

Chapter 6

SITE PLANNING AND DESIGN CONSIDERATIONS

Table of Contents

CHAPTER SECTION HEADINGS

6.0	INTRODUCTION	6-8
6.1	ENVIRONMENTAL SITE DESIGN	6-9
6.1.1	Environmental Site Design Principles	6-10
6.1.1.1	Achieve Multiple Objectives	6-10
6.1.1.2	Integrate Stormwater Management and Design Early in the Site Planning and Design Process	6-10
6.1.1.3	Prevent Problems to Avoid Having to Mitigate Them	6-11
6.1.1.4	Conserve Resources and Minimize Land Cover Changes	6-11
6.1.1.5	Design the Development to Fit the Terrain	6-12
6.1.1.6	Apply Decisions that Have the Effect of Maintaining the Natural Site Hydrology	6-12
6.1.1.7	Manage Stormwater As Close to the Point of Origin (Generation) As Possible; Minimize Collection and Conveyance	6-13
6.1.1.8	Rely to the Maximum on Natural Processes that occur in the Soil Mantle and the Plant Community	6-13
6.1.2	Soils and Vegetation Provide Key Natural Processes in Environmental Site Design	6-14
6.1.2.1	Soil-Linked Processes for Water Quality/Quantity Management	6-14
6.1.2.2	Vegetation-Based Processes for Water Quality and Quantity Management	6-15
6.2	STORMWATER MANAGEMENT THROUGH ENVIRONMENTAL SITE DESIGN	6-16
6.3	THE BENEFITS OF ENVIRONMENTAL SITE DESIGN	6-17
6.4	ENVIRONMENTAL SITE DESIGN PROCESS	6-22
6.4.1	Environmental Site Design Site Planning Checklist	6-26
6.4.2	List of Stormwater Environmental Site Design Techniques and Practices	6-26
6.4.3	Using Stormwater Environmental Site Design Practices	6-27
6.5	ENVIRONMENTAL SITE DESIGN TECHNIQUES AND PRACTICES	6-28
6.5.1	Conserving Natural Features and Resources	6-28
6.5.1.1	Environmental Site Design Practice #1: Preserve Undisturbed Natural Areas	6-30
6.5.1.2	Environmental Site Design Practice #2: Preserve Riparian Buffers	6-34

6.5.1.3	Environmental Site Design Practice #3: Preserve or Plant Native Trees	6-40
6.5.1.4	Environmental Site Design Practice #4: Avoid Floodplains	6-48
6.5.1.5	Environmental Site Design Practice #5: Avoid Steep Slopes	6-50
6.5.2	Using Low Impact Site Design Techniques	6-51
6.5.2.1	Environmental Site Design Practice #6: Fit the Design to the Terrain	6-54
6.5.2.2	Environmental Site Design Practice #7: Locate Development in Less Sensitive Areas	6-56
6.5.2.3	Environmental Site Design Practice #8: Reduce the Limits of Clearing and Grading	6-60
6.5.2.4	Environmental Site Design Practice #9: Use Open Space Development	6-63
6.5.2.5	Environmental Site Design Practice #10: Consider Creative Development Design	6-69
6.5.3	Reducing Impervious Cover in Site Design	6-71
6.5.3.1	Environmental Site Design Practice #11: Reduce Roadway Lengths and Widths	6-72
6.5.3.2	Environmental Site Design Practice #12: Reduce the Impervious Footprints	6-78
6.5.3.3	Environmental Site Design Practice #13: Reduce the Parking Footprints	6-83
6.5.3.4	Environmental Site Design Practice #14: Reduce Setbacks and Frontages	6-94
6.5.3.5	Environmental Site Design Practice #15: Use Fewer or Alternative Cul-de-Sacs	6-98
6.5.3.6	Environmental Site Design Practice #16: Create Parking Lot Stormwater "Islands"	6-101
6.5.4	Using Natural Features and Runoff Reduction to Manage Stormwater	6-103
6.5.4.1	Environmental Site Design Practice #17: Use Buffers and Undisturbed Filter Areas	6-105
6.5.4.2	Environmental Site Design Practice #18: Use Creative Site Grading, Berming and Terracing (Terraforming)	6-108
6.5.4.3	Environmental Site Design Practice #19: Use Natural Drainageways and Vegetated Swales Instead of Storm Sewers and Curb & Gutter	6-117
6.5.4.4	Environmental Site Design Practice #20: Drain Runoff to Pervious Areas	6-122
6.5.4.5	Environmental Site Design Practice #21: Infiltrate Site Runoff or Capture It for Reuse	6-124
6.5.4.6	Environmental Site Design Practice #22: Restore or Daylight Streams at Redevelopment Projects	6-128
6.6	Overcoming Barriers to Environmental Site Design	6-134
6.7	Environmental Site Design Examples	6-134
6.7.1	Example 1: Rural Residential Subdivision	6-134
6.7.2	Example 2: Suburban Residential Subdivision A	6-139
6.7.3	Example 3: Suburban Residential Subdivision B	6-141
6.7.4	Example 4: Suburban Residential Subdivision C	6-143

6.7.5	Example 5: Commercial Development Example	6-144
6.7.6	Example 6: Office Park Example	6-146
6.8	Other Good Reference Material on Environmental Site Design	6-147
6.9	Planning Stormwater Management for Special Site or Climatic Conditions	6-147
6.9.1	Karst Geologic Conditions	6-147
6.7.1.1	For Site Design	6-149
6.7.1.2	For Stormwater Design	6-149
6.9.2	Coastal Plain/High Groundwater Table	6-150
6.7.2.1	General Stormwater Design Principles in the Coastal Plain	6-152
6.9.3	Pollution Hot Spots	6-153
6.9.4	Cold Winter Climate	6-155
6.9.5	Cold-Water Fisheries and Other Sensitive Receiving Waters	6-158
6.9.6	Waters Where TMDLs Have Been Established	6-159
6.9.6.1	Strategies for Local Stormwater Managers to Address TMDLs Through Special Stormwater Criteria	6-161
6.9.7	Ultra Urban Settings	6-164
6.10	REFERENCES	6-165

FIGURES

Figure 6.1	Site Natural Resource Inventory Map	6-11
Figure 6.2	Comparative Analysis of Stonehill Estates in the Pre-development Condition (top), the Conventional Design (middle), and the Open-Space Design (bottom)	6-19
Figure 6.3	Fit the Site Design to the Natural Terrain and Natural Features	6-23
Figure 6.4	Natural Resource Inventory Site Map	6-24
Figure 6.5	Traditional Site Plan	6-24
Figure 6.6	Contrasting Environmental Site Design for the Same Site	6-25
Figure 6.7	Map Delineating Natural Feature on a Site	6-29
Figure 6.8	A Composite Map Developed from GIS Map Layers	6-29
Figure 6.9	A Subdivision with Conserved Natural Areas	6-30
Figure 6.10	Site Footprinting	6-30
Figure 6.11	Delineation of Natural Conservation Areas	6-31
Figure 6.12	Riparian Stream Buffer	6-34
Figure 6.13	Three-Zone Stream Buffer System	6-35
Figure 6.14	The Benefits of Tree Canopy for Stormwater Management	6-40
Figure 6.15	Subdivision with Tree Preservation	6-41
Figure 6.16	Subdivision Cleared and Grubbed	6-41
Figure 6.17	Comparison of Annual Nutrient Loads from Different Land Uses	6-41
Figure 6.18	Street Trees in Seattle	6-43
Figure 6.19	Potential Tree Planting Areas at a Development Site	6-44
Figure 6.20	Preserve or Establish Multiple Layers of Vegetation	6-45
Figure 6.21	Tree Protection Sign	6-45
Figure 6.22	Most of a Tree's Roots Exist in the Top 1-Foot of Soil Depth and Extend Well Beyond the Canopy Drip Line	6-45
Figure 6.23	Compacted Soil	6-45
Figure 6.24	Construction Materials Stored within Critical Root Zones of Trees Being Preserved	6-45

Figure 6.25	(a) upper left): residential trees; (b) upper right): street trees; (c) center left): trees at a commercial site; (d) center right): trees at a parking lot; (e) lower left): parking lot trees at a commercial office building; (f) lower right): trees, bioretention, and conserved open space around and within a parking lot	6-46
Figure 6.26	Floodplain Boundaries in Relation to a Riparian Buffer	6-48
Figure 6.27	Flattening Steep Slopes for Building Sites Uses More Land Area Than Building on Flatter Slopes	6-50
Figure 6.28	Development Design Using Several Lower Impact Site Design Techniques	6-51
Figure 6.29	Composite Site Analysis of a Residential Lot	6-52
Figure 6.30	LID Practices Incorporated at a Residential Lot	6-52
Figure 6.31	Use of LID Practices on a Medium- to High-Density Lot	6-53
Figure 6.32	Preserving the Natural Topography of the Site	6-54
Figure 6.33	Subdivision Design for Hilly or Steep Terrain Uses Branching Streets from Collectors that Preserves Natural Drainageways and Stream Corridors	6-55
Figure 6.34	A Subdivision Design for Flat Terrain Uses a Fluid Grid Layout that is Interrupted by the Stream Corridor	6-55
Figure 6.35	Soil Mapping Information Can Be Used To Guide Development	6-56
Figure 6.36	Avoid Building On or Disturbing Porous Soils	6-57
Figure 6.37	Guiding Development to Less Sensitive Areas of a Site	6-58
Figure 6.38	Design Carefully Around Floodplains	6-58
Figure 6.39	Clearing Vegetation Decreases Infiltration and Baseflow and Increases Runoff	6-60
Figure 6.40	Establishing Limits of Clearing	6-61
Figure 6.41	Example of Site Footprinting	6-61
Figure 6.42	Open Space Subdivision Site Design Example	6-64
Figure 6.43	Aerial View of an Open Space Subdivision	6-64
Figure 6.44	Zero Lot Line Configuration	6-69
Figure 6.45	Example of Reducing Impervious Cover (clockwise from upper left): Cul-de-sac with Vegetated Island; (b) Narrower Residential Street; (c) Vegetated Median in Roadway; and (d) "Green" Parking Lot with Vegetated Islands	6-71
Figure 6.46	Narrow Residential Street with Swale Drainage	6-72
Figure 6.47	Alternate Street Layouts	6-73
Figure 6.48	Potential Design Options for Narrower Street and Roadway Widths	6-75
Figure 6.49	Traditional Street Width (left) and a Narrowed Street with "Queuing Lanes" (right)	6-76
Figure 6.50	Design Options for Narrower Rights-of-Way on Residential Streets	6-76
Figure 6.51	Building Up Rather Than Out Can Reduce the Amount of Impervious Cover on the Site	6-78
Figure 6.52	A Common Walkway Draining to Adjacent Vegetation and Linking Pedestrian Areas	6-79
Figure 6.53	Alternative (Permeable) Driveway Surfaces	6-81
Figure 6.54	Example of a Shorter Driveway (left) and a Shared Driveway (right)	6-82
Figure 6.55	Multiple Stormwater Management Strategies Applied to Parking Lot	6-83
Figure 6.56	Original Parking Lot	6-85
Figure 6.57	Original Design	6-85
Figure 6.58	Redesigned Lot	6-85
Figure 6.59	Variation in Parking Space Sizes Across the U.S.	6-87

