

Attachment C

TA-5-15 Landscape Maintenance (FOR INFORMATION) - Village Planning Committee Summary Results

Village	Date	Comments
Central City	1/11/21	Concerned with existing enforcement efforts with developments not meeting landscaping requirements, improper maintenance or lack of watering. Structured shade should not be the only option, trees are necessary for clean air.
Laveen	1/11/21	Concerns with landscape maintenance in the right-of-way.
Rio Vista	1/12/21	Concerned that inspectors only focus on caliper size and not the type of tree. Consideration for different types of plants (male vs. female).
South Mountain	1/12/21	Need to address unnatural shape of trees after improper pruning, consider location of trees to prevent deteriorating infrastructure, consider tree species to withstand flood and strong winds, consider and active or proactive inventory of plants. Concerned that landscaping is not maintained equally throughout the City. Consider potential partnerships with nonprofits to help with landscape maintenance throughout the City. Concerns with landscape maintenance in the right-of-way.
Maryvale	1/13/21	Important to see plans of where trees are meant to be planted in areas on city-owned land, streets and medians. Increased shade on City-owned sites (i.e., bus stops).
North Gateway	1/14/21	No Comments
Deer Valley	1/14/21	Concerned with detached sidewalk requirements do not provide enough space to accommodate large canopy shade trees. Consideration to reduce the shade coverage percentage requirement for desert environment.
Estrella	1/19/21	No Comments
North Mountain	1/20/21	No Comments
Ahwatukee Foothills	1/25/21	No Comments
Alhambra	1/26/21	Important to facilitate training regarding tree maintenance and low impact development practices (including inspectors, plan reviewers, and Streets maintenance crews). Consider adding street trees in historic districts. Single-family properties should be included in the scope to address impact on future water rate increase and the prospect of water rationing.
Encanto	2/1/21	Consider a tree preservation plan throughout the construction process.
Paradise Valley	2/1/21	No Comments
Camelback East	2/2/21	Important to facilitate training regarding tree maintenance.
Desert View	2/2/21	No Comments

Village Planning Committee Meeting Summary
Z-TA-5-15
INFORMATION ONLY

Date of VPC Meeting January 11, 2021

Request Amend the Phoenix Zoning Ordinance to address
landscape maintenance

VPC DISCUSSION:

Joshua Bednarek, Deputy Director of the Planning and Development Department shared that this text amendment at the request of City Council is to address longstanding policy goals and initiatives in relation to trees and shade. Mr. Bednarek continued that currently landscaping requirements are addressed with tree and shade requirements in the Zoning Ordinance, inventory and salvage requirements, through zoning stipulations for enhance landscaping and with the help of a new Principal Landscape Architect hired by the City. Mr. Bednarek continued that the text amendment is centered around three core concepts: trees being treated as infrastructure, that trees provide benefits when appropriately planted and trees should be kept in place and in healthy living conditions. The text amendment proposes to reinforce existing and best practices and procedures such as a site inspection of landscaping tied to certificate of occupancy and the standing of approved landscaping documents. The text amendment also proposes to reconcile inconsistencies within the Zoning Ordinance and establish new standards and procedures related to criteria for removal and replacement and tree maintenance. Mr. Bednarek shared the feedback staff has received so far and a preliminary public hearing schedule.

Dana Johnson commented that one of the issues is that tree maintenance doesn't happen over time, the NSD staff avoid citing businesses and they are not versed in the sign or tree regulations and gave an example of the Downtown Safeway replacing trees with Ocotillo, developers chopping trees down to not obscure signs, and in Roosevelt Row some owners are not watering their trees. Mr. Johnson continued that in regard to salvage, not all trees are created equal and some trees such as the tamarisk or the "lead tree" are invasive and should not be salvaged.

Darlene Martinez commented that the City is rebuilding Section 8 housing on 20th Street and the trees on site are dying because they aren't being watered, and she went every day to prevent one of the oldest Palo Verde trees from being cut down at the hospital parking lot. **Mr. Bednarek** thanked Ms. Martinez for her efforts to save that

tree and he will look to provide the committee with the comments that Cindy Stotler, Housing Director, made regarding saving and incorporating as many trees as possible with the Choice Neighborhoods redevelopment.

Eva Olivas shared that she worked with the Choice Neighborhoods residents who discussed trees in the One Vision Plan, and the developer was great in incorporating existing trees into the plan.

