

**Consolidated Comments on Comprehensive Review Draft - Landscape Manual
Prince George's County
March 2018**

This document complements the analysis of comments received on the Comprehensive Review Draft of the proposed Zoning Ordinance and Subdivision Regulations, but focuses on comments pertaining to the Landscape Manual update. In September 2017, the County's consultant team, led by Clarion Associates, released the Comprehensive Review Draft, including the proposed updates to the Landscape Manual. This draft consolidates and revises the three modules containing Clarion's initial recommendations for creating a set of modern 21st Century zoning and subdivision laws to provide us with the necessary toolkit to successfully compete with our peer jurisdictions within the region, foster economic development opportunities, implement community-based planning, and incorporate simplified language and streamlined procedures.

Over the last three months of 2017 and first two months of 2018, the County Council (which sits as the District Council for planning and zoning matters in the County), Planning Board, County Executive's Office, residents, municipalities, civic groups, project focus groups, property and business owners, land use attorneys, the development community, Planning Department staff, and local, state, and regional agencies have engaged the project staff team and offered their thoughts on the Comprehensive Review Draft

The result of this on-going, essential, and extraordinarily productive conversation, as they pertain to landscaping, is contained in this analysis. In response to community desire and to better document the overall process of the difficult task of comprehensively replacing the Zoning Ordinance, Subdivision Regulations, and Landscape Manual, staff has adopted an approach similar to that taken when evaluating comprehensive plan testimony.

This analysis contains community and agency stakeholder comments received by staff as of the date of its compilation (March 2018). Staff analyzed these comments and have made final staff recommendations for revisions of the Landscape Manual as it transitions to the first legislative draft for possible District Council consideration later in 2018. Staff has also identified, in very general terms, the source of the comments. Additional changes to the Landscape Manual will also be made based on internal review and conversations between M-NCPPC staff and Council staff that are of a minor or technical level. Only substantive changes resulting from these conversations have been included in this analysis.

Landscape Manual Comments 2017					
Page Number	Section	Comment	Source	Staff Analysis	Staff Recommendation
Global		"In principle and theory, the proposed Landscape Manual Update compliments the DPW&T's overall streetscape vision for its roadways as outlined in its recently adopted Urban Street Standards. The proposed new landscaping standards and advisements for the County's public rights-of-way (ROW) may add cost and burden to perform the necessary long term maintenance services for green infrastructure facilities and as roadside planning along County roads that would fall to DPW&T. The Department is committed to requesting the funds required to meet the new standards, given that there is maintenance required for existing planting in the ROW or green infrastructure. These are facilities that would be inevitably transferred to DPW&T after the build out of a development."	DPW&T	The requirements of the Landscape Manual do not apply to PDPW&T roadways or other public rights-of-way. All landscaping requirements contained in the Landscape Manual are associated with privately-held land. Any new proposed public street shown on a plan of development is required to follow Subtitle 23 of the County Code, unless the road is within a municipality with jurisdiction over its streets or is a State or Federal roadway. The standards within Sections 4.8 and 4.10 of the Landscape Manual only apply to the development of private roadways, unless the applicant worked with the operating agency to allow for a modification to their standards. The reference to "green infrastructure facilities" is interpreted to mean stormwater management facilities. Those facilities, for the purpose of the Landscape Manual relate to facilities within the private property and would have been part of the approval of stormwater plans reviewed by DPIE. There is	Any language within the Landscape Manual relating to improvements within a public street should be deleted or revised as may be necessary.

Landscape Manual Comments 2017

Page Number	Section	Comment	Source	Staff Analysis	Staff Recommendation
				no intent to expand the Landscape Manual to require stormwater facilities within the public right-of-way.	
Global		Maintenance of planting beds, trees and shrubs and stormwater management facilities in the ROW a. Maintenance is expensive. Suggest adding a maintenance fee for SWM, Silva or filterra cells or street trees or landscape buffers in the ROW b. These more demanding landscape plantings will require more maintenance. DPW&T has no funding source for expensive or routine maintenance. The plants will not look good or even survive is the planting beds are not maintained Maintenance of planting beds, trees and shrubs and stormwater management facilities in the ROW Maintenance is expensive. Suggest adding a maintenance fee for SWM, Silva or filterra cells or street trees or landscape buffers in the ROW These more demanding landscape plantings will require more maintenance. DPW&T has no funding source for expensive or routine maintenance. The plants will not look good or even survive is the planting beds are not maintained	DPW&T	This comment assumes that the landscape manual is regulating landscaping within the right-of-way. It is not the intent to address any landscaping within the right of way.	Make no change.
Global		Abbreviations: Suggest calling out any frequently used acronyms or abbreviations in a text box rather than including these in a separate appendix section.	DPW&T	Comment noted.	Make no change.
Page V	INTRODUCTION	“Introduction, page V. The last sentence is unclear, DPW&T suggests the following be changed from: ‘and less promote visual monotony...’, to: ‘and discourage visual monotony’	DPW&T	Staff concurs; this appears to be a typo.	Revise the language as necessary.
VIII	INTRODUCTION	Remove the words “Section 5” before Glossary of terms in paragraph 3	Planning Staff	There is no “section 5” in the proposed Landscape Manual	Delete the reference to “section 5” in the 2 nd full paragraph on page VIII.
VIII	ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS	“Please include proper legal references for existing regulations for street trees. These are: a. Maryland Roadside Tree Law of 2014 b. DPW&T Standards and Specs Section 600. Prince George’s County Department of Public Works and Transportation, <u>“Specifications and Standards for Roadways and Bridges” -latest edition.</u> https://www.princegeorgescountymd.gov/DocumentCenter/View/4789 . c. Please add that the developer needs to adhere to Category 600 in the DPW&T Specifications and Standards for Roadways and Bridges. This is the section that talks about street trees, etc. Section III, Standards 600.01 through 600.20. d. County Council Resolution CR-023-2014 July 23, 2014, <i>A resolution concerning establishment of county policy for shade trees within county rights-of way.</i> ”	DPW&T	The list provided includes the references used in the review of proposed street trees within the public right of way. As these trees are not the subject of the Landscape Manual, except perhaps for allowing credit for fulfillment of certain requirements, a paragraph should be added under Additional Requirements so that a plan preparer and public will understand that other regulations existing for the planting of vegetation within a public right-of-way.	Add a reference under “Additional Requirements” that indicates other agencies and operators may have additional regulations pertaining to vegetation within public rights-of-way and these operators should be consulted.
Page 12	Section 1.1.a	Remove the word “public” from the first line	Planning Staff	Public projects are subject to Mandatory referral and are not subject to the regulations of the Zoning Ordinance or the Landscape Manual.	Delete the word “public” from the first line of Section 1.1.a.
Page 12	1.1.c	As was done in 2010 with the comprehensive update to the Landscape Manual, the proposed Planned Development zones should be treated as was done with the Comprehensive Design Zones. All landscaping requirements should apply to the Planned	Planning Staff	Staff concurs.	Revise the Planned Development (PD) zones section of the proposed

Landscape Manual Comments 2017

Page Number	Section	Comment	Source	Staff Analysis	Staff Recommendation
		Development zones and Alternative Compliance should be the method used for relief from the standards. This change would also require revisions to Section 27-4.300.E.2. Prior to the 2010 Comprehensive Update, the issue of which sections of the Landscape Manual apply was a constant source of confusion with applicants and staff, ultimately causing errors in permit issuance.			Zoning Ordinance to clarify that the PD Basic Plan may not amend the standards of the Landscape Manual, and that the Landscape Manual would apply to development in a PD zone.
Page 12	Section 1.1.d	The added language relating to a Departure from Design Standard is placed in the wrong location within the code and should be re-located to Section 1.3.f of the Landscape Manual	Planning Staff	The part of the proposed Zoning Ordinance pertaining to departures does not authorize departures from landscaping standards, as the intent of the proposed code is that the Alternative Compliance approach should be used for any requests to make changes from the Landscape Manual standards. Variances would still be permitted as a path of relief should a proposed Alternative Compliance not be approvable.	Revise Sec. 1.1.d. and Sec. 1.3.f. to remove references to departures.
Page 13	Section 1.1.f.3	This applicability is mixed in with the exemptions and should be relocated to 1.1.d	Planning Staff	Staff concurs	Replace Sec. 1.1.d. with the following: “d. Except as stated in Sections 1.1(e) to 1.1(q), all building and grading permits shall be in compliance with this Manual. However, notwithstanding the exemptions below, any conversion of commercial property to a residential use shall comply with Sections 4.1, Residential Requirements, 4.6(c)(1), Buffering Residential Developments from Streets, and 4.7, Buffering Incompatible Uses, to the greatest extent possible.”
Page 13	Section 1.1.g.	Change the “and” in the second line to “or.” The exemption should apply to either situation.	Planning Staff	Staff concurs.	Replace “and” with “or” in the second line of Sec. 1.1.g.
Page 13	Section 1.1.g.2.	Delete “in a residential zone.” The exemption should apply in all zones.	Planning Staff	Staff concurs.	Revise Sec. 1.1.g.2. to read: “Accessory uses to residential development[in a residential zone].”
Page 13	Section 1.1.g.4	Delete as duplicative to Sec. 1.1.g.2.	Planning Staff	Staff concurs.	Delete Sec. 1.1.g.4.
Page 13	Section 1.1.g.4	Add language that reflects the same language as Sec. 1.1(i)(3), since it should apply to Section 4.2 of the Landscape Manual as well as Section 4.6.	Planning Staff	Staff concurs.	Add a new Sec. 1.1.g.4. to read: “Permits for properties that abut a master plan right-