Figure 6.60	Parking Stall Dimension Analysis	6-89
Figure 6.61	Structured Parking at an Office Park Development	6-90
Figure 6.62	Grass Paver Surface Used for Parking	6-91
Figure 6.63	Other Options for Permeable Surfaces in Fringe Parking Areas	6-92
Figure 6.64	Glencoe Elementary School Parking Lot (Before and During Storm), Portland, Oregon	6-93
Figure 6.65	Grass Channel Receiving Parking Lot Runoff	6-93
Figure 6.66	Bioretention in Parking Median	6-93
Figure 6.67	Setback Geometry of a Typical 1-Acre Lot	6-94
Figure 6.68	Reduced Impervious Cover by Using Smaller Setbacks	6-96
Figure 6.69	Examples of Reduced Frontages and Side Yard Setbacks	6-96
Figure 6.70	Non-Traditional Lot Designs	6-96
Figure 6.71	Four Turn-Around Options for Residential Streets	6-98
Figure 6.72	Use of a Loop Road to Avoid Creating a Cul-de-Sac	6-99
Figure 6.73	Trees and Vegetation Planted in the Landscaped Island of a Cul-de-Sac (left) And a Loop Road (right)	6-99
Figure 6.74	Alternative Cul-de-Sac Design	6-100
Figure 6.75	Recessed Bioretention Area in Cul-de-Sac	6-100
Figure 6.76	Parking Lot Stormwater Island	6-101
Figure 6.77	Residential Site Design Using Natural Features for Stormwater Management	6-104
Figure 6.78	Using a Level Spreader with a Riparian Buffer	6-105
Figure 6.79	Components of a Berm Created for Stormwater Control	6-108
Figure 6.80	Berm Creates Small Bioretention Area	6-109
Figure 6.81	Allowing a Grading Variance Results in More Tree Protection	6-109
Figure 6.82	Successive Berms on Slope Create	6-111
Figure 6.83	Berms Controlling Flood Flows	6-112
Figure 6.84	Creative Berm Configurations	6-112
Figure 6.85	Berms Form a Basin to Detain Runoff from Larger Storms	6-113
Figure 6.86	Example of a Filter Strip with "Terraforming" Berming	6-115
Figure 6.87	Dry Swale along Suburban Collector Street	6-117
Figure 6.88	Street-Related Runoff Pollutant Pathways	6-118
Figure 6.89	Example of a Subdivision Using Natural Drainageways to Treat and Convey Stormwater	6-119
Figure 6.90	Using Vegetated Swales Instead of Curb and Gutter	6-120
Figure 6.91	Grass Channel in Median	6-120
Figure 6.92	Subdivision Street Swale Drainage	6-120
Figure 6.93	Using Vegetated Swales Instead of Curb and Gutter	6-123
Figure 6.94	Rain Barrel	6-124
Figure 6.95	Vegetated Roof	6-124
Figure 6.96	Infiltration Trench	6-125
Figure 6.97	Dry Well	6-125
Figure 6.98	Downspout Connected to Infiltration Trenches Spread Out to Provide Underground Moisture to Lawn	6-125
Figure 6.99	Porous Asphalt Bike Path	6-126
Figure 6.100	Porous Asphalt Playing Court	6-126
Figure 6.101	Headwater Streams in the Urban Landscape: Montgomery County, Maryland	6-128
Figure 6.102	Waukegan Brook Restoration, Washington Park, Michigan	6-129


Figure 6.103	Juday Creek, University of Notre Dame Golf Course, South Bend, Indiana	6-129
Figure 6.104	Location Map: University of Virginia Stream Daylighting Project (The Dell)	6-130
Figure 6.105	The UVA Dell Project Site Before Restoration	6-130
Figure 6.106	The UVA Dell Project Site. Location of the Piped Stream, Connecting Pipes, and the Daylighted Stream Configuration	6-131
Figure 6.107	UVA Dell Project Site. Location of Rain Gardens and the 1-Year Flood Zone	6-131
Figure 6.108	UVA Dell Project Site. Location of Rain Gardens and the Maximum Flood Zone	6-132
Figure 6.109	UVA Dell Project Site. View of the Stream from Upstream of the Tennis Courts	6-132
Figure 6.110	UVA Dell Project Site. Daylighted Stream Leading to Pond (lower center)	6-133
Figure 6.111	Location Map for Remlick Hall Farm/Subdivision	6-134
Figure 6.112	Aerial View of Remlick Hall Farm Prior to Development	6-135
Figure 6.113	Site Plan of Remlick Hall Farm Prior to Development	6-135
Figure 6.114	Site Plan and Aerial View of Conventional Subdivision Design for Remlick Hall	6-137
Figure 6.115	Site Plan and Aerial View of Clustering Subdivision Design for Remlick Hall	6-138
Figure 6.116	Comparison of a Traditional Residential Subdivision Design (above) with an Innovative Site Plan Developed Using ESD Techniques and Practices (below)	6-140
Figure 6.117	Comparison of a Traditional Residential Subdivision Design (above) with an Innovative Site Plan Developed Using ESD Techniques and Practices (below)	6-142
Figure 6.118	Comparison of a Tradition Subdivision Design (above) with an Innovative Site Plan Developed Using ESD Techniques and Practices (below)	6-143
Figure 6.119	Comparison of a Traditional Commercial Development Design (above) with an Innovative Site Plan Developed Using ESD Techniques and Practices (below)	6-145
Figure 6.120	Comparison of a Traditional Office Park Design (above) with an Innovative Site Plan Developed Using ESD Techniques and Practices (below)	6-146
Figure 6.121	Karst Distribution in Virginia	6-148
Figure 6.122	Profile Through Typical Karst Geology	6-148
Figure 6.123	Gasoline Station	6-153
Figure 6.124	Public Works Yard	6-153
Figure 6.125	Six Categories of Pollution-Generating Activities Assessed at Stormwater Hotspot Facilities	6-154
Figure 6.126	Covered Chemical Storage	6-154
Figure 6.127	Wash Water Containment	6-154

TABLES

Table 6.1	Benefits of Environmental Site Design vs. Conventional Development: 4 Virginia Studies	6-20
Table 6.2	Percent Savings Due to Compact Growth Patterns (1992 – 1997)	6-21
Table 6.3	Comparison of Benefits of Environmental Site Design Techniques	6-22
Table 6.4	Environmental Site Design Site Planning Checklist	6-26
Table 6.5	Riparian Buffer Management Zones	6-35
Table 6.6	Sample of Fire Hazard Rating System in the Wildland/Urban Interface	6-37
Table 6.7	Recommendations for Target Vegetation Around Structures in Medium- to-High-Wildfire	6-37
Table 6.8	The Comparative Costs of Open Space Maintenance	6-43
Table 6.9	Redesign Analyses Comparing Impervious Cover and Stormwater Runoff from Conventional and Open Space Subdivisions	6-65
Table 6.10	Redesign Analyses Comparing Stormwater Pollution Loads from Conventional and Open Space Subdivisions	6-66
Table 6.11	Projected Construct Cost Savings for Open Space Designs from Redesign Analyses	6-66
Table 6.12	Examples of Successful Open Space Developments	6-67
Table 6.13	Condensed Summary of National Residential Street Design Standards	6-74
Table 6.14	VDOT Residential Street Design Standards	6-74
Table 6.15	Examples of Narrower Right-of-Way Widths	6-77
Table 6.16	Survey of Pedestrian Accidents Related to the Presence of Sidewalks	6-80
Table 6.17	Design Elements for User-Friendly, Safe and Legally Defensible Sidewalks	6-80
Table 6.18	Conventional Minimum Parking Ratios	6-86
Table 6.19	Land Uses with Different Peak Daily Operating Times	6-90
Table 6.20	Environmental Factors to Consider When Integrating Stormwater and Landscaping	6-126
Table 6.21	Cold Weather Challenges to BMP Selection and Design	6-156

APPENDICES

Appendix 6-A	Site Plan Preparation and Submission as Part of the Land Development Process
Appendix 6-B	Karst Area Design Guidelines
Appendix 6-C	Coastal Plain Design Guidelines
Appendix 6-D	The Sustainable Sites Initiative



6.0. INTRODUCTION

As research, technology, and information transfer have improved over recent years, alternative approaches are being sought by citizens and governments to reduce the impacts of stormwater runoff from new development and redevelopment. Developers and designers also are seeking alternatives to expedite permitting processes, reduce construction costs, reduce long-term operation and maintenance costs, and increase property values.

Careful site planning at the outset of a project is the most effective approach for preventing or reducing the potential adverse impacts from development. Site planning is a preventive measure that addresses the root causes of stormwater problems. In the past, “stormwater management” has been defined largely as stormwater *disposal*. Stormwater management in Virginia can be significantly improved by approaching the task differently than this. A new and better approach is based on a conceptual understanding of stormwater, which is more comprehensive in scope and addresses the full array of stormwater issues.

In order to protect Virginia’s water resources, we must pay attention to recharging groundwater and maintaining a balance in the hydrologic cycle, preventing flooding, and maintaining water quality and the ecological values that have historically characterized Virginia waters. This different perspective further challenges us to prevent stormwater from becoming a problem, and to avoid highly engineered structural solutions that are expensive to both build and maintain. Where feasible, this new approach focuses on using natural systems and processes to achieve stormwater management objectives.

At the same time, this new approach is intended to enhance the natural functions of beneficial site resources. The end result is a site design that enhances existing wetlands, promotes the critical functions of floodplains, and integrates with riparian buffer systems, even while satisfying stormwater requirements. This approach maximizes the value achieved for the money spent.

The purpose of this chapter is to provide guidance for managing stormwater at land development projects in a manner that provides the optimum opportunity to protect and conserve natural resources, maintain the pre-development hydrologic regime, minimize the potential negative impacts of stormwater runoff, and minimize the human “footprint” on the environment.

While reducing the impacts from stormwater runoff may be achieved through both regulatory and non-regulatory techniques, this chapter focuses on the site-level planning and design tools that provide the best opportunity to accomplish the above goals. The techniques for doing this most effectively are represented under the banner of the terms “Better Site Design,” “Sustainable Site Design,” or, as DEQ prefers to label it, “Environmental Site Design”(ESD).