Wayne Rainey commented that the Texas Olive trees are irrigated on Roosevelt Row and that man-made shade shouldn't be the only option for shade, trees are necessary for clean air.

Ryan Boyd asked if the proposed changes would affect current plans, how would a business be held to the requirements, would it add to shade that currently isn't there, and if maintenance plans are open to the public. **Mr. Bednarek** replied that currently business are required to put in trees and maintain them, this proposal is to highlight that requirement and add clarifying language, penalties are a recourse although the goal is to get compliance by working with stakeholders rather than issue fines, and that maintenance plans will be publicly accessible.

Public Comment:

None.



Village Planning Committee Meeting Summary

Z-TA-5-15

INFORMATION ONLY

Date of VPC Meeting January 11, 2021

Request Amend the Phoenix Zoning Ordinance to address landscape maintenance

VPC DISCUSSION:

Ms. Tricia Gomes, Zoning Administrator of the Planning and Development Department, shared that this text amendment, at the request of City Council, is to address longstanding policy goals and initiatives in relation to trees and shade. She continued that currently, landscaping requirements are addressed with tree and shade requirements in the Zoning Ordinance, inventory and salvage requirements, through zoning stipulations for enhance landscaping and with the help of a new Principal Landscape Architect hired by the City. She explained that the text amendment is centered around three core concepts: trees being treated as infrastructure, that trees provide benefits when appropriately planted and trees should be kept in place and in healthy living conditions. The text amendment proposes to reinforce existing and best practices and procedures such as a site inspection of landscaping tied to certificate of occupancy and the standing of approved landscaping documents. The text amendment also proposes to reconcile inconsistencies within the Zoning Ordinance and establish new standards and procedures related to criteria for removal and replacement and tree maintenance. Ms. Gomes shared the feedback staff has received so far and a preliminary public hearing schedule.

Mr. Carlos Ortega asked who is responsible for funding the maintenance of trees at community parks. **Ms. Gomes** explained that this is outside the scope of this text amendment, as it is intended solely for privately owned property and all maintenance costs will fall on the property owner. Landscaping maintenance for public parks is under the purview of the Parks and Recreation Department.

Ms. Jennifer Rouse asked if the city is able to extend their public outreach on this text amendment through additional channels like Facebook Events. **Ms. Gomes** stated that, if there are specific groups that the city should target, they would be happy to look into sharing the information about upcoming public hearings on those channels. She also stated that city staff is available to meet with or call interested members of the public on this matter.

Vice Chair Linda Abegg asked if this text amendment will also address the landscaping within street medians. **Ms. Gomes** stated that it is only intended for privately owned property, so street medians are not addressed in this text amendment. However, this is hopefully only the first phase of a more far-reaching landscape maintenance reform, so other landscape areas may be addressed in the future.

Chair Tonya Glass thanked Ms. Gomes and city staff for initiating this text amendment, stressing that it is something the community sorely needs. She stated that too often, the committee puts in the work and effort to stipulate high quality landscaping in new development projects, but they end up falling short, as the plants are not properly cared for and die off. More importantly, there currently are no provisions to enforce the replacement of said trees.



Village Planning Committee Meeting Summary

Z-TA-5-15

INFORMATION ONLY

Date of VPC Meeting January 12, 2021

Request Amend the Phoenix Zoning Ordinance to address landscape maintenance

VPC DISCUSSION:

Tricia Gomes provided an overview of the proposed text amendment on landscape maintenance, noting it would likely come back to the committee in March for recommendation. Overall, the proposed change was to promote trees and shade in the city. Ordinance changes were directed to commercial as well as common areas for multifamily developments and single-family subdivisions. The regulations would not impact individual single-family residences.

Vice Chair Steven Scharboneau asked if this text amendment could be seen as a clean up to the ordinance to reflect current policy. **Tricia Gomes** responded it could be seen as a clean up in that we want to strengthen and explicitly state requirements in the ordinance. More maintenance provisions are being proposed as a result.

Judy Lorch commented that she is happy to see this come forward and asked how compliance can be forced. **Tricia Gomes** commented that the provisions do not address individual homeowners, instead addressing perimeter and common areas. The overall expectation is that you remain compliant.