Landscape Manual Comments 2017

Page Number	Section	Comment	Source	Staff Analysis	Staff Recommendation
					of-way that has not been dedicated or is not required to be dedicated pursuant to an approved preliminary plan of subdivision.”
Page 13	Section 1.h.1	Remove the word “building” in the first line and add “or Change of Use”	Planning Staff	New building construction such as a pad site located in a “sea of asphalt” should be required to incorporate internal green area within the limits of disturbance and should be subject to the requirements of Section 4.3. Adding the term change in use recognizes that changes in use can result in the construction of additional asphalt parking compounds if the use is a high parking generator use. These situations should be required to landscaping according to the requirements of Section 4.3.	Revise Sec. 1.h.1 to read: “Permits for any [building,] building renovation, <u>change in use</u> , or building expansion that does not result...”
Page 13	Section 1.h.1	Take out the word “Detailed” before the words “site plan” and increase the five percent to eight percent.	Planning Staff	This suggestion is in keeping with comments made relating to the desire to improve the appearance of older shopping centers in the county.	Change accordingly
Page 14	Section 1.i.5 and Section 1.i.6	Remove	Planning Staff	The language of subsection i.5 is unclear and not understandable. Subsection i.6 is not an exemption statement, as there are not exemptions listed from section 4.4, all building permits are subject to Section 4.4	Change accordingly
Page 15	Section 1.j.4	Remove the words “in a residential district” as superfluous language.	Planning Staff	Staff concurs.	Revise Sec. 1.j.4. to read: “Accessory uses to residential properties[in a residential district].
Page 16	Section 1.1.p	“Planting of shrubs and grasses should be permitted within the WSSC R/W. The depth of the R/W should count at minimum towards the bufferyard depth requirements. There should be flexibility due to existing WSSC R/W locations.”	Maryland Building Industry Association	The requirements of WSSC regarding landscaping within their easements is entirely within the control of the public utility and are not regulated by the Zoning Ordinance or Landscape Manual. The information provided in Section 1.1.p is there to notify plan preparers that they should be aware of the utilities and receive permission prior to showing plant material in the WSSC right-of-way or easement.	Make no change.
Page 16	Section 1.2.a	Remove the words in the parentheses and add the words, “except those sites exempt per Section 1.1”	Planning Staff	A landscape plan is not just required for a detailed site plan, but is also required for other application types such as special exceptions.	Revise Sec. 1.2.a. to read: “A landscape plan is a required element of all site plans [(Zoning Ordinance, Section

Landscape Manual Comments 2017

Page Number	Section	Comment	Source	Staff Analysis	Staff Recommendation
					27-3.508, Detailed Site Plan (Minor and Major),] <u>except those sites exempt per Section 1.1 of this Manual,</u> and shall be approved in accordance with the provisions in the Zoning Ordinance for approval of those plans.”
Page 16	Section 1.2.b	Remove as superfluous.	Planning Staff	Staff concurs; the revision immediately above renders a separate clause unnecessary.	Delete Sec. 1.2.b.
Page 17	Section 1.3.a.5	Remove this section as unnecessary and duplicative.	Planning Staff	Staff concurs.	Delete Sec. 1.3.a.5.
Page 18	Section 1.3.f	Remove the word variance and the reference, and change “those sections” to read “that section.”	Planning Staff	Staff concurs that potential changes to the landscaping standards beyond the scope of Alternative Compliance should become a major departure request to be heard and decided by the Planning Board. The criteria for approving a variance is too stringent to be a suitable procedure for deciding landscaping requests.	Revise Sec. 1.3.f. to delete references to variances. Clarify the Zoning Ordinance by inserting language to the departures section that clearly authorizes major departures for standards contained in the Landscape Manual that may not be approvable through an Alternative Compliance application.
Page 18	Section 1.4.b	Substitute Planning Department with “urban design section of the development review division of the planning department” and add after telephone number, “and e-mail address or mailing address”	Planning Staff	Staff does not agree with this recommendation. The organization of the Planning Department may, one day, change, which would eliminate the utility of being this specific.	Make no change.
Page 20	Section 1.5	“ Certification of Installation of Plant Materials – Minor exceptions such as slight relocation of plant materials to avoid an unforeseen site condition or too dense of planting, groundcover counts when based on square footage calculations as long as entire proposed bed is filled per spacing specification provided on plan. These are to be recorded on the certification sheet in the space provided. Species substitution, and miscounts of plants in the shrub category or higher are not to be certified until corrected or substitution/amended plan is submitted and approved, or until corrections to the original planting are made.”	Civicomment	This request seems to be asking that language be added to Section 1.5, but enforcement of plans and field adjustments is an issue that should be addressed by the Department of Permitting, Inspections, and Enforcement at the time of third party certification. If DPIE finds that the plantings have not been implemented in accordance with the approved landscape plan, then the bond is not released.	Make no change
Page 21	Section 1.7	“ Certificate of Landscape Maintenance - Remove - Unreasonable. Many times, plans are not available for proper inspection, and properties are not maintained properly. Puts unreasonable liabilities on the Landscape Architect.”	Civicomment	This section of the Landscape Manual ensures that dead or dying plant material on the site that was previously required by an approved plan is replaced at the time of new improvements on the site and is important to retain.	Make no change

Landscape Manual Comments 2017

Page Number	Section	Comment	Source	Staff Analysis	Staff Recommendation
Page 24	Section 2.1	“Remove ‘prepared by’ registered Landscape Architect... There are many qualified landscape architects/designers who are not registered. The plan should be reviewed and sealed by a registered LA.”	Maryland Building Industry Association	The preparation of the landscape plan is not the issue in this statement, it is the sealing of the plan by the Registered Landscape Architect that is the important phrase and the regulatory aspect. This Section is consistent with Maryland state law per the Department of Labor, Licensing, and Regulation.	Make no change
Page 33	Section 3.4.b	“Plant ‘close to the street’ is too vague; suggest adding ‘with an adequate soil volume for survivability.’ Street trees are usually planted within 25 feet of the edge of pavement with adequate planting bed for root expansion and plant needs. Page 134 describes these minimum bed sizes. There should be a detailed link to this section.”	DPW&T	This section of the Landscape Manual is for discussion of the importance of critical issues to provide guidance to the Landscape Architect but is not for the purpose of creating the actual regulations, within are contained in Section 4.	Make no change
Pages 34 and 147	Ornamental Grasses and Perennials	“The manual does not address ornamental grasses or perennials which are an important part of any successful and well-rounded plantings. Will there be any equivalencies provided for using perennials and or grasses in place of shrubs?”	DPW&T	Staff agrees, and it is the intent to allow for the use of ornamental grasses and perennials, as well as ground covers in lieu of lawn areas. In fact, the Landscape Manual promotes the use of these plant types. Therefore, a number of changes are needed to provide for this outcome.	On page 34, label the table and clarify the equivalency of 5 perennials/ornamental /grasses = 1 plant unit. The definition of plant unit on page 147 needs to be adjusted to include the information in the table adjustment made above.
Page 34	Section 3.4.e	“‘Ground plane planting’ - this term is unclear.”	DPW&T	“Ground plane planting” is surface planting with materials that are low-growing and is a recognized term or art for landscaping.	Make no change
Page 34	Section 3.4.f	For clarity, in the second paragraph add “screening and” between where and bufferyard in the first sentence. Add “4.6 Buffering Development from Streets between the reference to 4.4 and 4.7	Planning Staff	Staff concurs.	Revise Sec. 3.4.f. to read: “Where <u>screening and</u> bufferyard planting is required (see Sections 4.4, <u>Screening Requirements</u> , <u>4.6 Buffering Development From Streets</u> , and 4.7, <u>Buffering Incompatible Uses</u>),...”
Page 34	Section 3.4.g	Delete the line for “street tree” from the Planting Unit Equivalences table.	Planning Staff	Staff concurs. A street tree is the same as a shade tree for the purposes of the Landscape Manual	Delete the line for street trees from the table.
Page 35	Section 3.5	“ Other Landscape Design Considerations – Landscaping for energy conservation - Protection from wind requires evergreen trees planted in masse, in close proximity, and often two rows deep, which is not practical on most sites.”	Civicomment	Chapter 3 of the Landscape Manual, Landscape Elements and Design Criteria, is not regulatory, but provides guidance to the plan preparer for consideration. The language as proposed is appropriate for this purpose.	Make no change
Page 36	Section 3.5.b	Low-impact development methods should be substituted with environmental site design for stormwater management	Planning Staff	Staff concurs.	Search for the term “low-impact development” and