6.1. ENVIRONMENTAL SITE DESIGN

How do we describe Environmental Site Design, and how does it differ from “Conventional Design?” Environmental Site Design incorporates non-structural and natural approaches to new development and redevelopment projects to reduce impacts on watersheds by conserving natural areas, reducing impervious cover and better integrating stormwater treatment into the landscape. The aim of environmental site design is to reduce the environmental impact, or “footprint,” of the site while retaining and enhancing the owner/developer’s purpose and vision for the site. Many of the environmental site design concepts employ non-structural on-site treatment that can reduce the cost of infrastructure while maintaining or even increasing the value of the property relative to conventional designed developments.

For the purposes of this chapter, Conventional Design can be viewed as the style of suburban development that has evolved over the past 50 years, which generally involves larger lot development, clearing and grading of significant portions of a site, wider streets and larger cul-de-sacs, large monolithic parking lots, enclosed drainage systems for stormwater conveyance, and large “hole-in-the-ground” detention basins.

It is important to point out that Environmental Site Design (ESD) techniques/practices are *not* the same thing as Low Impact Development (LID) practices, and vice versa, although these strategies overlap and complement one another. The goals of environmental site design are set out in the following section. The goal of LID is to manage the process by which each site responds to hydrologic and hydraulic impacts of development through the use of a specific array of practices.

Environmental site design employs small-scale stormwater management practices, non-structural techniques, and better site planning to mimic natural hydrologic runoff characteristics and minimize the impact of land development on water resources. This includes:

- Optimizing conservation of natural features (e.g., drainage patterns, soil, vegetation, etc.);
- Minimizing impervious surfaces (e.g., pavement, concrete channels, rooftops, etc.);
- Slowing down runoff to maintain discharge timing and to increase infiltration and evapotranspiration on the development site; and
- Using other non-structural practices or innovative technologies approved by DEQ.

Each ESD practice incrementally reduces the volume of stormwater on its way to the stream, thereby reducing the amount of conventional stormwater infrastructure required. ESD principles and practices are considered at the earliest stages of design, implemented during construction, and sustained in the future as a low-maintenance natural system. Also, it is important to recognize that ESD practices are more appropriately applied to greenfield development, where

there is ample space and soil conditions to apply the principles and practices. ESC principles may be difficult to apply at typical redevelopment sites, where space is limited and costly and “urban” (mixed, dense) soils exist.

Environmental site design is intrinsically associated with the concept of sustainability and the emerging *sustainable site design* movement, reflected in the 2009 release of the Sustainable Sites Initiative™ (SSI), an interdisciplinary partnership of the American Society of Landscape Architects, the Lady Bird Johnson Wildflower Center at the University of Texas at Austin, and the National Botanic Garden (see ASLA et al., 2009a and 2009b). For more information on the SSI, including a discussion of its scoring and certification criteria, see **Appendix 6-E** of this chapter.

6.1.1. Environmental Site Design Principles

Environmental Site Design techniques are mostly applied at sites of new development. It is more difficult to achieve ESD at redevelopment sites due to lack of space, compacted soils, and the constructed drainage system and utilities that are already in place. There are several very important principles involved in accomplishing ESD effectively.

6.1.1.1. Achieve Multiple Objectives

Stormwater management should be comprehensive in scope, with management techniques designed to achieve multiple stormwater objectives. These objectives include managing both the peak flow rate and total volume (i.e., balance with the hydrologic cycle of the site), as well as water quality control and water temperature maintenance. Comprehensive stormwater management involves addressing all of these aspects of stormwater.

“Treatment train” configurations with multiple structural techniques may be required in some situations in order to achieve comprehensive objectives. However, the objective in ESD is to try to achieve multiple comprehensive objectives with simpler, rather than more complex, management systems.

6.1.1.2. Integrate Stormwater Management and Design *Early* in the Site Planning and Design Process

In the past, the street and lot layouts of development sites have been decided upon first, often based on criteria that have little or nothing to do with the site’s natural features or ecology. Stormwater control measures would then be squeezed into leftover spaces on the site, whether or not they were best suited for this purpose. Tacking stormwater management decisions on at the *end* of the site design process almost invariably leads to less than ideal results.

For comprehensive stormwater management objectives to be optimized, stormwater management must be incorporated into site design from the outset, integrated into the concept/sketch plan phase of development, just as traffic and circulation are integrated at that stage. In fact, the configuration of the natural drainage system and management of runoff generated by the development should carry significant weight in determining the site’s use and the site plan configuration. Along with early site mapping and natural resource inventory (see **Figure 6.1**

below), site planners need to consider incorporation of ESD techniques and practices into the overall site design process, and not engineer them after the fact.




Figure 6.1. Site Natural Resource Inventory Map
Source: Chesapeake Bay Stormwater Training Partnership

6.1.1.3. Prevent Problems to Avoid Having to Mitigate Them

The first objective in stormwater management strategizing is *prevention*. Approaches to site design which can reduce stormwater runoff generation from the outset are the most effective, although such area-wide *planning* decisions are typically not actually thought of as stormwater management per se. For example, effective clustering significantly reduces the length of roads and, thus, the amount of imperviousness, when compared to conventional development. Arrangement of units with minimal setbacks reduces driveway length, thus, the amount of imperviousness. Reduction in street width and other street design considerations further subtract from total impervious cover. Such important elements of site design are rarely thought of as part of conventional stormwater management practices, yet they result in significant stormwater quantity and quality benefits.

6.1.1.4. Conserve Resources and Minimize Land Cover Changes

Minimization of impacts refers to reducing the extent of construction and development practices that adversely impact the hydrologic conditions of the site. This includes limiting the clearing and grading of land to the minimum needed to construct the development and associated infrastructure. Conserving specific sensitive lands on a site is a crucial early step in the planning process. Obviously, any areas of a site that are conserved will not be converted to impervious cover. The general benefits of conservation can be enhanced by locating and protecting certain hydrologic features such as drainage paths, permeable soils, steep slopes, etc.; and, in accordance with appropriate zoning and subdivision requirements, strategically locating setbacks, easements,

woodland conservation zones, buffers, utility corridors, and other permanent site features to enhance the overall goals of maintaining the pre-developed hydrology (LIDWG, 2005).

Fixed improvements such as roads, houses or buildings, sanitary and storm sewer utility corridors, etc., should be located on the site so as to minimize unnecessary grading and/or compaction of the natural soil horizon, clearing of trees, and creating of impervious surfaces (LIDWG, 2005). Specific recommendations include:

- Reducing the size of cleared area (i.e., preserve as much woodland as possible) and reforest areas of the site where feasible.
- Locating cleared/graded areas outside of permeable soils and vegetated areas.
- Minimize the use of turfgrass (which requires more maintenance, fertilizer and pesticides) by establishing more naturalized landscaping with native vegetation
- Designing roads, sidewalks, and parking areas to minimize land cover impacts.

6.1.1.5. Design the Development to Fit the Terrain

Developments that are designed to “fit the terrain” of the site require significantly less grading and soil disturbance than those that are designed without regard for the existing topography. Road patterns should match the landform by placing roadways parallel to contour lines where possible. In doing so, natural drainageways can be constructed along street rights-of-way, thereby reducing the need for storm pipe systems. Open space development, allowable in many municipalities, can help preserve large natural areas and open space as well as make it possible to design around topographical constraints.

6.1.1.6. Apply Decisions that Have the Effect of Maintaining the Natural Site Hydrology

The most common parameter used to account for changes in site condition is the runoff curve number (CN). As the value of the site’s CN increases from the pre-development condition to the post-development condition, temporary storage becomes necessary to mimic the pre-development CN. Site development factors most responsible for the determination of the CN are generally related to the land cover type. Of specific concern is the area of impervious cover as a fraction of the total site area, since it has such a pronounced effect on the hydrologic response of the site. Other factors include the soil infiltration rate and condition of the land cover. Key objectives in mimicking the site’s pre-development hydrology include preserving the site’s runoff rate and patterns, maintaining the pre-development volume, frequency, and duration of runoff, and sustaining groundwater recharge, stream baseflow and stream water quality. Ideally, the post-development drainage patterns and time of concentration (Tc) should closely resemble those of the pre-development condition. The Tc, in conjunction with the CN, determines the peak discharge rate for a storm event. From theoretical considerations, site and infrastructure components that affect time of concentration and travel time include:

- Travel distance (flow path);
- Slope of the ground surface and/or water surface;
- Ground surface roughness; and
- Channel shape and pattern.

These concepts are applied to ESD by using techniques that control the T_c by modifying the following aspects of flow and conveyance within the development:

- Maximize sheet flow;
- Modify/lengthen the flow path;
- Minimize site and lot slopes;
- Disconnect impervious area runoff
- Use open swale drainage; and
- Maximize site and lot vegetation.

6.1.1.7. Manage Stormwater As Close to the Point of Origin (Generation) As Possible; Minimize Collection and Conveyance

From both an environmental and economic perspective, redirecting runoff back into the ground, as close to the point of origin as possible costs less money and maintains natural hydrology. Pipes, culverts, and elaborate systems of inlets to collect and convey stormwater work against management objectives, in most cases increasing the challenges of managing stormwater holistically. Such systems increase flows and increase rates of flow, all making erosive stormwater forces worse. Structural collection and conveyance systems are increasingly expensive, both to construct and maintain. Furthermore, almost without exception, these systems suffer from failures and, therefore, should be avoided if at all possible. A corollary principle is to avoid concentrating stormwater flows, which is achieved when stormwater is not conveyed long distances, but rather recycled into the ground at or near the source.

6.1.1.8. Rely to the maximum on natural processes that occur within the soil and the plant community

The soil offers critical pollutant removal functions through physical processing (filtration), biological processing (various types of microbial action), and chemical processing (cation exchange capacity and other reactions). Plants similarly provide substantial pollutant uptake/removal potential, through physical filtering, biological uptake of nutrients, and even various types of chemical interactions. The final destination of pollutants is important. Pollution is often just a resource out of place – too much of a good thing in the wrong location; elements that are often useful to vegetation and within the soil mantle. Natural processes can work effectively to minimize these types of pollution problems.

Environmental site design is based on a philosophy – a vision for the environment – that is neither pro-development nor anti-development. Environmental site design is grounded on the positive notion that environmental balance can be maintained as new communities are developed throughout our watersheds, if basic principles are obeyed. Environmental site design means understanding our natural systems such as our essential water resources and making the commitment to work within the limits of these systems whenever and wherever possible. As stated above, ESD is grounded on recognition of a principle stated in **Chapter 4**: that stormwater is ultimately a precious resource to be used carefully, rather than a waste product in need of disposal.

6.1.2. Soils and Vegetation Provide Key Natural Processes in Environmental Site Design

Before describing specific aspects of ESD, a quick review is in order regarding the nature and extent of the natural systems and processes that are important to the success of the ESD solutions. Keep in mind that the following information is very much condensed; numerous details have been omitted for the sake of brevity and user friendliness.