Chair Massimo Sommacampagna explained he had a question and comment. He was wondering how the city dealt with landscape in the right-of-way. In his experience, civil inspectors enforce the landscape provisions, but only focus on caliper size and not the type of tree. More training in this regard would be helpful. **Tricia Gomes** explained the Zoning Ordinance generally only discusses private property, however some developments include development agreements to maintain right-of-way landscape.

Chair Massimo Sommacampagna also commented that there is a difference between male and female plants. The male varieties produce more pollen. Does this get discussed? **Tricia Gomes** responded that she can talk with the department's landscape architect on this and follow up.



Village Planning Committee Meeting Summary

Z-TA-8-20

INFORMATION ONLY

Date of VPC Meeting	January 12, 2021
Request	Amend the Phoenix Zoning Ordinance to address landscape maintenance

VPC DISCUSSION:

No requests to speak from members of the public were received.

Joshua Bednarek, Deputy Director in the Planning and Development Department, introduced himself and this citywide text amendment under case Z-TA-5-15 to address landscape maintenance. This proposal addresses long standing policy goals and initiatives, including the Tree and Shade Master Plan. Currently, landscaping is addressed via Zoning Ordinance requirements, inventory and shade requirements, rezoning case stipulations and landscape plan reviews by a new Principal Landscape Architect. This proposed text amendment addresses three core concepts. Trees are infrastructure and should be part of the inspection process that enforces the approved landscape documents for a site. Trees provide benefits and the proposed text amendment would reconcile inconsistencies within the Zoning Ordinance. Trees should remain in place once approved and healthy, thus criteria regarding the removal, replacement and maintenance of trees would help to accomplish this goal. Thus far, staff has heard requests to clarify requirement applicability, utility considerations, utilization of structured shade, enforcement procedures and design considerations on the topic of landscape maintenance. He discussing the hearing schedule and timeline for this proposed text amendment. He added that this proposed text amendment is a great first step to address several challenges including the urban heat island effect.

Chairwoman Trites stated that trees also help with flooding and erosion problems. Maricopa County Flood Control Department has a list of approved plants. She added that several items should be considered in this text amendment including:

- How to address the unnatural shape of trees after these are pruned improperly.
- Consider the location of trees to prevent these from deteriorating infrastructure and cited an example in her homeowners' association.
- Consider tree species that are hardy to flood and strong winds.

Mr. Bednarek stated that the intent of this text amendment is to address landscape maintenance for commercial, industrial and multifamily developments and not single-family homes to avoid repeating previous mistakes.

Ms. Busching asked if the proposed text amendment addressed the following items:

- Large trees that are left to die while the property is undergoing a rezoning process. She cited examples of properties near 107th Avenue and Camelback Road and near 24th Street and Vineyard Road.
- Spot vs. mass grading and drainage plans.
- Preventing the clearing of existing trees and having these trees replaced by a project developer with trees of similar size. She cited an example near 18th Street and Baseline Road where she suspects this type of activity happened.

Mr. Bednarek responded that salvage and inventory plans are required for trees when a site is proposed to be developed. He will speak with the city's civil review team for their input on this proposal. Lastly, he added that while he does not know site specific details on the example provided, he will speak with the city's landscape reviewers.

Chairwoman Trites asked if keeping an active or pro-active inventory of plants had been considered.

Mr. Bednarek responded that this idea had been considered, but there are time, funding and staffing capacity constraints. The City of Houston, Texas has done something similar.

Mr. Brooks asked if edible tree species had been contemplated.

Mr. Bednarek responded that no specific trees species had been prescribed.

Mr. Brownell asked if this effort would apply to vacant properties and if the city will take care of the trees or allow these to die. This text amendment is geared towards other parts of the city, citing issues with mandating landowners to cut weeds on their property. He asked why mandating the upkeep of the landscaping was not required, citing examples from California. The city is not obligated to maintain its rights-of-way or land that it owns, and landscaping is not maintained equally throughout the city. There should be a collaboration with non-profits to identify which trees to keep.

Ms. Daniels agrees with Mr. Brownell's comments.

Mr. Bednarek responded that this ordinance addresses other aspects, citing examples of where the ordinance applies. He cited issues with enforcing zoning and landscaping standards on vacant land as the process requires this to be address when the land develops.

Mr. Brownell asked if the city can partner with non-profits to identify trees that need to be kept and maintained.

Mr. Bednarek responded that he agrees with this idea to partner with non-profits but sees challenges in expanding this across such a large city due to staffing shortages.