Landscape Manual Comments 2017

Page Number	Section	Comment	Source	Staff Analysis	Staff Recommendation
					update it to “environmental site design.”
Page 36	Section 3.5.b	“The problem of landscaping plants being destroyed by deer needs to be addressed by noting the importance of using ‘Deer resistant plants’ in areas where plant survival is a problem.”	DPW&T	The issue of deer-resistant plants is a comment that would be best addressed in the discussion relating to Sustainable Landscaping, as a consideration of the Landscape Architect as they design the plant palette for the proposed development.	Revise Sec. 3.5.b. to add a reference to the importance of using deer-resistant plants
Page 37	Section 3.5.b	“ Sustainable Landscaping - This needs to be open to all forms of permeable surfaces, not just jointed ones. Porous asphalt pavements and pervious concrete are equally valid options that should not be disallowed because the code specifies jointed surfaces such as permeable pavers.”	Civiccomment	This comment pertains to Sec. 3.5.b, item 8 of 10 in the list of “key sustainable landscaping techniques.” Staff concurs that a broader reference to porous asphalt pavements and pervious concrete are equally valid options in this guidance section.	Revise list number 8 on page 37 to read: “Reducing the amount of impervious surface used in landscaped areas through the use of alternative hard surfaces [with permeable joints, such as stepping stones, permeable paver walkways, cobblestones, and decks] <u>such as porous asphalt pavement and pervious concrete.</u> ”
Page 37	Section 3.5.c	“ Landscaping for energy conservation - This is incorrect. Trees in this function often have large canopies of 30'-to 40' and the center of the trunk is to be planted 20' away from the structure in order to avoid interference or damage to the structure. Ideally, instead of providing a distance number, when designing, the edge of the mature canopy diameter should not touch the building, with the trunk being in the center of the canopy circle.”	Civiccomment	Staff concurs. The dimensions should be revised from 10 feet to at least 20 feet from the building façade.	Revise Sec. 3.5.c. to read: “...within [thirty (30)] feet of the structure and a minimum of [ten (10)] <u>20</u> feet off of the building façade.”
Page 38-44	Section 3.5	“Landscaping standards as set forth in the beginning reference good design standards, but we could not find any mention of the importance of providing “four season interest” as part of a design strategy. We suggest including this in the design criteria on pages 38-44.”	DPW&T	Staff concurs	Add a new subsection l. to Section 3.5 to include a discussion of the importance of diversity of plant material to improve the visual quality of the landscape as a whole. Landscapes should be designed for year-round visual interest through the use of evergreen, deciduous, flowering, herbs and fruiting plant species. These elements of the vegetative materials are often found in the historic manuals of gardens that are visually recognizable by people as plant materials that

Landscape Manual Comments 2017

Page Number	Section	Comment	Source	Staff Analysis	Staff Recommendation
					they can relate to and remember.
Page 39	Section 3.5.f	“ Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED) - and understory plant materials with a maximum natural growth height of 36”	Civiccomment	This added verbiage is helpful and should be added into paragraph 2, line 4 after “eight feet”.	Change accordingly
Page 40 and 68	Section 3.5.h and Section 4.3.c.2.C and I.ii	“Tree pruning and clearance of vehicles under trees, page 40. Refer to pruning standards in DPW&T guidelines. There are many professional sources of information on pruning including SHA and DNR. The State also has standards. Clearance Pruning standards: 7 feet above the sidewalk, 10 feet above the curb and 17 feet above the roadway. Clearance standards are also mentioned on page 68, parking lot standards.”	DPW&T	These suggestions are to refer to other professional sources for the pruning of trees. This issue is addressed in Section 4.3.c.2.C on page 75 and I.ii on page 79, where the trees are required to provide a clearance of 8 feet. This height should actually be changed to 10 feet in both of those sections and the reference to clearance on page 40 should be removed, as it is conflicting	Delete the second paragraph of Sec. 3.5.h. Revise Sec. 4.3.c.2.C. on page 74 and 4.3.c.2.I.ii. on page 79 to increase the tree clearance height from eight to ten feet.
Page 41	Section 3.5j	“...DPW&T's Standards and Specifications [Prince George's County Code Part II, Title 17, Subtitle 25 - Trees and Vegetation and Stormwater Management Design Manual] should be referenced as the guideline for all plantings proposed in the County's ROW, not just those related to stormwater management, as cited under <i>Section 3.5 Other Landscape Design. Considerations.</i> ”	DPW&T	DPW&T is emphasizing the specific section of the County Code relating to all plantings within the right-of-way. Staff agrees that the wording should be adjusted to delete the reference to DPW&T and that the appropriate agency is DPIE, relating to the governance of on-site stormwater management. Section 3.5j should be revised to delete the reference to DPW&T and substitute DPIE as the agency that reviews and approves the plans associated with the stormwater management. In addition, for informational purposes only, it makes sense to include another notation under I, stating that DPW&T's Standards and Specifications (Prince George's County Code Part II, Title 17, Subtitle 25 - Trees and Vegetation and Stormwater Management Design Manual) should be referenced as the guideline for all plantings proposed in the County's rights-of-way	Change the language to reference the tree planting specifications.
Page 41	Section 3.5.j	Change “shall” to “should” in the second to last line	Planning Staff	Staff concurs.	Revise the last sentence of Sec. 3.5.j. to read: “...similar techniques [shall] <u>should</u> be planted in accordance with the MDE manual and/or DPW&T regulations.”
Page 41	Section 3.5.k	Substitute “take the concept of community gardens to” with “are privately held lands that serve the local community at”	Planning Staff	The initially-proposed language is confusing and slightly inaccurate. The proposed language needs some additional tweaks,	Revise the third sentence of Sec. 3.5.k. to read: “A community garden is a

Landscape Manual Comments 2017

Page Number	Section	Comment	Source	Staff Analysis	Staff Recommendation
				since not all urban farms are, or will be, privately held land.	shared space where groups of people can grow fruits, vegetables, and other planted species and urban farms [take the concept of community gardens to] <u>serve the local community at a larger production scale</u>
Page 44	Section 4.1 Residential Requirements	“Purposes and Objectives – #4. Turfgrasses actually can contribute to biodiversity by providing insect habitat, food stock, and open spaces, particularly supporting bird and small mammal life.”	Civiccomment	The purpose statement is intended to support more use of ground cover, understory and canopy, rather than large expanses of turf grass. The use of large expanses of lawn deter biodiversity in the landscape.	Make no change
Page 44	Section 4.1.a.4	Add the words “which provide habitat for pollinators and bird species” between the words “plant materials” and “in the landscape.”	Planning Staff	Staff concurs, as this revision would help to support the bio-diversity goals.	Revise Sec. 4.1.a.4. to read: “Create greater bio-diversity of plant materials <u>which provide habitat for pollinators and bird species in the landscape, through...</u> ”
Page 44	Section 4.1.b	“Design Guidelines – “1. Remove/Rewrite - Singular evergreen trees are completely ineffective in the role described in this paragraph. What would be required are windbreaks consisting of a row of evergreen trees, often double rows, and trees being a significant height, to block wind, these trees would also need to be relatively close to the house to be in the wind shadow. Too close for most homeowners to be comfortable with. It will also take 20 years or more for the trees to be effective. Rewrite the building code to achieve energy goals. “2. Remove or rewrite all of the sections regarding Landscaping for Energy Conservation - Most of the County's zoning categories minimum dimensions for side yards do not allow adequate space for large shade trees to grow effectively. And the minimum dimension to be planted away from the house is entirely too close. The types of tree required in the text often reach a canopy diameter of 35'-40', meaning the trunk be planted 15' to 20' from the structure to avoid interfering and damaging the house. Consider revising the building code for greater energy efficiency instead.”	Civiccomment	These design guidelines provide suggestions to the plan reviewer for consideration and are not regulatory. The issue raised relating to the design of wind breaks is valid but are not required to be planted if there is insufficient space. The same is true of the issues raised relating to the guidelines on landscaping for energy conservation.	Make no change.
Page 46	Section 4.1.c	“No minimum lot area plantings for all sections.”	Maryland Building Industry Association	Minimum planting quantities for each lot, based on size of the lot is a basic concept of the residential planting requirements since the 1990 Landscape Manual.	Make no change
Page 46 Page 139	Section 4.1.c	Noncombustible landscaping buffers should be provided around the exterior of any buildings made of combustible materials to provide enhanced fire protection.	Fire/EMS Department	Staff concurs.	Add a new subsection 1 to Sec. 4.1.c. on page 46 to read: “ <u>Ensure there is a minimum offset of 1 foot between the building foundation and combustible</u>