6.1.2.1. Soil-Linked Processes for Water Quality/Quantity Management

Soil constitutes an extremely valuable resource, and documenting the complete array of these soil-based processes would require a separate Handbook altogether. Environmental site design, as with other stormwater control measures, relates in important ways to the soil mantle and the manner in which water moves across and through this soil. Understanding how much of what type of soil is in place is essential when assessing stormwater impacts and stormwater management needs. The type of soil existing on a site may turn a management problem into an opportunity. For example, soil type influences how much water can be infiltrated per time period, based on soil permeability. Soil permeability rating, therefore, is a critical variable in ESD. Soil type will also affect pollutant removal potential. Soil erodibility is an important factor as well. Factors such as depth to bedrock and depth to seasonal high water table also have important ramifications for ESD.

Soil surveys, provided by the USDA-NRCS on a county-by-county basis, provide a considerable amount of information relating to all relevant aspects of soils. Soil with a coarse texture (i.e., having large particle size such as sand) has a high rate of infiltration. Soil with extremely small particle size (clayey soil) has a low rate of infiltration. Understanding these soil characteristics is an essential first step in ESD. When dealing with structural practices which rely on infiltration (e.g., infiltration basins and trenches, dry wells, etc.), the Hydrologic Soil Group (HSG) classification and permeability rating is crucial for determining success. Typically a permeability of at least 1/2-inch per hour is required for structural control measures. Because ESD often does not involve the type of soil disturbance and potential compaction problems that can occur with construction of structural controls, somewhat lower permeability – perhaps as low as 1/4-inch per hour – can be tolerated and put to good use. However, when permeability rates are that low, extreme care must be taken with design and construction, because there is little margin for error. Furthermore, it is possible that locating an infiltration BMP on soils with such a low permeability may result in a larger footprint for the practice. So the trade-offs must be considered carefully.

At the same time areas of such poor permeability but with good stands of vegetation may function quite satisfactorily and offer opportunity which should not be ignored at a site (a well-developed root zone associated with established vegetation can significantly improve poor soil infiltration and permeability). For example, an otherwise questionable HSG C soil, if not disturbed and if reasonably well vegetated, may offer surprisingly good opportunity for receiving and infiltrating stormwater created by new impervious surfaces elsewhere on the site. The presence of stems and roots can substantially enhance infiltration and permeability. Conversely, even seemingly good soils (HSG B), if substantially disturbed and compacted, can become far less permeable, as is typical of the yards in many mass-graded residential subdivisions. In such cases permeability ratings should be reduced. However, sandy HSG A soils may be able to

withstand disturbance problems more readily than heavier soils with clay content, and therefore may not experience this same kind of loss of permeability.

Although reliance on the published soil data is acceptable for most feasibility studies and conceptual planning, detailed planning should be accompanied by field sampling (using saturated bore holes) and verification of soil types and classes. The size of the site, geologic complexity, and other factors will determine the number of bore holes necessary at each site.

Soils are very important for their ability to remove pollutants entrained in stormwater, through a complex of physical, chemical, and biological mechanisms. Above all, the soil mantle must be understood to be a vast and complex system, a rich and diverse community of organisms – thousands, even millions of organisms per cubic inch – all of which have complex functions which can become the basis of impacts if damaged or destroyed, or become mechanisms for treatment if understood and properly used. The various types of processes which occur as the result of soil microbe action and the other essential elements of the soil community, when fully understood, can be used quite effectively for stormwater management purposes. Soil microflora are abundant and diverse, including innumerable species of bacteria, fungi, actinomycetes, algae, and viruses. These species process organic material (one type of stormwater-linked pollutant) as food and energy sources in various ways. Physically, particulate pollutants are caught and filtered by the soil mantle as well. Many of the soil-based functions which are chemically-oriented (e.g., adsorption, etc.) occur through the mechanisms of cation exchange driven by, among other factors, surface area of soil particles. Such functions are especially important for their ability to remove soluble pollutants such as nutrients. Even in large particle sandy soils where surface area is low (72 sq cm per gram), significant pollutant reduction can occur through these chemical mechanisms. Cation exchange capacity (CEC) is used as a measure of pollutant reduction potential and can be determined through soil testing.

Pollutant removal potential often varies indirectly with permeability. For example, soils that are extremely sandy (large particle size, fewer particles) can be expected to have excellent permeability but borderline CEC values. In fact extremely sandy soils may have such low CEC values that they are typically not as effective in removing either soluble or particulate pollutants from stormwater. In no way should “hot spot” runoff from roads, gasoline stations, auto repair centers or fast food parking lots be cycled through sandy infiltration systems without being pretreated through some sort of filtering mechanism. Conversely, heavy clayey soils may have limited permeability, yet typically do an excellent job of removing a wide variety of pollutants due to their high CEC ratings.

6.1.2.2. Vegetation-Based Processes for Water Quality and Quantity Management

Vegetation provides a host of useful functions which are vital to effective environmental site design. These functions typically reflect the close connection between water quantity and water quality issues:

- Vegetation absorbs the energy of falling rain, promoting infiltration, minimizing erosion, etc.
- Roots hold soil particles in place, like structural steel in reinforced concrete, preventing erosion.

- Vegetation (blades, stems, trunks, etc.) provides friction that slows runoff velocity and filters out particulate pollutants; as the velocity slows, not only is the erosive force reduced, but sediment already entrapped will begin to settle out, as will other pollutants. Reduced velocity also means increased opportunity for infiltration.
- Vegetation provides for a richer organic soil layer which improves soil porosity and structure, maximizing the absorptive capacity of the soil and promoting infiltration.
- Vegetation “consumes” many different types of stormwater-linked pollutants through absorption from the root zone. In addition to the positive effects on sediment and sediment-bound phosphorus, even solubilized nitrogen is taken up through a series of complex processes and transformations, as are some metals and other compounds.

6.2. STORMWATER MANAGEMENT THROUGH ENVIRONMENTAL SITE DESIGN

In the context of stormwater management, the goal of environmental site design should be to promote runoff control through the use of the natural drainage system and to reduce the environmental impacts of commonly used land development and drainage methods. In addition to maintaining natural drainage, ESD should (1) provide a natural open-space based drainage system using undeveloped flood plains and drainage swales; (2) avoid channelization within the natural drainage system; and (3) maintain forest cover and other natural vegetation to the extent feasible. These practices will result in maintenance or enhancement of the normal water table level.

By maintaining or restoring the natural drainage system, runoff from even a 100-year storm should be managed with minimal problems. Runoff generated by higher frequency storms (e.g., 5-10 year storms) should be handled on the individual sites. At the site scale, runoff can be managed in various ways, including (1) capturing it for reuse on the site; (2) directing it to primary and secondary swales where vegetation will retard flow and allow water to infiltrate permeable soils; (3) holding it on identified recharge areas; and (4) directing it into detention and retention facilities, as necessary.

Development projects can be designed to reduce their impact on watersheds when careful efforts are made to conserve natural areas, reduce impervious cover and better integrate stormwater treatment. By implementing a combination of these nonstructural ESD approaches, it is possible to reduce the amount of runoff and pollutants that are generated from a site and provide for some nonstructural on-site treatment and control of runoff. The volume of stormwater runoff and the mass of pollutant loads can be reduced as much as 20-60 percent on most development sites (even up to 100 percent on some sites) simply by implementing the land development principles and practices advocated in this chapter. When applied early in the site design and layout process, environmental site design techniques can sharply reduce stormwater runoff and pollutants generated at a development site, and also reduce the size and cost of both the stormwater conveyance system and stormwater management practices. Important stormwater management objectives include:

- Preventing soil erosion and increases in nonpoint pollution from development projects;
- Preventing stormwater impacts rather than having to mitigate them;
 - Minimizing the extent of land disturbance and impervious surfaces;

- Minimizing pollutants in stormwater runoff from new development and redevelopment;
- Restoring, enhancing, and maintaining the chemical, physical, and biological integrity of receiving waters to protect public health and enhance domestic, municipal, recreational, industrial and other uses of water;
- Aiming to maintain 100% of the average annual pre-development groundwater recharge volume;
- Capturing and treating stormwater runoff to remove pollutants;
- Implementing a channel protection strategy to protect receiving streams;
- Preventing increases in the frequency and magnitude of out-of-bank flooding from large, less frequent storms;
- Protecting public safety through the proper design, construction and operation of stormwater management facilities;
- Managing stormwater (quantity and quality) as close to the point of origin as possible and minimizing the use of large or regional-scale collection and conveyance facilities;
- Preserving natural areas and native vegetation and reducing the impact on watershed hydrology;
- Using simple, nonstructural methods for stormwater management that are lower in cost and have lower maintenance needs than structural controls;
- Creating a multifunctional landscape; and
- Using natural drainage pathways (the site's hydrology) as a framework for site design.

6.3. THE BENEFITS OF ENVIRONMENTAL SITE DESIGN

Many Virginia communities are currently struggling with the issue of balancing economic growth with protection of their natural resources and water quality. As stated earlier, the rise in impervious cover associated with new development affects local water resources by reducing the infiltration of rainfall and increasing the volumes of stormwater runoff that eventually enter local water bodies. The application of environmental design principles can help developers and local governments recognize increased economic and environmental benefits through reduced infrastructure requirements, decreased need for clearing and grading of sites, and less expenditure to meet stormwater management requirements due to reduced runoff volumes and pollutant export from sites.

There is a common misconception that ESD and LID are more expensive to implement than conventional stormwater management techniques. This derives from the fact that the conventional method of costing stormwater facilities (in the same manner as ponds or centralized facilities) is no longer valid. Environmental site design and LID cause us to rethink how we place value and calculate the cost-benefit of environmental protection.

Communities are asking different costing questions, such as what happens at the end of a 50-year cycle for a pond, or how long can we expand or protect our stormwater infrastructure capacity using grey and green techniques. For example, ten years ago vegetated roofs were thought to be cost-prohibitive to use here in the United States. Yet, as of this writing, at least several North American cities (e.g., Toronto, Chicago, Portland) have built over a hundred vegetated roofs each, while several European cities have already place vegetated roofs on about 15 percent of all buildings. The performance-based technology market-driven approach used by ESD and LID has

helped to drive the costs down to the point where they can compete with conventional stormwater management technologies. In many cases, these approaches are proving to have less net cost than conventional stormwater controls. For example, see the document entitled *Reducing Stormwater Costs Through Low Impact Development (LID) Strategies and Practices*, published by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, available at www.epa.gov/nps/lid.

There is also a common misconception that ESD and LID practices are difficult to maintain. In reality, if you look at performance record of runoff reduction practices (e.g., bioretention cells, permeable pavement, and vegetated roofs) where they haven't been adequately maintained, they still have a high level of pollutant removal and runoff reduction efficiency. This is important in an era when routine inspection and maintenance is often not performed. Furthermore, ESD and LID practices constitute a distributed management approach, inherently building redundancy into the system. Therefore, if some of the systems perform less than optimally, fail, or are not maintained, redundant decentralized practices at the site prevent the effect from being catastrophic, as with dam breaches or system overloads.