Ms. Daniels stated that she agrees with the previous comments made and that the city should hire arborists to maintain trees along Baseline Road. Also, focusing infrastructure improvements on the South Mountain Village like other parts of the city.

Mr. Shelly Smith stated that the city needs to have its name on these ordinances and maintain their properties first. He cited an example where trees along Broadway Road were left to die, but the city should maintain its trees first.

Ms. Shepard asked if this ordinance only addresses trees or also shrubs.

Mr. Bednarek responded that this ordinance does address both trees and shrubs.

Ms. Shepard cited examples of properties along 32n Street and agrees with the previous comments provided.

Mr. Holmerud seconds Ms. Shepard's comments.

Ms. Muriel Smith agrees with Ms. Daniels' comments. Landscape maintenance should be addressed in her neighborhood, referencing examples where trees were not maintained by the city. She asked if trees can be interchanged with other plants such as cacti.

Mr. Bednarek responded that he will look into this, but wants to double check the information given certain Overlay requirements which may require trees instead of cacti.

Mr. Brooks cited an arrangement that had been made with Ms. Miller to ensure that water is maintained on trees over time.

Mr. Bednarek responded that he will follow up on that information.

Ms. Daniels recalls that water was cut-off citywide for landscaping for some time.

Mr. Bednarek remembers that a creative solution to help solve this issue along Baseline Road had been utilized.

Mr. Holmerud acknowledged the efforts from Dr. Brooks regarding this.

Village Planning Committee Meeting Summary
Z-TA-5-15
INFORMATION ONLY

Date of VPC Meeting	January 13, 2021
Request	Amend the Phoenix Zoning Ordinance to address landscape maintenance

VPC DISCUSSION:

Joshua Bednarek, Deputy Director of the Planning and Development Department shared that this text amendment at the request of City Council is to address longstanding policy goals and initiatives in relation to trees and shade. Mr. Bednarek continued that currently landscaping requirements are addressed with tree and shade requirements in the Zoning Ordinance, inventory and salvage requirements, through zoning stipulations for enhance landscaping and with the help of a new Principal Landscape Architect hired by the City. Mr. Bednarek continued that the text amendment is centered around three core concepts: trees being treated as infrastructure, that trees provide benefits when appropriately planted and trees should be kept in place and in healthy living conditions. The text amendment proposes to reinforce existing and best practices and procedures such as a site inspection of landscaping tied to certificate of occupancy and the standing of approved landscaping documents. The text amendment also proposes to reconcile inconsistencies within the Zoning Ordinance and establish new standards and procedures related to criteria for removal and replacement and tree maintenance. Mr. Bednarek shared the feedback staff has received so far and a preliminary public hearing schedule.

Joe Barba asked if the Neighborhood Services Department (NSD) would handle compliance for trees for commercial properties, if there would be fees if a business is not in compliance, and if NSD has the capacity to enforce the requirements city-wide. **Mr. Bednarek** responded that NSD would handle enforcement through their complaint-based system, that ultimately there could be fees but the goal is to get compliance and avoid going to court, and that NSD and the Planning and Development Department are prepared to administer this proposal.

Viri Hernandez asked in regard to transparency, if there was any way to see plans of where trees are meant to be planted in areas such as city-owned land, streets and medians. Ms. Hernandez continued that there was an initiative a few years ago for tree planting however its unclear where the trees were planted, and that Maryvale is a heat zone and does not have the same level of investment of trees. **Mr. Bednarek** replied

that while this text amendment would only impact private commercial properties, he will work on getting contact information on who to reach out to regarding street trees and trees in medians.

Vice Chair Gene Derie asked for clarification on how this proposal would add new requirements for commercial properties. **Mr. Bednarek** replied that commercial properties are required to have landscaping, and that this request does not add new standards but seeks to clarify the responsibilities of commercial property owners in terms of tree maintenance.

Joe Barba shared that he would like to see the City do more in terms of shade on City-owned sites and gave an example of a bus stop near a high school with no shade canopy, where children have to wait in the sun for their bus, and that non-profits can also help with education and what type of trees that can be planted.

Alvin Battle asked how the allowable trees used for projects is determined. **Mr. Bednarek** responded that there is a list that applicants can choose from and depending on utility considerations and certain overlays, some trees can be restricted.