Landscape Manual Comments 2017

Page Number	Section	Comment	Source	Staff Analysis	Staff Recommendation
					<p><u>planting, landscaping, or mulching material.”</u></p> <p>Add a new subsection 1 to Sec. 4.1.c. on page 139 to read: “<u>Ensure there is a minimum offset of 1 foot between the building foundation and combustible planting, landscaping, or mulching material.”</u>”</p>
Page 46	Section 4.1.c.1	<p>Reword the paragraph to say:</p> <p>Street trees planted along the front lot line and required per Section 4.10 may count toward the required per-lot plantings specified in Section 4.1(c)(1)(A-D) below.</p>	Planning Staff	There is no need to revise the paragraph, since it is specific to certain circumstances.	Make no change
Page 46	Section 4.1.c.1.A.II	Substitute the word “total” with the word “minimum” and add the words “in planting beds” at the end of the sentence.	Planning Staff	This change will help facilitate the measurement of the required area of the plantings for compliance and enforcement purposes.	Revise Sec. 4.1.c.1.A.II. on page 46 to read: “A minimum of [two (2)] percent of the [total] <u>minimum</u> lot area shall be planted with shrubs, perennials, and/or groundcover <u>in planting beds.</u> ”
Page 46	Section 4.1.c.1.A.III	“Remove - Ineffective, and trees are required to be planted entirely too close to the structure. These major shade trees reach canopy diameters of 35' to 40', and should be planted a minimum of 20' away from the structure.”	Civicomment	The staff agrees that there is a discrepancy in the Landscape Manual that should be corrected by removing the last sentence of Section 4.1.c.1.A.III	Delete the last sentence of Sec. 4.1.c.1.A.III. on page 46.
Page 47	Section 4.1.c.1.B.II	Substitute the word “total” with the word “minimum” and add the words “in planting beds” at the end of the sentence.	Planning Staff	Staff concurs.	Revise Sec. 4.1.c.1.B.II. on page 46 to read: “A minimum of [four (4)] percent of the [total] <u>minimum</u> lot area shall be planted with shrubs, perennials, and/or groundcover <u>in planting beds.</u> ”
Page 47	Section 4.1.c.1.B.III	“Same comment as above Remove - Ineffective, and trees are required to be planted entirely too close to the structure. These major shade trees reach canopy diameters of 35' to 40', and should be planted a minimum of 20' away from the structure.”	Civicomment	Staff concurs.	Delete the last sentence of Sec. 4.1.c.1.B.III. on page 47.
Page 47	Section 4.1.c.1.C.II	Substitute the word “total” with the word “minimum” and add the words “in planting beds” at the end of the sentence.	Planning Staff	Staff concurs.	Revise Sec. 4.1.c.1.C.II. on page 47 to read: “A minimum of [six (6)] percent of the [total] <u>minimum</u> lot area shall be planted with shrubs, perennials, and/or

Landscape Manual Comments 2017

Page Number	Section	Comment	Source	Staff Analysis	Staff Recommendation
					groundcover <u>in planting beds</u> .”
Page 47	Section 4.1.c.1.C.III	“Same comment as above Remove - Ineffective, and trees are required to be planted entirely too close to the structure. These major shade trees reach canopy diameters of 35' to 40', and should be planted a minimum of 20' away from the structure.”	Civicomment	Staff concurs.	Delete the last sentence of Sec. 4.1.c.1.C.III. on page 47.
Page 48	Section 4.1.c.1.D.II	Substitute the word “total” with the word “minimum” and add the words “in planting beds” at the end of the sentence.	Planning Staff	Staff concurs.	Revise Sec. 4.1.c.1.D.II. on page 47 to read: “A minimum of [eight (8)] percent of the [total] <u>minimum</u> lot area shall be planted with shrubs, perennials, and/or groundcover <u>in planting beds</u> .”
Page 48	Section 4.1.c.1.D.III	“Same comment as above Remove - Ineffective, and trees are required to be planted entirely too close to the structure. These major shade trees reach canopy diameters of 35' to 40', and should be planted a minimum of 20' away from the structure.”	Civicomment	Staff concurs.	Delete the last sentence of Sec. 4.1.c.1.D.III. on page 48.
Page 48	Section 4.1.c.1.E.II	Substitute the word “total” with the word “minimum” and add the words “in planting beds” at the end of the sentence.	Planning Staff	This will help facilitate the measurement of the required area of the plantings for compliance and enforcement purposes and streamline.	Revise Sec. 4.1.c.1.E.II. on page 48 to read: “A minimum of [eight (8)] percent of the [total] <u>minimum</u> lot area shall be planted with shrubs, perennials, and/or groundcover <u>in planting beds</u> .”
Page 49	Section 4.1.c.2 – intro paragraph	This should be deleted	Planning Staff	The development of townhouse dwellings and other multiplex units horizontally arranged in the Transit-Oriented/Activity Center zones would most likely never have backyard 20 feet in depth. That is a suburban standard. Rear yards may be a driveway used for rear load garages. Further, it should be noted that that all required plant materials required are allowed to be either on the lot or in the common areas.	Delete the first paragraph in Sec. 4.1.c.2.
Page 49	Section 4.1.c.2.A	“Remove all fractional requirements. Either make it one or two.”	CiviComment	The fractional quantitative measurement relates to the total plant count and allows for the plants to be placed either on the lot or in common open space.	Make no change
Page 49	4.1.c.2	“ Townhouses - should not apply for towns with rear loaded garages or reduce the requirement by half. There is not enough room to place even small ornamental trees in the spaces between driveways. Also, even the placement of 1 shade tree per lot is excessive when the townhouse lot is 20 feet wide, let alone if they are 16ft wide. That would mean the spacing is 1 shade tree per every 16 ft. Too tight for towns.”	Maryland Building Industry Association	4.1.c.2.A.-Plantings of townhouse and multiplex single-family homes allows for the plantings to be either on the lot or in the common open space of the overall development.	Make no change
Page 50	Section 4.1.c.3 – intro paragraph	This should be deleted	Planning Staff	The development of townhouse dwellings and other multiplex units horizontally	Delete the first paragraph in Sec. 4.1.c.3.