Several researchers have employed redesign comparisons to demonstrate the benefits of environmental site design over a wide range of residential lot sizes and commercial applications. For example, Center for Watershed Protection (CWP, 1998b) demonstrated that ESD techniques could reduce impervious cover and stormwater runoff by 7 to 70 percent, depending on site conditions. **Figure 6.2** below illustrates a redesign analysis for a medium density residential subdivision. The analysis suggested that ESD techniques could reduce impervious cover and annual runoff volume by 24%, cut phosphorus loadings by half, and increase site infiltration by 55%, compared to a traditional subdivision.

In another analysis (CWP, 2003), the CWP evaluated the application of environmental design techniques to development projects in several Virginia localities. The following are examples of the economic benefits that can be gained through encouraging the use of environmental design techniques:

- For a 45-acre medium density residential site in Stafford County, Virginia, using environmental site design techniques would have saved \$300,547 compared to a more conventional design, due to reduced infrastructure and stormwater costs (CWP, 1998b).
- Studies have found that construction savings can be as much as 66 percent by using the open space designs encouraged in environmental site design techniques (CWP, 1998a).
- Environmental site design can also reduce the need to clear and grade 35-60 percent of the total site area. Since the total cost to clear, grade, and install erosion and sediment control practices can range up to \$5,000 per acre, reduced clearing can result in significant cost savings to builders (Schueler, 1995).
- A summary of 40 years of fiscal impact studies showed that smart growth consumes 45 percent less land, costs 25 percent less for roads, 15 percent less for utilities, 5 percent less for housing, and 2 percent less for other fiscal impacts than current trends of sprawl development (Burchell and Listokin, 1995).
- A 1990 study for the City of Virginia Beach compared the costs and benefits of conventional and smart growth development patterns. The study found that the smart growth pattern resulted in 45 percent more land preserved, 45 percent less in infrastructure costs to the city,

and a 50 percent reduction in impervious surfaces due to roads (Siemon, Larsen and Purdy, et al., 1990)




Figure 6.2. Comparative Analysis of Stonehill Estates in the Pre-development Condition (top), the Conventional Design (middle), and the Open-Space Design (bottom)
Source: Center for Watershed Protection (1998)

To illustrate the economic advantages of environmental site design, **Table 6.1** provides a short summary of the environmental cost benefits realized for four development projects in Virginia that have applied a number of Model Development Principles advocated by the Center for Watershed Protection (CWP, 2000b).

Table 6.1. Benefits of Environmental Site Design vs. Convention Development: 4 Virginia Studies

Case Study	Percent of Natural Areas Conserved	Percent Reduction in Impervious Cover	Percent Reduction in Stormwater Impacts			Percent Reduction in Total Infrastructure Cost
			Runoff	N Load	P Load	
Fields at Cold Harbor Hanover County, VA	80.4	25.3	12.2	6.4	6.4	47.2
Governor's Land James City County, VA	49.3	21.7	14.3	17.5	17.3	14.5
Rivergate Alexandria, VA	0*	32	30	25	28	49
The Arboretum III Chesterfield County, VA	5.1	12	19.7	36	37.1	Not calculated
* Open space area is maintained as landscaped parkland						

Source: CWP (2000b) and the James River Association

The assessment of Model Development Principle application in Virginia found that for the three residential case studies, the use of environmental site design could save up to 49 percent in total infrastructure costs, compared to conventional development (CWP, 2000b). Estimated total infrastructure costs include the costs of roads, gutters, sidewalks, landscaping, and stormwater control practices. In all these cases, the designs incorporating environmental site design saved the developers more than \$200,000 in infrastructure costs, while producing the same number of housing units.

In addition, other more intangible economic benefits that may be derived from the use of environmental site design techniques are not included in the case studies. Environmental site design techniques continue to provide benefits to the community beyond improving water quality and stormwater runoff management that extend long after the developer has sold the lots. Some examples of these benefits include:

- Reduced operation and maintenance costs for roads and stormwater system
- Increased property values for homes and businesses
- Increased open space available for recreation
- More pedestrian friendly neighborhoods
- Reduced annual cost for mowing
- Protection of sensitive forests, wetlands, and habitats
- More aesthetically pleasing and naturally attractive landscapes
- Improved air quality (more forest cover)
- Less temperature fluctuation from paved surfaces
- Reduced heating and cooling costs for homeowners from tree preservation

- Decreases in flooding incidence and associated damage
- Improved pollutant removal from the filtering action of forest and stream buffer areas.

For a more detailed summary, consult *The Economic Benefits of Protecting Virginia's Streams, Lakes, and Wetlands*, prepared by the Center for Watershed Protection. Studies have found that developments that permanently protect open space are often more desirable to live in, and consequently have higher property values (CWP, 1998a). **Table 6.2** illustrates the cost savings for both local governments and developers associated with using environmental site design, most of which are related to infrastructure, maintenance, and stormwater-related costs.

Table 6.2. Percent Savings Due to Compact Growth Patterns (1992 – 1997)

Area of Impact	Lexington, KY and Delaware Estuary	Michigan	South Carolina	New Jersey
Infrastructure Roads	14.8 – 19.7	12.4	12	26
Utilities	6.7 – 8.2	13.7	13	8
Developable Land Preservation	20.5 – 24.2	15.5	15	6
Agricultural Land Preservation	18 – 29	17.4	18	39

(Source: Burchell et al., 1998)

In summary, each environmental site design technique provides environmental and economic benefits to both the developer and the community at large. When techniques are applied together at a development site, they can result in tangible savings for the developer in the form of:

- Reduced construction (e.g., clearing and grading) costs;
- Reduced infrastructure costs (e.g., paving and piping)
- Smaller and less costly structural stormwater BMPs
- Faster sales and lease rates
- Easier compliance with wetland and other resource protection regulations
- More land available for building since fewer structural BMPs are needed
- Credits toward LEEDTM certifications.

Cost savings really start to add up when many ESD techniques are applied together. Research indicates that infrastructure savings alone can range from 5-65%, depending on site conditions, lot size and the extent that ESD techniques are applied (Cappiella et al, 2005; CWP, 1998b; Liptan and Brown, 1996; Dreher and Price, 1994; and Maurer, 1996). **Table 6.3** below compares the economic and environmental benefits that can be expected for individual environmental site design techniques.

Table 6.3. Comparison of Benefits of Environmental Site Design Techniques*

Environmental Site Design Technique	Minimizes Land Disturbance	Preserves Vegetation & Habitat	Lowers Capital Costs	Lowers O&M **	Raises Property Value
Preserve Undisturbed Natural Areas	○	○	○	○	◐
Preserve Riparian Buffers	○	○	○	○	◐
Preserve and Plant Trees	◐	○	●	○	○
Avoid Floodplains	○	○	○	○	◐
Avoid Steep Slopes	○	○	○	○	◐
Fit Design to the Terrain	○	◐	○	○	○
Locate Development in Less Sensitive Areas	◐	◐	○	○	◐
Reduce Limits of Clearing and Grading	○	○	○	◐	◐
Use Open Space Development	○	○	○	○	◐
Consider Creative Development Design	○	○	◐	◐	◐
Reduce Roadway Lengths and Widths	○	◐	○	○	◐
Reduce Building Footprints	◐	◐	○	○	◐
Reduce the Parking Footprint	◐	◐	○	○	◐
Reduce Setbacks and Frontages	◐	◐	◐	◐	◐
Use Fewer or Alternative Cul-de-Sacs	◐	◐	○	○	◐
Create Parking Lot Stormwater Islands	◐	◐	◐	◐	◐
Use Buffers and Undisturbed Areas (for SWM)	○	○	○	○	◐
Use Natural Drainageways Versus Storm Sewers	◐	◐	○	◐	◐
Use Vegetated Swales Versus Curb & Gutter	◐	◐	○	◐	◐
Drain Runoff to Pervious Areas	◐	◐	○	○	◐
Infiltrate Site Runoff or Capture It for Reuse	◐	◐	○	◐	◐
Stream Daylighting for Redevelopment Projects	●	○	◐	◐	◐
Key: ○ = Often provides indicated benefit ◐ = Sometimes provides a modest benefit ● = Does not provide benefit					
* Comparison is intended for general purposes and will vary on a site-by-site basis ** O&M = Operation and Maintenance					

Source: Adapted from MPCA (2006)

6.4. ENVIRONMENTAL SITE DESIGN PROCESS

As noted in **Section 6.1.1.2**, site design should be done *in unison with* the design and layout of stormwater infrastructure in attaining stormwater management and land use goals. Key concepts in ESD parallel requirements of state and federal wetland permitting programs, as follows:

- **Avoid** the Impacts – Use environmental site design techniques to preserve natural features and fit the site design to the natural terrain and natural features (see **Figure 6.3** below)
- **Minimize** (or *reduce*) the Impacts – Reduce mass grading and impervious cover.
- **Mitigate** (or *manage*) the Impacts – Use natural features and Environmental Site Design techniques to manage stormwater




Figure 6.3. Fit the Site Design to the Natural Terrain and Natural Features

Source: CNMI and Guam Stormwater Management Manual (2006)

Once sensitive resource areas and site constraints have been avoided, the next step is to minimize the impact of land alteration by reducing mass grading and the amount of impervious surfaces. Finally, for the areas that must be impervious, choose alternative and “natural-systems” stormwater management techniques as opposed to the more conventional structural (“pipe-to-pond”) approach. The goal is to disconnect runoff from impervious surfaces and promote filtration, infiltration and on-site use that mimics the pre-development hydrologic regime of the site and minimizes harmful impacts on the streams that receive runoff discharge from the site.

The aim is to reduce the environmental “footprint” of the site while retaining and enhancing the owner/developer’s purpose and vision for the site. Many of the ESD concepts can reduce the cost of infrastructure while maintaining or even increasing the value of the property, especially when incorporated early into the site design. For example, **Figure 6.4** below is a map representing a natural resource inventory of a 15-acre development site. **Figure 6.5** below is a more traditional plan layout for this site, with 25 lots, each exceeding ½-acre in area. A more traditional subdivision street design is used, with curb-and-gutter configuration draining into underground storm sewers. Minimal stream buffers and natural areas have been preserved. Much of the original vegetation from the site would have to be removed during the grading process. Using the Virginia Runoff Reduction Method Spreadsheet to calculate water quality treatment requirements for this site, we would calculate a required runoff “Treatment Volume” of 18,100 cubic feet. This is the volume of runoff that would have to be captured by BMPs and treated to remove the necessary amount of pollutants in order to comply with the water quality requirements in the Virginia SWM Regulations.




