

Tree Policy – Mitigation Stakeholder Outreach Summary

Targeted feedback from code users, development community, business community (ULI NOCO, Development Review Advisory Committee, Chamber of Commerce LLAC) and Development Review Team staff

6/13/2025 Chamber of Commerce Local Legislative Affairs Committee

- Requirements for trees often compete with other city requirements (stormwater, detention, utilities, sight distance at intersections)
- Can we utilize incentives vs. penalties?
- Requiring private landowners to solve a community-wide issue
- Need to clarify what trees would fall under the Commercial Tree Permit for removal. Should not include suckers or naturalizing detention pond trees.
- Could requirements to save older trees increase liability for property owners?
- Increasing tree requirements can create barriers to development/redevelopment
- What is long-term impact of adding multiple new trees to replace each tree?

6/13/2025 Planning and Zoning Commission Work Session/Update

- Support the reduction for saving existing trees with development
- When payment-in-lieu occurs, could the developer know where the \$ goes, where ‘their’ trees will be planted?
- Should mitigation be based on tree age rather than size?

6/17/2025 City of Fort Collins Development Review Team

- Code should prioritize tree protection vs payment-in-lieu to remove trees
- Tree preservation ‘incentives’ should be stronger to be effective
- Street trees should be considered Infrastructure – important for the community
- Should we consider voluntary ‘landmarked’ trees?
- Mitigation seems complex – can we make it simple to understand and enforce?
- Support for reducing payment-in-lieu when tree health measures are included with development plans
- Should we consider requiring more green/open space in infill/commercial areas?

6/17/2025 and 6/24/2025 Tree Policy Engagement Meetings (2 total)

- High land costs and development costs make it difficult to develop and redevelop in the city. This policy will add cost.
- Is the city willing to give up density to save trees?
- Increasing tree mitigation conflicts with city's goals for higher density mixed use development
- City already has robust planting, stormwater requirements
- 3-year Street Tree warranty is too long, moves the maintenance and replacement responsibility to the HOAs instead of the Developer.
- City requires rain gardens and other LID that could support trees, but does not allow these in street Rights-of-Way
- Requiring wider tree lawns, double row of street trees conflicts with PFA requirements for building access
- Support idea of saving trees with development
- Need to understand regulations early in the planning process (clear, predictable)
- Cumulative impact of multiple regulations. It feels like every department is requiring 'above and beyond' requirements. These requirements will make it more difficult to develop/redevelop in infill areas. What are other communities doing?
- What is the rate of tree loss that we're trying to replace?
- Should requirements vary in different parts of the city? Or by use type?
- The requirements and incentives are confusing.
- Required trees should be allowed for tree mitigation. There is no room for additional trees on higher-density infill sites.
- Sometimes we can't place a building to protect a tree due to other city requirements (i.e. build-to standards)
- Do not support changing mitigation to apply to 3" diameter and above (from current 6"). This will have significant impacts.
- Will you have different requirements/incentives for affordable housing?