Landscape Manual Comments 2017

Page Number	Section	Comment	Source	Staff Analysis	Staff Recommendation
				arranged in the Transit-Oriented/Activity Center zones would most likely never have backyard 20 feet in depth. That is a suburban standard. Rear yards may be a driveway used for rear load garages. Further, it should be noted that that all required plant materials required are allowed to be either on the lot or in the common areas.	
Page 50	4.1.c.3	“Same for 2 family dwellings. If they have rear garages, the back yard/planting area is gone.”	Maryland Building Industry Association	The language of 4.1.c.2.A. allows for the plantings to be placed on lots or in the common open space.	Make no change
Page 50	Section 4.1.c.3.A	“Remove all fractional requirements”	Civicomment	The fractional quantitative measurement relates to the total plant count and allows for the plants to be placed either on the lot or in common open space.	Make no change
Page 50	Section 4.1.c.3.B	Add the words “in planting beds” at the end of the sentence.	Planning Staff	This will help facilitate the measurement of the required area of the plantings for compliance and enforcement purposes.	Revise Sec. 4.1.c.3.B. on page 50 to read: “...or common open space shall be planted with shrubs, perennials, and/or groundcover <u>in planting beds</u> along the entire façade.” Revise Sec. 4.1.c.2.B. on page 49 in the same manner.
Page 50	Section 4.1.c.3.B	Add this to Table 4.1-1 on page 53.	Planning Staff	The table lists all of the requirements and this is missing from the table.	Revise Table 4.1-1 on page 53 to add references to shrub, perennial, and/or groundcover in planting beds along the entire façade.
Page 51	Section 4.1.c.5.B	Remove the second to last sentence	Planning Staff	Trees planted in response to the amount of green area on the site should be planted in the green area, not in a parking compound. The trees within parking compounds are urban trees that live on average no more than 7-10 years. The trees required based on green area should be within the green area and will live much longer and provide ecosystem services that a parking lot shade trees cannot due to lack of soil volume.	Delete the second to last sentence of Sec. 4.1.c.5.B.
Page 51	4.1.c.5.D	“The requirement for 25% for gross SF planted with ornamental, evergreen, shrubs, and groundcover is not a practical way of providing diversity. Maybe it should say 25% of the required planting calculated in 4.1C.5A shall be a combination of ornamental, evergreen, shrubs, and groundcover based upon the substitution table.”	Maryland Building Industry Association	The requirement is proposing the creation of biodiversity as compared to the use of turf grass, see 4.1(a)(4), by requiring 25 percent of the common area to be planted with material s other than turf. This will mean the	Make no change

Landscape Manual Comments 2017

Page Number	Section	Comment	Source	Staff Analysis	Staff Recommendation
				creation of planting beds rather than large expanse of turf grass. These beds might be at the base of the structure as foundations plantings or other areas of the site.	
Page 57	Section 4.2	“Shrubs & smaller plant material should be permitted to be planted up to half of the width of the PUE and count towards the landscape strip.”	Maryland Building Industry Association	The planting of vegetations within any public utility easement is not an issue for the Zoning Ordinance or the Landscape Manual. Permission must be granted by the utility prior to the approval of the plans.	Make no change
Page 57	Section 4.2	“Section 4.2 landscape strips along streets. Page (46) 57(?) discusses requirements but does not mention Maryland Roadside Tree Law, OPIE regulations or OPW&T Specifications and standards. Need some brief mention at least. See# 3 above.” Staff comment: There is confusion on the statement above because the page number is not associated with Section 4.2	DPW&T	As suggested earlier in this document, the references to the review of proposed street trees within the public right of way is not the subject of the Landscape Manual. A paragraph should be added under Additional Requirements so that a plan preparer and public will understand that other regulations existing for the planting of vegetation within a public right-of-way	Make no change
Page 63	Section 4.2.c.6.A	“Provide buffer reduction for properties providing an ornamental non-opaque fence between the street and parking lot.”	Civicomment	Reducing the width of the landscape strip for the provision of a non-opaque fence behind the right-of-way line is reasonable.	Add an option to allow a minimum of 6 feet in width when a 4-6 foot-high non-opaque decorative fence is provided and provide 1 tree and 10 shrubs per 30 linear feet planted between the R/W and the fence.
Page 74	Section 4.3	“Figure 4.3-7 and text should be revised to not include the building, sidewalks, and drive aisles not associated with parking. If the objective is to “provide shade and visual relief within parking areas” then true parking areas should be measured.	Maryland Building Industry Association	Staff believe the referenced figure accurately shows the parking lot area that counts toward the planting requirements.	Make no change.
Page 74	Section 4.3.c.2.A	“Parking Lot Interior Planting Requirements <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Plantings within 8' of the back of curb, including trees, can count towards parking lot landscaping. Trunks must be planted within 8'. Canopy coverage will not count. • Revise graphic (Figure 4.3-7 Parking Lot Area) to show condition if there is larger planting space adjacent to a building so larger planter can count towards parking lot landscaping Landscape” 	Civicomment	The suggestion is to allow for credit to be given for trees located along the perimeter of a parking compound if they are located within 8 feet of the exterior edge of the parking compound. There is merit to this suggestion, particularly if the planting provides for tree canopy and shade to deflect the heat island effect of large expanses of asphalt, such as locating the trees along the southern or western edge of the parking lot. The second suggestion relates to planting associated with the requirements of Section 4.8, along the building frontage. The suggestion is to allow the building frontage areas to also fulfill the requirements for the	Revise Sec. 4.3.c.2.A. to read: “...For purposes of computing the total area of any parking lot, all areas within the perimeter of the parking lot shall be counted, including planting islands, curbed areas, corner areas, <u>plantings located within 8 feet of the back of the perimeter parking area curb,</u> parking spaces, aisles, and all circulation exclusively to the drop-off and loading area.”

Landscape Manual Comments 2017

Page Number	Section	Comment	Source	Staff Analysis	Staff Recommendation
				parking lot interior planting requirements. Staff agrees that the “double counting” of the plant material should be allowed, if shade trees have adequate space to provide canopy over the primary drive aisle. The illustration already reflects this concept, as there are larger planting areas adjoining the building in the illustration.	
Page 75	Section 4.3.c.2.C	“300 SF can be a very difficult # to achieve. Suggest lowering the number but increasing minimum planting space to allow for larger shade tree varieties to be planted.”	Civicomment	The one shade tree per 300 square-feet of green area was established in law as early as 1984 has been a successful practice. The suggestion to increase the minimum planting space, to allow for large shade tree varieties as a good one, and consistent with advocates of urban trees in order to provide adequate soil volume for tree health and vitality.	Revise Sec. 4.3.c.2.E. on page 75 to increase the planting spaces required for healthy tree growth.
Page 76	Section 4.3.c.2.E.IV	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “For visibility and safety, shrubs or ground covers with a natural growth height above 36” are prohibited from being planted in parking lot islands. • “For safety and visibility, no shrubs or groundcovers with a natural height over 48” shall not be planted in medians. • “No shrubs or groundcovers or grasses with a natural mature height in excess of 24” and shall be planted within 20’ of an intersection internal to the parking lot.” 	Civicomment	Staff concurs.	Revise Sec. 4.3.c.2.E.IV. to add the suggested clarity regarding plantings in the planting islands.
Page 79	Section 4.3.c.2.I II	“1/200 SF is entirely too many shade trees, as forces many trees to be planted in conditions they cannot survive...too much density. Reduce #”	Civicomment	This section of the code is an alternative to Section 4.3.c.2.II (which requires not more than 2 contiguous parking bays without the provision of a minimum 9 foot wide island). Staff disagrees with the suggestion to remove this provision because it provides flexibility in the design of parking compounds over 50,000 square feet. Further, staff disagrees with the suggestions that the trees could not survive.	Make no change
Page 82 and 83	Section 4.4.b and 4.4.c.1. B	“Design Guidelines #1- or gloss finished PVC.”	Civicomment	This comment focuses on adding a gloss finished PVC fencing to the prohibited list of screening materials. Staff believes that the high gloss PVC might not be desired by some, but it is highly marketed and may be an issue of aesthetic taste rather than unsightliness.	Make no change
Page 87	Section 4.5	“...the manual repeatedly gives special mention to WSSC design criteria and requirements as a guideline for working within the public ROW. WSSC is one of multiple utility companies that have assets located in the County or State Highway ROW. When located in the County's ROW, WSSC and other utilities must follow DPW&T guidelines for planting and activities, not vice versa. The landscape manual is a County document and it is vital that jurisdictional rights and agency governance within the public	DPW&T	Staff does not agree with this comment. Members of the staff project team have been present in joint agency discussions with WSSC, DPIE, SHA, and DPW&T where it was stated by both WSSC and the roadway operating agencies that they each held	Make no change.