Figure 6.4. Natural Resource Inventory Site Map

Source: Center for Watershed Protection




Figure 6.5. Traditional Site Plan

Source: Center for Watershed Protection

By contrast, **Figure 6.6** reflects the application ESD techniques. Smaller ¼-acre lots are clustered in a tighter configuration on the site. The streets are narrower and shorter, minimizing impervious cover, and the streets drain to surface swales that allow for runoff filtering and infiltration. More of the site's original vegetation is conserved as buffers or other open space, which also reduces the amount of stormwater runoff. When we apply the Spreadsheet to this alternative design, we calculate a runoff Treatment Volume of only 14,300 cubic feet. **That is a 25% reduction in the amount of runoff that must be treated and a smaller pollutant reduction requirement (due to less pollutants being generated in runoff from the site), achieved simply by applying Environmental Site Design techniques alone, before any stormwater management BMPs have been chosen and applied to the site.**




Figure 6.6. Contrasting Environmental Site Design for the Same Site

Source: Center for Watershed Protection

Reduction of adverse stormwater runoff impacts through the use of Environmental Site Design should be the first consideration of the design engineer. Operationally, economically, and aesthetically, the use of Environmental Site Design techniques offers significant benefits over treating and controlling runoff downstream. Therefore, all opportunities for using these methods should be explored and all viable options exhausted before considering the use of structural stormwater controls.

The use of Environmental Site Design typically results in a reduction of the required runoff peak flows and volumes that need to be conveyed and controlled on a site and, therefore, the size and cost of necessary drainage infrastructure and structural stormwater controls. In some cases, the use of Environmental Site Design practices may eliminate the need for structural controls entirely. Hence, Environmental Site Design concepts can be viewed as both a water quantity and water quality management tool.

6.4.1. Environmental Site Design Site Planning Checklist

The following checklist (**Table 6.4** below) is provided to help site designers ensure that they do *not* overlook any opportunities to integrate ESD into their site plans. The list includes 12 criteria that cover the main concepts addressed by ESD. Ideally, a designer should be able to answer “Yes” or “Does Not Apply” (N/A) to every criterion. If a designer answers “No” to any of the criteria, he should give careful consideration to the reasons why the criteria cannot be applied to the site.

Table 6.4. Environmental Site Design Checklist Example

Check All of the Following ESD Practices That Were Implemented On-Site	Yes	No	N/A
Environmental mapping was conducted at the site prior to layout	X		
Natural areas were conserved (e.g., forests, wetlands, steep slopes, floodplains)	X		
Stream, wetland and shoreline buffers were reserved			X
Disturbance of permeable soils was minimized	X		
Natural flow paths were maintained across the site	X		
The building layout was footprinted to reduce clearing and grading at the site	X		
Site grading promotes sheetflow from impervious areas to pervious areas	X		
Site design was evaluated to reduce creation of unnecessary impervious cover	X		
Site design was evaluated to maximize the disconnection of impervious cover	X		
Site design was evaluated to identify potential hotspot generating areas for stormwater treatment	X		
Erosion and sediment control practices and post-construction stormwater management practices were integrated into a comprehensive site plan	X		
Tree planting was used at the site to convert turf areas into forest	X		

Source: Chesapeake Bay Stormwater Training Partnership

6.4.2. List of Stormwater Environmental Site Design Techniques and Practices

The stormwater-related ESD practices and techniques covered in this Handbook are grouped into four categories and are listed below:

A. Conserving of Natural Features and Resources

1. Preserve Undisturbed Natural Areas
2. Preserve Riparian Buffers
3. Preserve or Plant Trees
4. Avoid Floodplains
5. Avoid Steep Slopes

B. Using Lower Impact Site Design Techniques

6. Fit Design to the Terrain
7. Locate Development in Less Sensitive Areas
8. Reduce Limits of Clearing and Grading
9. Utilize Open Space Development
10. Consider Creative Development Design

C. Reducing Impervious Cover in Site Design

11. Reduce Roadway Lengths and Widths
12. Reduce Building Footprints
13. Reduce the Parking Footprint
14. Reduce Setbacks and Frontages
15. Use Fewer or Alternative Cul-de-Sacs
16. Create Parking Lot Stormwater "Islands"

D. Using Natural Features and Runoff Volume Reduction for Stormwater Management

17. Use Buffers and Undisturbed Filter Areas
18. Use Creative Site Grading, Berming and Terraforming
19. Use Natural Drainageways and Vegetated Swales, Not Storm Sewers/Curb & Gutter
20. Drain Rooftop Runoff to Pervious Areas
21. Infiltrate Site Runoff or Capture It for Reuse
22. Stream Daylighting for Redevelopment Projects

More detail on each site design practice is provided in the Environmental Site Design Practice Summaries in the next section of this chapter. These summaries provide the key benefits of each practice, examples and details on how to apply them in site design.

6.4.3. Using Stormwater Environmental Site Design Practices

Site design should be done in unison with the design and layout of stormwater infrastructure in attaining stormwater management goals. The following bullets describe the stormwater-related ESD process that use the four ESD categories:

- Identify existing natural features and resources and delineate site conservation areas
- Design the site layout to preserve conservation areas and minimize stormwater impacts
- Use various techniques to reduce impervious cover in the site design
- Use natural features and conservation areas to manage stormwater quantity and quality

The first step in stormwater-related ESD involves identifying significant natural features and resources on a site such as undisturbed forest areas, stream buffers and steep slopes that should be preserved to retain some of the original hydrologic function of the site.

Next, the site layout is designed such that these conservation areas are preserved and the impact of the development is minimized. A number of techniques can then be used to reduce the overall imperviousness of the development site.

Finally, natural features and conservation areas can be utilized to serve stormwater quantity and quality management purposes.

6.5. ENVIRONMENTAL SITE DESIGN TECHNIQUES AND PRACTICES

6.5.1. Conserving Natural Features and Resources

Conservation of natural features is integral to environmental site design. Natural areas generate the least amount of stormwater runoff and pollutant loads and establish and maintain the desired pre-development hydrology for the site. The first step in the ESD process is to identify and preserve the natural features and resources that can be used in the protection of water resources by reducing stormwater runoff, providing runoff storage, reducing flooding, preventing soil erosion, promoting infiltration, and removing stormwater pollutants. Next, designers modify the layout of the development project to take advantage of natural features, preserve the most sensitive areas, and mitigate any stormwater impacts. Open space design is one of the most effective environmental site design techniques for preserving natural areas at residential sites without losing developable lots. Some of the natural features that should be taken into account include the following:

- Perennial streams
- Intermittent and ephemeral streams
- Zero order streams
- Springs and seeps
- Aquifer recharge areas
- Riparian stream buffers
- Wetlands/tidal marshes
- Wetland buffers
- Floodplains
- Existing drainage areas and drainage divides
- Forest stands
- Other significant vegetative cover
- Ridge tops and steep slopes
- Sinkholes, caves and other karst features
- Highly erodible soils
- Highly permeable soils
- Shallow bedrock
- High water tables
- Other critical areas

Delineation of natural features is typically done through a comprehensive site analysis and inventory before any site layout design is performed. From this site analysis, a concept plan for a site can be prepared that provides for the conservation and protection of natural features. **Figures 6.7 and 6.8** below show how to use GIS map layers to delineate natural features on a parcel's base map and, from that information, develop a composite site resource map.




Figure 6.7. Map Delineating Natural Feature on a Site
Source: MPCA (1989)



Figure 6.8. A Composite Map Developed from GIS Map Layers
Source: Puget Sound LID Technical Manual (2005)

6.5.1.1. Environmental Site Design Practice #1: Preserve Undisturbed Natural Areas

KEY BENEFITS	USING THIS PRACTICE
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Conserving undisturbed natural areas helps to preserve a portion of the site's natural predevelopment hydrology Can be used as nonstructural stormwater filtering and infiltration zones Helps to preserve the site's natural character and aesthetic features May increase the value of the developed property 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Delineate natural areas before performing site layout and design Ensure that conservation areas and native vegetation are protected in an <i>undisturbed state</i> throughout construction and occupancy



Figure 6.9. A Subdivision with Conserved Natural Areas

Clearing and grading of native vegetation should be limited to the minimum needed to (1) build on lots, (2) allow access, and (3) provide fire protection. Important natural features and areas such as undisturbed forested and vegetated areas, natural drainageways, stream corridors, wetlands and other important site features should be delineated and placed into conservation areas. A suggested limit of disturbance (LOD) is 5 to 10 feet out from building pads (**Figure 6.10** below).




Figure 6.10. Site Footprinting

Source: Center for Watershed Protection

Preserving such areas on a development site helps to preserve the original hydrology of the site and aids in reducing the generation of stormwater runoff and pollutants. Undisturbed vegetated areas also promote soil stabilization and provide for filtering, infiltration and evapotranspiration of runoff.

Natural conservation areas are typically identified through a site analysis using maps and aerial/satellite photography, or by conducting a site visit. These areas should be delineated before any site design, clearing or construction begins. When done before the concept plan phase, the planned conservation areas can be used to guide the layout of the site. **Figure 6.11** shows a site map with undisturbed natural areas delineated.




Figure 6.11. Delineation of Natural Conservation Areas

Source: ARC (2006)

Conservation areas should be incorporated into site plans and clearly marked on all construction and grading plans to ensure that equipment is kept out of these areas and that native vegetation is not undisturbed. The boundaries of each conservation area should be mapped to illustrate the limit which should not be crossed by construction activity. Once established, natural conservation areas must be protected during construction and managed after occupancy by a responsible party able to maintain the areas in a natural state in perpetuity. Typically, conservation areas are protected by legally enforceable deed restrictions, conservation easements, and maintenance agreements. Buildings and roads should be located *around* the natural topography and drainage to avoid unnecessary land disturbance.

The undisturbed soils and vegetation of natural areas promote infiltration, runoff filtering and direct uptake of pollutants. Forested areas intercept rainfall in their canopy, reducing the amount of rain that reaches the ground. Vegetation also pumps soil water back into the atmosphere which increases storage available in the soil. Native vegetation also prevents erosion by stabilizing soil, filtering sediment and pollutants from runoff, and absorbing nutrients from the soil and groundwater.

Wetlands provide many benefits to society, including habitat for fish and wildlife, natural water quality improvement, flood storage, shoreline erosion protection, and opportunities for recreation and aesthetic appreciation. Wetlands are among the most productive and biodiverse ecosystems in the world – comparable to rain forests and coral reefs (EPA, 2007c). Estuaries and their coastal marshes are important nursery areas for the young of many game (recreational) and commercial fish and shellfish.

Wetlands help improve water quality, including that of drinking water, by intercepting surface runoff and removing or retaining inorganic nutrients, processing organic wastes, and reducing suspended sediments before they reach open water. Furthermore, a large part of recreational bird-watching – an outdoor recreational activity that is growing in popularity even faster than

biking, walking, skiing or golf – is associated with wetlands and aquatic habitats, in large part because many birds are wetland-dependent.

Preserving areas where threatened or endangered species exist is also a wise decision and is typically required by law. As frustrating as this may seem to landowners and developers, there are good scientific reasons to preserve the habitat of these species. Species extinctions can disrupt the interactions and feedback mechanisms of natural ecosystems that have developed over time to be relatively stable and resistant to pests and diseases. Stable natural ecosystems control more than 95 percent of the potential crop pests and carriers of human diseases (Erlich, 1985).