Village Planning Committee Meeting Summary

Z-TA-5-15

INFORMATION ONLY

Date of VPC Meeting January 14, 2021
Request Amend the Phoenix Zoning Ordinance to address landscape maintenance

VPC DISCUSSION:

Joshua Bednarek provided an overview of the proposed text amendment on landscape maintenance, noting it would likely come back to the committee in March for recommendation. Overall, the proposed change was to promote trees and shade in the city. Ordinance changes were directed to commercial as well as common areas for multifamily developments and single-family subdivisions. The regulations would not impact individual single-family residences.

Committee Member Daniel Tome asked who would be impacted by the changes. **Joshua Bednarek** responded that commercial properties, multifamily developments and HOA area for single-family developments would be impacted.



Village Planning Committee Meeting Summary

Z-TA-5-15

INFORMATION ONLY

Date of VPC Meeting January 14, 2021

Request Amend the Phoenix Zoning Ordinance to address
landscape maintenance

VPC DISCUSSION:

Ms. Tricia Gomes, City of Phoenix Zoning Administrator, shared that this text amendment at the request of City Council is to address longstanding policy goals and initiatives in relation to trees and shade. Ms. Gomes continued that currently landscaping requirements are addressed with tree and shade requirements in the Zoning Ordinance, inventory and salvage requirements, through zoning stipulations for enhance landscaping and with the help of a new Principal Landscape Architect hired by the City. Ms. Gomes continued that the text amendment is centered around three core concepts: trees being treated as infrastructure, that trees provide benefits when appropriately planted and trees should be kept in place and in healthy living conditions. The text amendment proposes to reinforce existing and best practices and procedures such as a site inspection of landscaping tied to certificate of occupancy and the standing of approved landscaping documents. The text amendment also proposes to reconcile inconsistencies within the Phoenix Zoning Ordinance and establishes new standards and procedures related to criteria for removal and replacement as well as tree maintenance. Ms. Gomes shared the feedback staff has received so far and a preliminary public hearing schedule.

Chairman Joseph Grossman asked what staff has done to reduce ridiculous planting requirements. Has staff included developers in these conversation, if they have taken place.

Ms. Gomes replied, yes. The development community has been involved int the process. She also shared that the City of Phoenix follows the native plant tree list. In regard to detached sidewalks, that is part of more policy plans including the Complete Streets Guiding Principles and the Tree and Shade Master Plan. She iterated that detached sidewalks provide a multitude of benefits.

Mr. Russell Osborn shared that from personal experience with sidewalk infrastructure, a 5 foot plating area between sidewalk and back of curb is not nearly wide enough to accommodate large canopy shade trees as the roots compromise the sidewalks integrity. He asked staff what the required shade coverage percentage is currently, 25 percent? If so, it should be reduced to 15 percent in his opinion for a desert city. He asked if shade requirements have been addressed.

Ms. Gomes shared that in many instances the detached sidewalks are located with the city right-of-way, which this text amendment does not address. However, she stated that she appreciated Mr. Osborn's feedback.

Mr. Osborn stated that even if the sidewalks are located in the right-of-way, it is still the property owner's responsibility to repair damaged sidewalks due to root damage and this needs to be changed.

Chairman Joseph Grossman stated that this text amendment may be too restrictive and asked staff to address practical concerns when the text amendment comes back for recommendation.

Public Comment:

None.



Village Planning Committee Meeting Summary Z-TA-8-20 INFORMATION ONLY

Date of VPC Meeting January 19, 2021
Request Amend the Phoenix Zoning Ordinance to address landscape maintenance

VPC DISCUSSION:

No requests to speak from members of the public were received.

Joshua Bednarek, Deputy Director in the Planning and Development Department, introduced himself and this citywide text amendment under case Z-TA-5-15 to address landscape maintenance. This proposal addresses long standing policy goals and initiatives, including the Tree and Shade Master Plan. Currently, landscaping is addressed via Zoning Ordinance requirements, inventory and shade requirements, rezoning case stipulations and landscape plan reviews by a new Principal Landscape Architect. This proposed text amendment addresses three core concepts. Trees are infrastructure and should be part of the inspection process that enforces the approved landscape documents for a site. Trees provide benefits and the proposed text amendment would reconcile inconsistencies within the Zoning Ordinance. Trees should remain in place once approved and healthy, thus criteria regarding the removal, replacement and maintenance of trees would help to accomplish this goal. Thus far, staff has heard requests to clarify requirement applicability, utility considerations, utilization of structured shade, enforcement procedures and design considerations on the topic of landscape maintenance. He concluded the presentation by discussing the hearing schedule and timeline for this proposed text amendment.