Landscape Manual Comments 2017

Page Number	Section	Comment	Source	Staff Analysis	Staff Recommendation
		right of way complement practice (see page 87, 132.). Specific mention of WSSC ROW and easement "rights, guidelines, criteria" should be removed. Washington Gas, Pepco, and Verizon all have their own guidelines and it is helpful to mention these in broad terms as a design constraint for County streetscapes but the utility companies have utility easements not rights-of-ways within DPW&T ROW."		<p>supremacy over guidelines and utilities relationships, and there was much confusion and disagreement as to the actual practices at play and to which organization the state has authorized supremacy for this situation.</p> <p>Staff is agnostic over this issue – we are most concerned with effective placemaking, not necessarily who owns what where.</p> <p>Pending additional – and clear – guidance on this question, we choose to retain the current language, which is simply a pointer to applicants that they must coordinate with appropriate operating agencies.</p>	
Page 87	Section 4.5	"SWM - Add trees to accept materials."	Civicomment	Section 4.5 is suggestive and provides guidance in the design of landscaping in stormwater management facilities. The comment suggests that any trees used in the design of stormwater management facilities be allowed to be counted toward the fulfillment of requirements of the subject Landscape Manual. Any vegetation shown on the landscape plan will be given credit toward the fulfillment of the requirements of the Landscape Manual, but the actual agency that reviews and approves the plantings associated with the stormwater management facilities is the Department of Permitting, Inspections, and Enforcement.	Make no change
Page 89	Section 4.6	"The width of the bufferyard should include the PUE. If you have a 50ft requirement, then you actually have a 60 ft setback. Shrubs and perennial should be permitted to be planted in the PUE".	Maryland Building Industry Association	The public utilities agencies have the final authority of what can and cannot be planted within their rights of ways and easements.	Make no change
Page 89	Section 4.6	"Four season interest is good design should also be conveyed in Section 4.6, page 89, "be designed to create varied and attractive views on a year-round basis."	DPW&T	This suggestion is already addressed in the Design Guideline Section 4.6.b.1 which addresses the need for diversity in visual characteristics and year-round attractiveness within the buffers to be planted along the roadways.	Make no change
Page 90	Section 4.6.c.1.A.III	"Reduce planting requirement and buffer distance if ornamental non-opaque [fence] is provided. 6' or higher."	Civicomment	Staff concurs.	Revise Sec. 4.6.c.1.A to read: "...All plant material required for this buffer shall be located outside of public utility easements adjacent to the right-of-way. <u>Planting</u>

Landscape Manual Comments 2017

Page Number	Section	Comment	Source	Staff Analysis	Staff Recommendation
					<u>and buffer requirements for this buffer may be reduced up to 50 percent if an ornamental, non-opaque fence of six feet in height is provided.</u> The width of the buffer and the plant materials....”
Page 97	Section 4.7	“Incompatible Uses should be identified by existing and proposed uses not existing zoning of the property. Existing zoning should only be used when the land is vacant.”	Maryland Building Industry Association	This section does focus on uses. The zoning only plays a role with regard to the proposed Transit-Oriented/Activity Center zones, where bufferyards and additional setbacks are not appropriate, as the primary goal for these areas is to ensure mixed-use, transportation-oriented development.	Make no change.
Page 111	Section 4.8	“This should only apply to Transit Oriented projects and only 4.8-1 & 4.8-2 should apply. The other frontage relationships should not be incorporated. These standards would seem to fit only urban settings and the entire County is not urban.”	Maryland Building Industry Association	There is confusion on the statement because it is unclear if the writer is speaking of the Figures 4.8-1 & 4.8-2, which are illustrative, or the requirements of 4.8.c.1 & 4.8.c.2, which is the entirety of the Section.	Make no change.
Page 116	Section 4.8.c.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “Trees numbers should be based on minimal planting volumes, not by a % or linear footage. • “Suspending sidewalk systems to provide minimum planting volumes or bioretention? • “The use of gravel based structural soils is not allowed unless special circumstances warrant (poor drainage areas) • “The regulations as outlined above are very outdated, suggest looking for newer, more modern requirements from surrounding municipalities such as DC or Alexandria. 	Civicomment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Although not totally clear, the comment may be suggesting that the number of trees required to be planted should be based on the available soil volume associated with the planter area. This will ensure that there is sufficient soil volume to support the urban tree planting. The problem with this suggestion is the lack of quantities for the minimum soil volume. Opinions vary greatly. • This comment suggests that suspending sidewalks over soil volumes is an effective way of providing more soil for the trees. The requirements do not prohibit this technology from being utilized. • This comment suggests that gravel-based soils are not recommended, but the Landscape Manual does not promote the use of the gravel-based soils. • Comment noted. 	Make no change
Page 117-119 and 134-136	Section 4.8 and 4.10	“Regarding spacing of street trees, pages 117-119, pages 134-136, and pages117-119. “a. Suggest that the spacing requirement for shade trees be 30-35 ft. apart and not 50 ft. We recommend 25 ft. spacing for ornamental trees. Please change the wording from "not greater than fifty (50) feet on center" to "not greater than 30 feet on center." In this	DPW&T	Section 4.8 of the Landscape Manual speaks to street tree spacing of not less than 25 or greater than 50 feet, excluding driveways.	Revise Sections 4.8 and 4.10 to indicate that street trees should not be planted more

Landscape Manual Comments 2017

Page Number	Section	Comment	Source	Staff Analysis	Staff Recommendation
		document, there are inconsistent references to 40 and 50 ft. spacing, but we suggest 30 ft to provide a closed canopy in 20 years. We will accept 35 ft. in lieu of 30 ft. “b. Please confirm that these recommendations are consistent with County code. “c. Changing the minimum distance for street trees will affect many pages and forms and the appendix.”		Section 4.10 requires street trees at a rate of 1 per 40 feet, excluding driveways. Staff is recommending that the revisions basically state that the street trees should not be planted more than 35 feet on center, excluding driveways. It is not the intent of the Landscape Manual to govern the requirements within the public right-of-way.	than 35 feet on-center, excluding driveways.
Page 119	Section 4.8.c.2.A.I	“Some of the distances are not workable. For instance, 14 feet, what happens when you include the implantable 10 PUE. There is only 4 feet left.”	Maryland Building Industry Association	Review of projects that include a public utilities easement (PUE) along a private roadway indicates that the PUE is located within the lot line. The area of the planting and the sidewalk is located outside of the lot line, so this concern should not be an issue	Make no change.
Page 119	Section 4.8.c.2.A.I	“Requiring planters is not practical. It leads to either substandard planters being proposed, or planters based upon the reviewer’s preferences”.	Maryland Building Industry Association	Staff agrees that raised tree planters are not necessary, so the sentence should be revised to clarify that raised tree planters are not required, but if included in the design, credit would be given.	Revise Sec. 4.8.c.2.A.1 to read: “...a minimum of [eight] 8 percent [(8%)] planted areas[,] (including, but not limited to, tree planters[,]) shall be provided.
Page 119	Section 4.8.c.2.A.II	“Residential uses besides multifamily buildings should be excluded.”	Maryland Building Industry Association	Staff agrees with the suggestion that Section 4.8(c)(2) should be revised to exclude all residential uses other than multifamily uses. This does bring to light that single-family attached housing with front load garages would not be able to adhere to the requirements, but single-family attached housing with rear load garages would be able to meet the requirements. It should also be noted that generally along the frontage of the private streets associated with townhouse development is the requirement of a PUE, which may make the requirement somewhat difficult to adhere to. Adjustments are needed to clarify. Further, this seems to replace the requirements of Section 4.10 Street Trees for Private Streets.	Revise Sec. 4.8.c.2 to be applicable to only multifamily development in all zones.
Page 120	Section 4.8.c.2.D	“with a natural maximum height less than 24”	Civicomment	This comment suggests that the words “with a natural maximum height less than 24” be inserted after the word shrubs in the second line. Staff concurs that low growing vegetation is appropriate	Revise Sec. 4.8.c.2.D to read: “A minimum of one-half [(1/2)] of the surface area of each provided tree planter shall be planted with shrubs