Invasive species compete with and harm plant and animal communities and disrupt natural ecosystems. Some 5,000 plant species have escaped into natural ecosystems, resulting in millions of dollars in control costs (Pimentel et al., 2005). Invasive species on the site should be identified when the development site is initially assessed. Then, as the development area is being cleared, effort could be made to remove any invasive species present. Such actions could help to methodically reduce or remove invasive species from an area or region.

A point that is often not considered during the planning of a development project and the preservation of natural open space on the development site is reducing the risk of catastrophic wildfire. Designing defensible space around structures protects property from wildfire damage by reducing flame heights and making fires easier to extinguish (Firewise Communities). When fuel loads exceed historical conditions, high intensity fires are more likely to occur, causing significant ecological damage (see SAFC). Design that takes into consideration reduction and management of fuels on the site reduces risks to local ecosystems, property and lives.

Where vegetation must be established on the site, choose to restore appropriate plants and plant communities that are native to the ecoregion of the site, to contribute to regional diversity of flora and provide appropriate habitat for native wildlife. Native plants provide habitat for native wildlife, including important pollinator species (e.g., insects, birds and bats) that are necessary for plant reproduction, including cultivation of nearby crops. Up to 80 percent of the world's food plant species are dependent on pollination by animals (Buchman and Nabhan, 1996). Wildlife habitat also supports recreational and educational opportunities.

As discussed in **Section 6.4.3** above, there are many environmental and economic reasons to establish native trees rather than lawn areas that require more intensive management, especially in open space to be conserved on the site. Not the least of these reasons is minimizing the application of chemical fertilizers and pesticides needed to maintain the desired appearance health and appearance of turfgrass.

Preserving natural areas creates many economic benefits including decreased heating and cooling costs, higher property values and improved habitat (Cappiella, 2005). To approach full ecological function, it is recommended that natural grassland areas should be five acres or larger and a forested areas should be in the range of 20-40 acres. However, smaller areas will still yield water quality and other environmental benefits. When there is not enough conserved area on the

development site to meet these thresholds, the designer should attempt to connect on-site conservation areas with similar areas off-site.

Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED®) and the Sustainable Sites Initiative (SSI). The LEED® point credit system designed by the U.S. Green Building Council (USGBC) and implemented by the Green Building Certification Institute (GBCI) awards points related to site design and stormwater management. Several categories of points are potentially available for new development and redevelopment projects. The SSI point credit system was designed by the American Society of Landscape Architects (ASLA) and the Lady Bird Johnson Wildflower Center at the University of Texas at Austin, and the National Botanic Garden (see ASLA et al., 2009a and 2009b). **Appendix 6-D** of this Chapter provides a more thorough discussion of the site planning process and design considerations as related to SSI credits. It is anticipated that SSI credits may eventually be blended into LEED credits. However, DEQ is not affiliated with any of the creators of LEED or SSI, and any information on applicable points suggested here is based only on perceived compatibility. **Designers should research and verify scoring criteria and applicability of points as related to the specific project being considered through LEED or SSI resources.**

Sustainable Sites Initiative: Applicable Benchmarks and Credits	
Benchmark	Points
1.3: Preserve wetlands	0 (Prerequisite)
1.4: Preserve threatened and endangered species	0 (Prerequisite)
4.1: Control and manage known invasive plants found on the site	0 (Prerequisite)
4.8: Preserve plant communities native to the ecoregion	2 - 6
4.9: Restore plant communities native to the ecoregion	1 - 5
4.13: Reduce the risk of catastrophic wildfire	3

6.5.1.2. Environmental Site Design Practice #2: Preserve Riparian Buffers

KEY BENEFITS	USING THIS PRACTICE
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Riparian buffers can be used as nonstructural stormwater filtering and infiltration zones • Keeps structures out of the floodplain and provides a right-of-way for large flood events • Helps to preserve riparian ecosystems and habitats 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Delineate and preserve naturally vegetated riparian buffers • Ensure that buffers and native vegetation are protected throughout construction and occupancy • Consult the local plan review authority for applicable buffer requirements and minimum or recommended widths
This practice reflects the CWP Better Site Design Principles #17 (Buffer Systems) and #18 (Buffer System Management)	

Naturally vegetated riparian buffers should be delineated and preserved or restored along the shorelines of all perennial streams, rivers, lakes, and wetlands. The primary function of buffers is to protect and physically separate a stream, lake or wetland from future disturbance or encroachment. Given the importance of riparian forests in the ecology of headwater streams, characteristics such as width, target vegetation and allowable uses within the buffer should be managed to ensure that the goals designated for the buffer are achieved.

Buffers are not merely setbacks, but vegetated systems managed to protect targeted soil and water resources. If properly designed, a buffer can stabilize soils, provide stormwater management functions, provide a right-of-way during floods, and sustain the integrity of stream ecosystems, wildlife corridors and habitats. An example of a riparian stream buffer is shown in **Figure 6.12**. Improved water quality resulting from riparian buffers can increase property values of waterside properties by up to 15 percent (Braden and Johnston, 2004). Riparian forest buffers should be maintained, and reforestation with native species should be encouraged where no wooded buffer exists. Proper restoration should include not just trees all layers of the forest plant community, including understory, shrubs and groundcover,. A riparian buffer can be of fixed or variable width, but should be continuous and not interrupted by impervious areas that allow stormwater to concentrate and flow into the stream without first flowing through the buffer.



Figure 6.12. Riparian Stream Buffer

Source: Center for Watershed Protection

Ideally, riparian buffers should be sized to include the 100-year floodplain as well as steep banks and freshwater wetlands. For proper performance, buffer depth will depend on the size of the stream and the surrounding conditions; but a minimum 25-35 foot undisturbed vegetative buffer is needed for even the smallest perennial streams and a 50-foot or larger undisturbed buffer is ideal. Even with a 25-35 foot undisturbed buffer, additional zones can be added to extend the total buffer to at least 100 feet from the edge of the stream (100 feet in Chesapeake Bay Preservation Areas). The three distinct zones are shown in **Figure 6.13** below.




Figure 6.13. Three-Zone Stream Buffer System

Source: CWP (1998a)

The buffer is often viewed as simply a line drawn on a map that is virtually invisible to contractors and landowners. In order to increase awareness of the buffer and the need for its protection, the boundaries should be marked with appropriate signage. Local governments may provide such signage. Some localities also implement buffer awareness programs and literature for their citizens.

To optimize stormwater treatment, the outer boundary of the buffer should have a stormwater depression area and a grass filter strip. Runoff captured within the stormwater depression is spread across a grass filter designed for sheet flow conditions, and discharges to a wider forest or shrub buffer in the middle or streamside zones that can fully infiltrate and/or further treat storm flow. The function, vegetative target and allowable uses vary by zone as described in **Table 6.5**.

Table 6.5. Riparian Buffer Management Zones

Criteria	Streamside Zone	Middle Zone	Outer Zone
Width	Minimum 25 feet plus wetlands and critical habitat (35 feet is better for both forest and wildlife habitat); protect the physical integrity of the stream ecosystem.	Variable, depending on stream order, slope, and extent of 100-year floodplain (min. 25 feet, but generally 50-75 feet); provides a buffer between upland development and the streamside zone.	25-foot minimum setback from structures; prevent encroachment and filter backyard runoff.
Vegetative Cover	Undisturbed mature forest. Reforest, if grass.	Managed forest, with some clearing allowed.	Forest encouraged, but usually turfgrass.
Allowable Uses	Very Restricted e.g., flood control, utility easements, rights-of-way, footpaths, limited water access, trimming for sight lines.	Restricted e.g., some passive recreational uses, some stormwater controls, pedestrian and bike paths, tree removal by permit.	Unrestricted e.g., residential uses including lawn, garden, compost, yard wastes, and most stormwater controls.

Source: MPCA (2006)

These recommendations are minimum criteria that should apply to most streams. Some streams and watersheds may require additional measures to achieve protection. In some areas, specific laws and regulations (e.g., the Chesapeake Bay Preservation Act) or local ordinances (e.g., drinking water reservoir protection) may require stricter buffers than are described here. The buffer widths discussed herein are not intended to modify or supersede deeper or more restrictive buffer requirements that are already in place.

As stated above, the streamside or inner zone should consist of a minimum of 25-35 feet of undisturbed mature forest. In addition to runoff protection, this zone provides bank stabilization as well as shading and protection for the stream. This zone should also include wetlands and any critical habitats, and its width should be adjusted accordingly. The middle zone provides a transition between upland development and the inner zone and should consist of managed woodland that allows for infiltration and filtration of runoff. An outer zone allows more clearing and acts as a further setback from impervious surfaces. It also functions to prevent encroachment and filter runoff. It is here that flow into the buffer should be transformed from concentrated flow into sheet flow to maximize ground contact with the runoff. Level spreaders can be used to accomplish this.

When establishing or enhancing riparian buffers on a development site, it is important to manage the buffer in a way that reduces the risk of catastrophic wildfire. Increasingly, development is occurring near wildland environments where wildfire is a major element of the native plant community. Development is expanding into the wildland/urban interface where structures are located next to large areas of natural vegetation. Designing defensible space around structures protects property from wildfire damage. Design that takes into consideration reduction and management of fuels on the site reduces risks to local ecosystems, property and lives

A Fire Hazard Rating System and National Wildland/Urban Interface Fire Protection Program has been established, which provides recommendations for target vegetation around structures. **Table 6.6** below presents a rating system for estimating the hazard potential of developing in a wildland/urban interface area. If a community has a high potential risk for wildfire, then it makes sense to consider the vegetation management techniques that are described in **Table 6.7** below. The most common technique is to clear or reduce vegetation that is within 70 feet of structures.

Development within the riparian buffer should be limited only to those structures and facilities that are absolutely necessary. Such limited development should be specifically identified in any codes or ordinances enabling the buffers. When construction activities do occur within the riparian corridor, specific mitigation measures should be required, such as deeper buffers or riparian buffer improvements.

Generally, the riparian buffer should remain in its natural state. However, some maintenance is periodically necessary, such as preventing concentrated flows, removing exotic plant species when these species are detrimental to the vegetated buffer, and removing diseased or damaged trees.