Chairman Cardenas asked for committee member comments or questions regarding the information. Hearing none, he thanked staff and moved to the next agenda item.

Village Planning Committee Meeting Summary
Z-TA-5-15
INFORMATION ONLY

Date of VPC Meeting January 20, 2021
Request Amend the Phoenix Zoning Ordinance to address
 landscape maintenance

VPC DISCUSSION:

No requests to speak from members of the public were received.

STAFF PRESENTATION

Tricia Gomes, Zoning Administrator of the Planning and Development Department, shared that this text amendment at the request of City Council is to address longstanding policy goals and initiatives in relation to trees and shade. Currently landscaping requirements are addressed with tree and shade requirements in the Zoning Ordinance, inventory and salvage requirements, through zoning stipulations for enhance landscaping and with the help of a new Principal Landscape Architect hired by the City. The text amendment is centered around three core concepts: trees being treated as infrastructure, that trees provide benefits when appropriately planted and trees should be kept in place and in healthy living conditions. The text amendment proposes to reinforce existing and best practices and procedures such as a site inspection of landscaping tied to certificate of occupancy and the standing of approved landscaping documents. The text amendment also proposes to reconcile inconsistencies within the Zoning Ordinance and establish new standards and procedures related to criteria for removal and replacement and tree maintenance. She then shared the feedback staff has received so far and a preliminary public hearing schedule and asked the committee for input and any questions.

Chair Krentz asked the committee if they had any questions and, hearing none, thanked Gomes for the presentation.

Village Planning Committee Meeting Summary Z-TA-5-15 INFORMATION ONLY

Date of VPC Meeting January 25, 2021

Request Amend the Phoenix Zoning Ordinance to address landscape maintenance

VPC DISCUSSION:

No requests to speak from members of the public were received.

Tricia Gomes, Zoning Administrator in the Planning and Development Department, introduced herself and this citywide text amendment under case Z-TA-5-15 to address landscape maintenance. This proposal addresses long standing policy goals and initiatives, including the Tree and Shade Master Plan. Currently, landscaping is addressed via Zoning Ordinance requirements, inventory and shade requirements, rezoning case stipulations and landscape plan reviews by a new Principal Landscape Architect. This proposed text amendment addresses three core concepts. Trees are infrastructure and should be part of the inspection process that enforces the approved landscape documents for a site. Trees provide benefits and the proposed text amendment would reconcile inconsistencies within the Zoning Ordinance. Trees should remain in place once approved and healthy, thus criteria regarding the removal, replacement and maintenance of trees would help to accomplish this goal. Thus far, staff has heard requests to clarify requirement applicability, utility considerations, utilization of structured shade, enforcement procedures and design considerations on the topic of landscape maintenance. She discussed the hearing schedule and timeline for this proposed text amendment.

Chairman Elliott asked for committee member questions or comments regarding the presentation. Hearing none, he thanked Ms. Gomes for her presentations.



Village Planning Committee Meeting Summary

Z-TA-5-15

INFORMATION ONLY

Date of VPC Meeting January 26, 2021
Request Amend the Phoenix Zoning Ordinance to address landscape maintenance

VPC DISCUSSION:

No requests to speak from members of the public were received.

STAFF PRESENTATION

Joshua Bednarek, Deputy Director of the Planning and Development Department, shared that this text amendment at the request of City Council is to address longstanding policy goals and initiatives in relation to trees and shade. Currently landscaping requirements are addressed with tree and shade requirements in the Zoning Ordinance, inventory and salvage requirements, through zoning stipulations for enhance landscaping and with the help of a new Principal Landscape Architect hired by the City. The text amendment is centered around three core concepts: trees being treated as infrastructure, that trees provide benefits when appropriately planted and trees should be kept in place and in healthy living conditions. The text amendment proposes to reinforce existing and best practices and procedures such as a site inspection of landscaping tied to certificate of occupancy and the standing of approved landscaping documents. The text amendment also proposes to reconcile inconsistencies within the Zoning Ordinance and establish new standards and procedures related to criteria for removal and replacement and tree maintenance. He then shared the feedback staff has received so far and a preliminary public hearing schedule and asked the committee for input and any questions.