Landscape Manual Comments 2017

Page Number	Section	Comment	Source	Staff Analysis	Staff Recommendation
					<u>with a natural maximum height of less than 24 inches, and/or perennials.</u>
Page 126	Section 4.9.b.	“Design Guidelines – “#4. native, native cultivars, or regionally adapted plants “#8. do not allow gravel based structural soils. Sand based structural soils should only be used for bioretention.”	Civicomment	These comments suggest that the phrase “native, native cultivars, or regionally adapted plants” be substituted for “native plants” in line one to expand the palette of acceptable plant types in the landscape. Staff concurs. As discussed above, the Landscape Manual does not encourage the use of gravel-based soils.	Revise Sec. 4.9.b.4 to read: “The landscape design should include a diverse plant palette of native plants, <u>native cultivars, or regionally-adapted plants</u> with a wide variety of environmental benefits and should not include invasive species that negatively affect regional ecosystems.
Page 127	Section 4.9	“There are limited native shrubs and evergreen trees available. If used exclusively, it could create uniformity. Plus, many of the urban settings that are being created will have these more rural native plants contrasting the look and feel”.	Maryland Building Industry Association	None of the minimum percentage of native plant materials is required to be planted at a rate of 100 percent, which staff takes to be the concern of the comment as it pertains to the use of the term “exclusively.” It is unlikely that the average citizen can distinguish from native and non-native plant materials.	Make no change
Page 128	Section 4.9.c	“Invasive species should be defined by Maryland Department of Natural Resources (DNR) since these are updated regularly. Any list put in these regulations as an appendix could be outdated in a couple of years. This is on page 128, but the authoritative source needs to specify Maryland DNR since the manual refers to a specific document name rather than the authoritative agency.”	DPW&T	Staff has done much research on this issue and the DNR website references the Maryland Invasive Species Council. The current reference is accurate.	Make no change
Page 132	Section 4.10	“Section 4.10 Street trees for private streets...describes who governs street trees... a. Need to include Maryland ONR and Roadside Tree Law of 1914 b. References to existing regulations and Maryland Roadside tree law are incomplete. Please include DPW&T, Maryland and OPIE regulatory authority. WSSC has no authority in our ROW neither does the National Park System.”	DPW&T	The proposed Landscape Manual already addresses the distinction between public and private streets on page 132. Paragraphs 2 and 3 on this page are globally applicable to all regulations of Section 4.10. The references to the various agencies are intended to identify the agencies which may have control over one or more streets or rights-of-way in the County. There is no intent to limit the discussion to DPW&T roadways only.	Make no change.
Page 132	Section 4.10	“Add a section called "Street Trees for public streets"	DPW&T	The Landscape Manual is not the appropriate location to provide regulations for street trees within the public right-of-way. That is the responsibility of the DPW&T for County rights-of-way, and is within Subtitle 23.	Make no change

Landscape Manual Comments 2017

Page Number	Section	Comment	Source	Staff Analysis	Staff Recommendation
Page 133	Section 4.10	<p>“Design guidelines. Suggested changes include:</p> <p>a. "Street trees should be part of an overall streetscape plan designed to provide both canopy and shade and to give special character and coherence to each street". Methods to achieve this should be detailed.</p> <p>b. Species diversity. "Plans should provide species diversity corresponding to the street character by planting different streets with different trees." Does this sentence imply only one species per block? Our suggestion is to include the design guideline that it is also a good idea to have diversity within each block while maintaining character.</p> <p>c. The following sentence seems not quite correct: "The desired aesthetic effect should be achieved using native and/or proven hardy adapted species." Along the street, we often use non-native species or cultivars of native species and the guidelines should allow this. The term "hardy" refers to temperature hardiness, the ability to survive cold weather and sub-freezing temperatures for extended periods. "Hardiness" in arboriculture is not <u>general</u> survivability and tolerance of street conditions.”</p>	DPW&T	<p>The methods to achieve the guideline take the creatively of the landscape architect that this required to prepare the plans. No changes are necessary to these guidelines.</p> <p>Staff agrees that diversity within each block can be an effective way to provide for sustainability, but that it should not be a requirement at this time.</p> <p>Staff agrees with the suggestion that the sentence could be improved, and substituted as follows:</p>	<p>Revise Sec. 4.10.b.5 to read: “The desired aesthetic effect should be achieved [through the use of native and/or proven hardy adapted species.] <u>using either native and/or cultivars of native species, with tolerance of street conditions to improve survivability.</u>”</p>
Page 134	Section 4.10.c	<p>“Requirements - “#6. prohibit gravel based structural soils “#8. Reduce minimum size to 2" to 2-1/2". Smaller caliper sizes have been proven to be far more successful in survival of newly planted street trees, as much less of the root structure is disturbed when dug out, and a younger tree can better adapt to new planting environment than an older 3" tree. Smaller trees are also far more available for planting, leading to having more appropriate species being installed. “#15. Tree grates are to be maintained by property owner to prevent tree girdling “#16. no greater than 36" natural maximum height.</p>	Civicomment	<p>Research indicates that the terminology between crushed stone and gravel is confusing and used interchangeably. Staff does not recommend prohibiting its use at this time, and further, notes the Landscape Manual does not encourage gravel-based soils.</p> <p>The suggestion that the use of a slightly smaller caliper tree is better due to higher viability rates along streets. Research indicates that Anne Arundel County, Baltimore County, and the City of Alexandria, VA all require a minimum 2-2.5 inch caliper shade tree. Staff also notes that a reduction in the tree caliper will also correlate with a reduction in height, so there will be less visual impact upon planting.</p> <p>The suggestion that tree grates should be maintained by the property owner is true as is all aspects of the tree maintenance. There is no additional need to state this.</p> <p>The suggestion that the words “no greater than 36" natural maximum height” should be added to the requirement. Staff assumes the suggestion to keep plant material below 36 inches is to provide for best visibility and concurs with this intent.</p>	<p>Revise Sec. 4.10.c.8 to reduce the minimum street tree caliper to 2 to 2.5 inches.</p> <p>Revise Sec. 4.10.c.16 to read: “Continuous street tree planting strips that contain a minimum of [three (3)] trees shall be planted with grass, shrubs, perennials, and/or groundcover. <u>Such plantings shall have a natural maximum height of no more than 36 inches.</u> (See Figure 4.10-4)”</p>

Landscape Manual Comments 2017

Page Number	Section	Comment	Source	Staff Analysis	Staff Recommendation
Page 135	Section 4.10	“...concerning minimum caliper of 2.5 inches. We will accept 2-inch caliper trees as the minimum.”	DPW&T	Although the trees required per the Landscape Manual are not required in the public right-of-way, staff has previously suggested the reduction in the shade tree size correlates with at least three other jurisdictions in the Washington Metropolitan area.	See revision above to reduce the minimum street tree caliper.
Page 138	Section 4.11.a	“Purposes and Objectives #3. Remove”	Civiccomment	Staff does not agree with this suggestion, which would delete a purpose/objective statement focused on reducing energy needs through passive energy conservation.	Make no change.
Page 139	Section 4.11.c.2	“As mentioned earlier, the requirement for 25% for gross SF planted with ornamental, evergreen, shrubs, and groundcover is not a practical way of providing diversity. Maybe it should say 25% of the required planting calculated in 4.1C.5A shall be a combination of ornamental, evergreen, shrubs, and groundcover based upon the substitution table.”	Maryland Building Industry Association	The requirement is proposing the creation of biodiversity as compared to the use of turf grass) see 4.1.a.4, by requiring 25 percent of the common area to be planted with materials other than turf. This will mean the creation of planting beds rather than large expanses of turf grass. Staff recommends adding a similar purpose statement to this section as was added in Section 4.1.a.4, recommended above, as this a similarly intended requirement.	Revise Sec. 4.11.c.2. to read: “...shall be planted with ornamental trees, evergreen trees, shrubs, perennials, and/or groundcover <u>to provide habitat for pollinators and bird species in the landscape.</u> ”
Page 147	Glossary of Terms	“Native Species - cultivars of native species and hybrids where both parents are native are also considered native for the purposes of this manual.”	Civiccomment	Staff concurs with this suggestion.	Revise the definition for native species on page 147 to add a sentence that reads: “Cultivars of native species and hybrids where both parents were native species are also considered native species for the purposes of this manual.”
Pages 153-155	Appendix Recommended Shade Trees (Table A-3a)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. We do not recommend Silver Linden in the ROW b. The common name for Ulmus parvifolia should be Lacebark Elm. Please include a note this is not to be confused with Siberian Elm, which is invasive c. Ulmus Americana cultivars: it gives 3 good cultivars, but it should not be limited to those. Because they keep on developing new cultivars d. Disagree with Bald Cypress comment. It only has aerating roots if it is situated in swampy locations and is constantly under wet conditions. We have planted this least Bald Cypress is native! (these trees are often confused) e. Golden Rain (Koelreuteria) tree should be on the list in Table A-3(e) or A-3(b) as it is a good tree in urban areas. I would add comments that it should not be used in rural areas or suburban areas. f. Table A-3(e) Trees Not Recommended for General Use <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Fraxinus spp. The common name given is Green Ash. The common name should be all Ash trees not just green ash. (White ash, pumpkin ash, blue ash, mountain ash, etc.) 	DPW&T	<p>The recommended list is not proposed within the public right-of-way. The plant lists only apply to planting of trees on private property. In this case, the Tilia tomentosa is highly recommend as a street tree by Dirr.</p> <p>The Ulmus parvifolia is known as both the Chinese Elm and the lacebark elm. The common name will be changed to list both names.</p> <p>The comments in these tables simply inform the Landscape Architect that certain species</p>	Revise the common name column next to “Ulmus parvifolia” to add “Lacebark Elm” to join “Chinese Elm.”

