%	9,313	0	0%	3,417	40	12,730	26.2%
Outlook at Miner's Corner PRD	30%	0	N/A	30%	21,786	0	2%	1,847	87	28,688	36.4%
Pendergrass Short Plat	20%	0	N/A	20%	0	4,032	37%	8,063	0	8,063	32.3%
Pinedale II	30%	0	N/A	30%	26,613	0	0%	-	57	26,613	39.3%
Portafino	30%	0	N/A	30%	26,749	0	0%	38,744	67	65,493	30.2%
Ramalah Short Plat	20%	0	N/A	20%	2,196	0	0%	2,170	9	4,366	23.2%
Raval Townhomes	15%	0	N/A	15%	3,360	0	0%	-	11	3,360	16.2%
Rice Short Plat	20%	0	N/A	20%	720	765	18%	3,825	2	4,545	20.9%
Saelens Short Plat	20%	0	N/A	20%	2,400	493	9%	13,268	5	4,370	20.0%
Shelby Road	20%	0	N/A	20%	17,165	0	0%	-	73	17,165	26.3%
Shelton Court SFDU	20%	0	N/A	20%	16,193	0	0%	-	72	16,193	20.0%
Silver Creek	20%	0	N/A	20%	16,635	0	0%	-	91	16,635	20.3%

Application	Tree Canopy Required	Reductions to the Required Canopy (per 30.25.016(8) or (9))	Code Authority for Reduction and Type	Required Tree Canopy After Adjustment	Required Tree Canopy Area After Adjustment (sq. ft.)	Use and Effect of Applying Incentives for Tree Retention (sq. ft. of bonus canopy)	Calculation of Existing Canopy to be Retained (% of site area)	Calculated Canopy of Trees Retained (including bonuses) (sq. ft.)	Number of New Trees Planted	20 Year Canopy Area Proposed	Total Tree Canopy Proposed
Silver Glen Meadows	30%	0	N/A	30%	47,760	0	0%	-	154	47,760	30.1%
Silver Peak West PRD	30%	0	N/A	30%	78,770	0	0%	-	227	78,770	30.0%
Sires Ridge PRD	30%	0	N/A	30%	38,126	0	0%	-	104	38,126	30.8%
Stratton Crest	20%	0	N/A	20%	21,766	0	0%	-	68	21,766	21.1%
Talavera Highlands	30%	0	N/A	30%	49,625	0	0%	-	182	49,625	30.1%
Tamara PRD	30%	0	N/A	30%	29,585	0	0%	-	68	29,585	30.1%
The Meadows	25%	0	N/A	25%	11,480	986	9%	5,879	29	17,359	25.1%
Tran SFDU	15%	0	N/A	15%	1,900	500	9%	2,500	9	4,400	15.3%
Village Crest	20%	0	N/A	20%	22,310	0	0%	-	123	22,310	21.3%
Westbrook Lane	20%	0	N/A	20%	22,125	0	2%	2,356	79	24,481	20.1%
Westlake Townhomes	20%	0	N/A	20%	14,005	0	0%	1,667	80	15,672	20.0%
Whitaker Short Plat	25%	0	N/A	25%	20,235	0	0%	-	51	20,235	25.3%
Zira SFDU	15%	0	N/A	15%	4,064	0	0%	-	9	4,064	17.8%