QUESTIONS FROM THE COMMITTEE

Ammon noted the importance of replacing trees with like-for-like sizes and asked if tree replacement always requires the tree to be placed in the same location or if the city can provide some flexibility. **Bednarek** responded that the text amendment supports flexibility and collaboration.

Fitzgerald asked if there are recommended tree lists. **Bednarek** responded that the City does have a list of preferred trees and more restricted lists of permitted trees in certain parts of the city such as the desert preservation districts and the urban core.

Bryck noted that he strongly supports the requirement that owners are responsible to their stipulated landscape plan and that the City model good tree maintenance on its property including its street trees. He asked that holistic conversations and training be facilitated regarding tree maintenance and low impact development practices, including the inspectors, plan reviewers, and the tree maintenance crews in the Street Transportation Department. He added that perhaps there is an opportunity to add street trees in the historic districts where there are broad landscape areas between the curb and sidewalk. **Bednarek** stated that conversations are ongoing with his counterpart in the Neighborhood Services Department because they respond to compliance issues, that will now include landscaping.

Adams stated that the success of landscape projects depends on maintenance which requires attention and follow-through. She asked that the City model good tree maintenance on its property including its street trees and noted that many crews do not have sufficient training on trimming. She added that the text amendment should include a system to ensure continual landscape maintenance. She added that many native trees are not appropriate for urban environment. She asked if the City has qualified consultants to help with the ordinance. **Bednarek** responded that the City hired a Principal Landscape Architect and has been working with other professionals and arborist organizations. He added that the City is trying to think of landscaping from the curb inward but that this holistic approach is not within the scope of the current text amendment.

Keyser opined on the impact on future water rate increases and the prospect of water rationing on landscaping on single-family properties and noted that single-family properties should be addressed in the amendment. He added that city installed street trees could be set up on a shared meter where the city or neighbors would be able to note if there is a malfunction to the system before the trees die.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

None.

FLOOR/PUBLIC DISCUSSION CLOSED: COMMITTEE DISCUSSION

None.



Village Planning Committee Meeting Summary

Z-TA-5-15

INFORMATION ONLY

Date of VPC Meeting February 1, 2021
Request Amend the Phoenix Zoning Ordinance to address landscape maintenance

VPC DISCUSSION:

No requests to speak from members of the public were received.

STAFF PRESENTATION

Joshua Bednarek, Deputy Director of the Planning and Development Department, shared that this text amendment at the request of City Council is to address longstanding policy goals and initiatives in relation to trees and shade. Currently landscaping requirements are addressed with tree and shade requirements in the Zoning Ordinance, inventory and salvage requirements, through zoning stipulations for enhance landscaping and with the help of a new Principal Landscape Architect hired by the City. The text amendment is centered around three core concepts: trees being treated as infrastructure, that trees provide benefits when appropriately planted and trees should be kept in place and in healthy living conditions. The text amendment proposes to reinforce existing and best practices and procedures such as a site inspection of landscaping tied to certificate of occupancy and the standing of approved landscaping documents. The text amendment also proposes to reconcile inconsistencies within the Zoning Ordinance and establish new standards and procedures related to criteria for removal and replacement and tree maintenance. He then shared the feedback staff has received so far and a preliminary public hearing schedule and asked the committee for input and any questions.

QUESTIONS FROM THE COMMITTEE

Bryck asked about the enforcement pathway. **Bednarek** responded that the text amendment will formally hold landscape plans as enforceable documents that will be used to ensure compliance throughout the life of the property improvements when permits are required or when complaints are filed.

Rodriguez asked that the city require a tree preservation plan with requirements throughout the construction process including protection to the critical root zone. Atlanta has an ordinance which addresses the topic well. **Bednarek** responded that the scope

of this text amendment is limited but that this type of input can be shared with Council to support additional attention.

Procaccini asked how the current ordinance and this text amendment address the replacement of existing trees. **Bednarek** responded that, in practice the current ordinance requires a like-for-like replacement when possible but also allows multiple smaller trees to replace a larger tree. The text amendment formalizes this practice.

Chair Kleinman stated that this seems like the beginning of the conversation and the first step in addressing a larger issue. He asked whether it would be helpful if a subcommittee convened to provide detailed comments. **Bednarek** responded that it would be helpful.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

None.

STAFF RESPONSE

None.

FLOOR/PUBLIC COMMENT CLOSED: DISCUSSION

None.