Landscape Manual Comments 2017

Page Number	Section	Comment	Source	Staff Analysis	Staff Recommendation
		The comments should say that all ash trees are susceptible to the deadly emerald ash borer beetle. Please add this species to the prohibited list.		listed are resistant to Dutch Elm disease, but it does not restrict the use of other cultivars.	
Page 153	Appendix 3, Table A-3 (a)	<p>“Sugar maple - Remove - Not recommended in the Atlantic Coastal Plains, which Prince George's County is in. Sugar Maples are an upland tree better suited to Western Maryland upland of the Piedmont region.</p> <p>“Northern Catalpa - Pure species not recommended for parking lot or street trees - use cultivars better suited to application.”</p>	Civiccomment	Staff concurs with both suggestions	Delete the Sugar Maple and Northern Catalpa shade trees from the list of recommended shade trees.
Page 153	Appendix 3: Plant Lists Table A-3e	“In considering Table A-3 (e): Plants Not Recommended for General Use, we must recognize that these species will be used as substitutions when more desirable species on the Recommended Lists are not available. This sets up an undesirable situation in the future when the County will pay the cost of removing these unwanted plants. Please consider moving the following trees to the "Prohibited" list: Tree of Heaven, Mimosa, Green Ash, Mountain Ash, and Siberian Elm.”	DPW&T	Staff agrees that the trees type requested to be in the prohibited list, Table A-3(h), are appropriately placed on that prohibited list. It should be noted that the Mimosa is already on the prohibited list and should not have been in both lists.	Place the recommended tree species on the prohibited planting list and remove Mimosa from the other list.
Page 153		<p>“The recommended plant lists in Appendix 3 of the proposed manual, could be expanded. Are these lists meant to be limiting or are they merely the lens through which OPIE and M- NCPPC views a plan for compliance and approval?</p> <p>“The list might be expanded to include cultivars and other plants that will survive and succeed in a low-maintenance scenario and harsh environments. We recommend that the lists have greater emphasis on identifying plants that are drought resistant, deer resistant, or have ability to thrive in compacted or clay soils. For example, the following plants, while on the recommended lists, have cultural, insect or disease issues that render them poor choices in the landscape: <i>Azaleas</i> (very susceptible to deer damage), <i>Pyracantha</i> (vulnerable to fire blight), <i>Kalmia</i> (hard to grow in all but the best conditions), <i>Arborvitae</i> (extremely susceptible to deer damage), <i>Rhododendron</i> (susceptible to deer damage and poor soils.) For instance, will <i>Ca/luna vulgaris</i>, or <i>Pierisjaponica</i> be permitted even though they are not listed?”</p>	DPW&T	<p>Most lists containing recommended plant material and are suggestive but not limiting. The prohibitive lists are intended to limit planting of Invasive Species and other nuisance plant material and are mandatory.</p> <p>The lists are suggestive as recommended and other plant material may be used, even if the material is not listed. The choice of the plant material is left to the Landscape Architect, except for those trees that are invasive. There is no “perfect” tree, as we learned with the Bradford Pear. Although the comment makes some valid points about certain trees, those same trees have other virtues that warren their use in certain circumstances. The use of a biodiverse landscaping is important and promoted.</p>	Make no change.
Page 156	Appendix 3, Table A-3 (e)	Add column for prohibited trees - Silver Maple is listed as not recommended, but it is actually prohibited as it is invasive.	Civiccomment	The Silver Maple has not been added to the reference lists used in the Landscape Manual.	Make no change
Page 158	Appendix 3, Table A-3 (h)	Not only should they be prohibited from being planted and only caught on review by County staff, many of these plants are readily available at landscape and big box retailers homeowners and landscape designers (that do not have to submit plans to regulatory agencies for residential landscapes) can still plant these prohibited items. Suggest the restriction of sale for these plants.	Civiccomment	The suggestion that invasive species be prohibited from sale in the County is an issue beyond the scope of the Zoning Ordinance Rewrite.	Make no change
page 158	Appendix	"Cleveland" Pears are a cultivar of the Bradford Pear and should be placed on the "do not plant" list. Prohibited trees, for the <i>Pyrus calleryana</i> , note for the comments section: This includes the Cleveland Pear and all cultivars.”	DPW&T	Staff concurs.	Add the following text to the “comments” box for the Bradford Pear: “Includes the Cleveland Pear and all other cultivars of <i>pyrus calleryana</i> .”

Landscape Manual Comments 2017

Page Number	Section	Comment	Source	Staff Analysis	Staff Recommendation
Page 160	Appendix 4	<p>Intro Paragraph - Not best practices. LCA is written from the contractor’s advantage, and thus, full of loopholes and poor practices. Suggest tighter minimum specifications based on other industry standards.</p> <p>Plant Standards - #c. ANSI Z60.1</p> <p>Plant measurements - #d. Reduce allowable tree planting size to 2". Research and practice has shown smaller trees adapt to their planting conditions much better, are not as stressed from having less root mass removed from digging, and over all have much better survival rates than larger trees. Many other local jurisdictions have changed to the 2" standard, including DC.</p> <p>Planting methods –</p> <p>#e.3 Excavation of Plant Pits A -This is a poor outdated planting method. Tree ball shoulder needs to be level with existing grade. Only trees in wet soils should be planted higher. Hole is to be dug 3 times the width of the root ball, and edges are sloped and scarified by hand to prevent glazing of the soils. Do not use a numerical dimension to measure tree pit. Always use a relative number (3x the width)</p> <p>#e.4 Staking, Guying and Wrapping -Outdated - Tree guying by using steel wire and hose is no longer acceptable. Either the use of woven webbing tree straps and steel wire (for tension), or knotted and nailed tree stabilization woven webbing is to be allowed. And must be removed within 1 year of planting.</p> <p>#e.5.C - Peat moss is not an acceptable mulch and is only to be used as soil amendment. Bark nuggets, AGED hardwood mulch, or shredded bark mulch are the only acceptable organic bio-based mulches. Recycled rubber, cocoa husks, or gravel. may be appropriate in certain circumstances.</p> <p>Planting Details - Refer to the Urban Tree Foundation for proper modern and proven planting techniques. The ISA and the LCA details are outdated.</p>	Civicomment	<p>Staff disagrees with the synopsis of the Landscape Contractors Association (LCA) Landscape Specification Guidelines. However, the text could be expanded to include other acceptable industry standards.</p> <p>Staff concurs with adding a reference to the ANSI standard next to the plant standards subheading.</p> <p>Staff has verified that the minimum shade tree size for a number of surrounding jurisdiction allow for the smaller caliper shade trees. Therefore, staff is recommending that the minimum shade trees size be changed to 2-2 ½ inch caliper.</p> <p>Staff agrees that some of the planting method recommendations are noteworthy, and concurs with the staking, guying, and wrapping and peat moss comments, and with the reference to the Urban Tree Foundation.</p>	<p>Revise the second sentence of Appendix 4 on page 160 to read: "...published by the Landscape Contractors Association (latest edition) or as subsequently amended, or as specified in other industry standards deemed acceptable by the Planning Director."</p> <p>Add ANSI Z60.1 next to the subheading for Plant Standards on page 160.</p> <p>Revise Appendix 4, subsection d.3 to read: "Minimum size for planting shade trees shall be [two and one half to three (2 1/2 – 3)] <u>2 to 2.5</u> inches caliper...."</p> <p>Replace subsection e.3.A on page 161 with the language suggested in the comments provided on excavation of plant pits.</p> <p>Revise subsections e.4. and e.5.C. as recommended.</p> <p>Add language to the Planting Details subheading on page 162 to read: "Shall be in accordance with standard practices in the industry as found in the Urban Tree Foundation and the <u>International Society of Arboriculture (ISA).</u>"</p>
page 162	Appendix	<p>a. Pruning should refer to International Society of Arboriculture (ISA) standards and DPW&T standards</p> <p>b. List of species should conform to DPW&T specifications. DPW&T allows a few non-native trees, but not invasive species.</p>	DPW&T	Staff agrees that the pruning should be done according to the International Society of Arboriculture (ISA) standards and has incorporated an appropriate revision recommended above.	Make no additional change.