

Tree Preservation Ordinance Amendment

RECOMMENDATION ON UDC CHAPTER 125, ARTICLE VII
OCTOBER 20, 2025



Context

- Last Updated in 2020
- Difficult to understand
- No caps
- Can constrain landowner's ability to use their land
- Several Developments have not move forward due to tree mitigation costs



Noted Concerns



In-Lieu Fee: same rate - removing a 6" or 18" protected tree \$250/caliper inch



38" or larger Oaks/Pecans can't be removed unless law allows



Restitution for Violations – \$250/inch + 200%, so 3 times base fee



No caps meaning fees could be more than land is worth



Appeal process is long, and fines keep occurring during process



Why Update the Ordinance

- To Establish Cost Predictability
- To Enhance Process Efficiency
- To Allow for Balanced Flexibility
- To Establish Fair Penalties

All while continuing to Protect Tree Canopy



What's Changing?

QUICK COMPARISON CHECK





unimproved land value





Changes to Base Fee and Payment In-Lieu

1. Why a 10% Base Removal Helps

- Acknowledges Site Realities
- Reduces Administrative Burden
- Fairness for smaller projects
- Predictability for Developers

2. Why Tiered Fees Make Sense:

- Reflects Truer Costs
- Encourages Large TreePreservation

- Fairer for Developers
- Predictability for All



3. Significant Tree Variance

Planning Director may authorize the removal of 1 Significant Tree or up to 10% of the total Significant Tree caliper inches if the following applies:

- Site Constraint Hardship site can't be developed unless tree is removed; site must maintain 75% of predevelopment canopy levels and mitigation is at least 1.5" per 1" removed.
- Public Safety & Infrastructure tree poses a hazard to public health/safety, utilities, conflict with planned public infrastructure, or is certified as dying, diseased, or structurally unsound.
- Public Benefit/Community Amenities a dedication of at least 10% of the site (min. of 15 acres) is made as public green space with enhanced landscaping is made

Variance Requests beyond 10% require City Council Approval.



Restitution and Caps

4. Why change Restitution from 300% for Violations to 200%:

- Fairness & Proportionality
- Predictability

Improved Compliance

5. Why Capping the value at 30% of Land is better than No Cap:

- Prevents Disproportionate Costs
- Legal Defensibility

- Balances Development + Preservation
- Unpermitted removal raises cap to 50%



Review Process & Next Steps

SPAC Review P&Z Public Hearing (10/20/25) City Council Public Hearing

(11/18/25)

Amendment Reflects:

- Protection of the right trees
- A Predictable Process
- Measured Results
- Fairness
- Big Picture Aligns with Westside Master Plan & Development Services Strategic Plan.

City Council Adoption w/ 2nd Reading

(12/16/25)