Village Planning Committee Meeting Summary
Z-TA-5-15
INFORMATION ONLY

Date of VPC Meeting February 1, 2021
Request Amend the Phoenix Zoning Ordinance to address landscape maintenance

VPC DISCUSSION:

Ms. Tricia Gomes, City of Phoenix Zoning Administrator, shared that this text amendment at the request of City Council is to address longstanding policy goals and initiatives in relation to trees and shade. Ms. Gomes continued that currently landscaping requirements are addressed with tree and shade requirements in the Zoning Ordinance, inventory and salvage requirements, through zoning stipulations for enhance landscaping and with the help of a new Principal Landscape Architect hired by the City. Ms. Gomes continued that the text amendment is centered around three core concepts: trees being treated as infrastructure, that trees provide benefits when appropriately planted and trees should be kept in place and in healthy living conditions. The text amendment proposes to reinforce existing and best practices and procedures such as a site inspection of landscaping tied to certificate of occupancy and the standing of approved landscaping documents. The text amendment also proposes to reconcile inconsistencies within the Phoenix Zoning Ordinance and establishes new standards and procedures related to criteria for removal and replacement as well as tree maintenance. Ms. Gomes shared the feedback staff has received so far and a preliminary public hearing schedule.

Chairman Robert Gubser stated that he is curious about tree maintenance. He asked if this text amendment strengthens the city's ability to maintain trees in the right-of-way.

Ms. Gomes shared that it does.

Public Comment:

None.

Village Planning Committee Meeting Summary

Z-TA-5-15

INFORMATION ONLY

Date of VPC Meeting February 2, 2021

Request Amend the Phoenix Zoning Ordinance to address landscape maintenance

VPC DISCUSSION & RECOMMENDED STIPULATIONS:

Ms. Tricia Gomes, Zoning Administrator of the Planning and Development Department, shared that this text amendment, at the request of City Council, is to address longstanding policy goals and initiatives in relation to trees and shade. She continued that currently, landscaping requirements are addressed with tree and shade requirements in the Zoning Ordinance, inventory and salvage requirements, through zoning stipulations for enhance landscaping and with the help of a new Principal Landscape Architect hired by the City. She explained that the text amendment is centered around three core concepts: trees being treated as infrastructure, that trees provide benefits when appropriately planted and trees should be kept in place and in healthy living conditions. The text amendment proposes to reinforce existing and best practices and procedures such as a site inspection of landscaping tied to certificate of occupancy and the standing of approved landscaping documents. The text amendment also proposes to reconcile inconsistencies within the Zoning Ordinance and establish new standards and procedures related to criteria for removal and replacement and tree maintenance. Ms. Gomes shared the feedback staff has received so far and a preliminary public hearing schedule.

Mr. Craig Tribken asked if long term enforcement of approved commercial landscape plans will be a part of this process to ensure that the trees planted when a development is first constructed remain healthy or are replaced if they die. **Ms. Gomes** explained that the expectation is that the city already does this, but it is complaint-based, and that by strengthening the ordinance, it will provide a framework for better communication with property owners in the future to help solve these issues. **Mr. Tribken** stated that this is a great step forward.

Ms. Ashley Nye asked if there is a maintenance training component to this, as there seem to be many instances of improper pruning of plant materials throughout the city, such as in street medians. **Ms. Gomes** stated that this text amendment only applies to private property, and not city-maintained public property, but that discussions regarding the latter will be ongoing as a result of this proposal.

Ms. Linda Bair asked if this will apply to single-family residential homes, or just for planned communities. **Ms. Gomes** explained that this amendment applies to all private

property but that, in the context of single-family communities, it will apply to perimeter landscaping and common areas, not to individual residential lots.

Village Planning Committee Meeting Summary
Z-TA-5-15
INFORMATION ONLY

Date of VPC Meeting February 2, 2021
Request Amend the Phoenix Zoning Ordinance to address landscape maintenance.

VPC DISCUSSION:

Josh Bednarek provided an overview of the proposed text amendment on landscape maintenance, noting it would likely come back to the committee in March for recommendation. Overall, the proposed change was to promote trees and shade in the city. Ordinance changes were directed to commercial as well as common areas for multifamily developments and single-family subdivisions. The regulations would not impact individual single-family residences.

David Kollar asked if landscape installation is currently tied to the certificate of occupancy. **Josh Bednarek** responded that this is the practice but not currently codified.