Table 6.6. Sample of Fire Hazard Rating System in the Wildland/Urban Interface (adapted from the National Wildland/Urban Interface Fire Protection Program) ¹

Hazard Rating Category	Description of Hazard	Point Range
I. Fuel Hazard Rating ²	Low, medium or high hazard fuels (grasses, mixed hardwoods, evergreen timber)	Grasses 1 pt Woodland (open understory) 2-3 pts Woodland (heavy brush) 4 pts Large evergreen timber 5 pts
II. Slope Hazard Rating ²	Mild, moderate, steep, to extreme slopes	Mild slopes (< 5%) 1 pt Moderate slopes (6-15%) 2 pts Steep slopes (16-25%) 3 pts Extreme slopes (> 25%) 4 pts
III. Structure Hazard Rating	Roof and siding material combustibility	Non-combustible roof & siding 1 pt Non-comb. roof, comb. siding 3 pts Comb. roof, non-comb. siding 7 pts Comb. roof & siding 10 pts
IV. Safety Zone Rating ²	Number of homes that do not have a safety zone of at least 30 feet	30% of homes 3 pts 31-60% of homes 6 pts 61-100% of homes 10 pts
V. Means of Access for Emergency Vehicles ³	Number of access points or width of access	Only one access point 3 pts Width for one-way traffic only 3 pts Road grades > 15% 2 pts Turn-around inadequate 3 pts Bridge width limits emrg. equip. 3 pts
VI. Additional Factor Rating ³	Other items that contribute to hazard potential	Most road names not marked 2 pts Subdiv. Entrance not marked 2 pts Individual home #s not marked 2 pts Power lines not buried 2 pts Lack of mun. water sources 2 pts Area lacks static water sources 2 pts Long distance from fire dept. 2 pts Ease of plowing for fire line 1-5 pts
Total Hazard Rating: (0-19 = Low Risk; 20-39 = Medium Risk; 40-60 = High Risk) ¹ Total hazard rating is the sum of all points awarded ² For Hazard Rating Categories I – IV, assign points based on the one criterion that best describes the existing site conditions. ³ For Hazard Rating Categories V and VI, points are awarded for all criteria that apply.		

Table 6.7. Recommendations for Target Vegetation Around Structures in Medium- to High-Wildfire Areas (adapted from the National Wildland/Urban Interface Fire Protection Program)

Zone	Distance from Combustible Structure	Target Vegetation
A	Primary setback zone – 20 feet	All natural vegetation cleared; plant only low level, fire-resistant vegetation (lawn, low-level ground covers; examples include: lily-of-the-valley, periwinkle, bearberry, lilac)
B	Wet zone – 70 feet	Most natural vegetation removed; area irrigated during dry conditions; planted with low-level, fire-resistant vegetation
C	Thinning zone – 120 feet	Remove all dead/dying vegetation and up to 50% of live natural vegetation (target the most flammable, large foliage, shaggy bark, plants that develop dry or dead undergrowth, etc., for removal)
D	Thinning zone – 150 feet	Remove all dead/dying vegetation and up to 30% of live natural vegetation

Buffers can provide many different ecosystem services and economic benefits, including:

- Reduced small drainage problems and complaints
- Reduced risk of flood damage
- Reduced stream bank erosion
- Enhanced pollutant removal
- Location for greenways and trails
- Sustained integrity of stream ecosystems and habitat
- Protection of wetlands associated with the stream corridor
- Prevention of disturbance of steep slopes
- Mitigation of stream warming
- Protection of important stream corridor habitat for wildlife
- Increased adjacent property values. Some examples of positive market influence include the following:
 - When managed as a “greenway,” stream buffers can increase the value of adjacent parcels, as illustrated by several studies. Pannypack Park in Philadelphia is credited with a 33 percent increase to the value of nearby property. A net increase of more than \$3.3 million in real estate is attributed to the park (CBF, 1996). Another greenway in Boulder, Colorado was found to have increased aggregate property values by \$5.4 million, resulting in \$500,000 of additional tax revenue per year (Fausold and Lilieholm, 1996).
 - Homes situated near seven California stream restoration projects had a 3-13 percent higher property value than similar homes located on unrestored streams (Streiner and Loomis, 1996). Most of the perceived value of the restored stream was due to the enhanced buffer, habitat, and recreation afforded by the restoration.
 - Housing prices were found to be 32 percent higher if they were located next to a greenbelt buffer in Colorado (Correll et al., 1978). Nationally, buffers were thought to have a positive or neutral impact on adjacent property in 32 out of 39 communities surveyed (Schueler, 1995).
 - Effective shoreline buffers can increase the value of urban lake property. A recent study in Maine found that water clarity was directly related to property values. Specifically, a measurable improvement in water clarity (visibility depth increased by 3 feet) resulted in \$11 to \$200 more per foot of shoreline property, potentially generating millions of dollars in increased value per lake (Michael et al., 1996).

The following actions help to minimize the risk of buffer encroachment and damage:

- Make sure buffers appear on site plans and are clearly labeled.
- Make sure buffers also appear on separate clearing and grading plans.
- Identify buffers and discuss buffer protection measures during the pre-construction meeting.
- Make sure construction inspectors assure that buffer integrity is not violated.
- Disclose the presence and location of buffers, with notes regarding limitations of use, on recorded plat maps.
- Implement a local buffer awareness program for citizens.
- Mark buffer boundaries with appropriate signage.

For additional guidance pertaining to planting vegetation in riparian buffer areas, see DEQ's guidance document entitled *Riparian Buffer Modification and Mitigation Guidance Manual*, available at the following website:

<http://www.deq.virginia.gov/Programs/Water/LawsRegulationsGuidance/Guidance/StormwaterManagementGuidance.aspx>

Sustainable Sites Initiative: Applicable Benchmarks and Credits	
Benchmark	Points
3.3: Protect and restore riparian, wetland, and shoreline buffers	3 - 8
4.13: Reduce the risk of catastrophic wildfire	3

6.5.1.3. Environmental Site Design Practice #3: Preserve or Plant Native Trees

KEY BENEFITS	USING THIS PRACTICE
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reduce stormwater runoff • Increase nutrient uptake • Stabilize streambanks • Provide shading and cooling • Provide pleasing aesthetic values • Provide or enhance wildlife habitat • Better resist disease and harsh conditions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Perform an inventory of the existing forest and identify trees to protect. • Design the development with conservation of native vegetation in mind. • Protect designated trees during and after construction. • Plant additional trees and native vegetation at the development site.
This practice reflects the CWP Better Site Design Principle #20 (Tree Conservation)	




Figure 6.14. The Benefits of Tree Canopy for Stormwater Management

Native trees, shrubs and grasses are important contributors to the overall quality and viability of the environment. One of the most cost-effective ESD practices is to conserve or plant trees and shrubs at new development or redevelopment sites, clustering tree areas and promoting the use of native plants (see contrast in **Figures 6.15 and 6.16** below). Wherever feasible, manage community open space, street rights-of-way, parking lot islands, and other landscaped areas to promote natural vegetation. This reduces stormwater runoff, reduces nutrient pollution (see **Figure 6.17** below), provides streambank stabilization, provides shading and cooling, and provides wildlife habitat (Cappiella, 2005). Forest soils actively promote greater infiltration rates due to surface organic matter and macro-pores created by tree roots. Forests intercept rainfall in

their canopy, reducing the amount of rain that reaches the ground and increasing potential water storage in forest environments.



Figure 6.15. Subdivision with Tree Preservation.

Source: Center for Watershed Protection




Figure 6.16. Subdivision Cleared and Grubbed from Property Line to Property Line

Source: Center for Watershed Protection




Figure 6.17. Comparison of Annual Nutrient Loads from Different Land Covers

Source: Chesapeake Bay Stormwater Training Partnership

Existing trees can be protected or new ones provided and used for applications such as landscaping, stormwater management practice areas, conservation areas, and erosion and sediment control. Where protection of existing trees and forest cover is desired, the developer should perform an inventory of existing trees and forest cover on the site as part of the site evaluation. Care should be taken to identify and preserve the highest quality forest stands prior to development. Specific mature tree/native vegetation targets can be established at the pre-development stage, based on reference sites and historic records. A professional arborist or forester can provide reliable advice regarding the health of trees and recommendations about what trees to preserve. Priority should be given to protecting or establishing hydrologically-connected tree clusters. In particular, trees within locally designated Resource Protection Areas

(RPAs) in localities subject to the Chesapeake Bay Preservation Act or elsewhere adjacent to streams are prime candidates for preservation (see the preceding Practice #2, *Preserving Riparian Buffers*).

As discussed in **Appendix 6-D** of this chapter, there are many environmental and economic reasons to establish trees instead of extensive lawn areas that require more intensive management, especially in open space to be conserved on the site. Having less lawn would result in less application of chemical fertilizers, pesticides and irrigation water, which are needed to maintain the desired health and appearance of turfgrass and which represent significant routine expenditures. Native species are generally preferable, requiring less attention and maintenance over time because their characteristics are attuned to the climatic zone of the site. The following are additional examples of the economic benefits of conserving or restoring tree and forest cover through the development process:

- A 1993 survey of members of the National Association of Homebuilders indicated that over 69 percent of the respondents described themselves as increasing the number of trees on their properties and were either thinking of or committed to continuing the practice (Andreason and Tyson, 1993).
- Two regional economic surveys documented that conserving forests on residential and commercial sites enhanced property values by an average of 6-15 percent and increased the rate at which units were sold or leased (Morales, 1980, and Weyerhaeuser, 1989).
- It has been conservatively estimated that over \$1.5 billion per year is generated in tax revenue for communities in the U.S. due to the value of privately-owned trees on residential property (USDA, as cited by the National Arbor Day Foundation, 1996).
- Single family homes in Athens, Georgia, with an average of five trees in the front yard, sold for 3.5-4.5 percent more than houses without trees (National Arbor Day Foundation, 1996).
- A study of 14 variables that might influence the price of suburban homes in Manchester, Connecticut and Greece, New York found that trees ranked sixth in influencing the selling price. Trees on the property increased sale prices by 5-15 percent (National Arbor Day Foundation, 1996).
- Another study found that large old street trees (**Figure 6.18** below) were the most important indicator of community attractiveness (Coder, 1996). This community attractiveness is important due to its positive impact on property value. This same study stated that a \$242 savings per home per year in cooling costs could be achieved when trees are present.
- In Austin, Texas, tree canopy was estimated to reduce stormwater flows by up to 28%, saving the city \$122 million (MacDonald, 1996).
- In Atlanta, Georgia, officials estimate that the significant loss of trees and other vegetation over 25 years had resulted in a 6-9 degree elevation in temperature, increasing energy consumption for cooling, and a 4.4 billion cubic foot increase in stormwater runoff; officials estimated that at least \$2 billion would be required to build containment facilities capable of storing the excess stormwater runoff (MacDonald, 1996, and American Forests, as cited in U.S. Water News, 1997)
- The Center for Watershed Protection has estimates of the long-term costs of maintaining different kinds of open-spaces in the urban landscape (**Table 6.8** below), showing that maintaining natural open space areas is by far the least expensive type of open space.




Figure 6-18. Street Trees in Seattle

Source: Puget Sound LID Technical Manual

Table 6.8. The Comparative Costs of Open Space Maintenance

Open Space Mgmt Strategy	Annual Maintenance Cost
Natural Open Space (only maintenance is trash/debris cleanup)	\$75/acre
Lawns (regular mowing)	\$240 - \$270/acre
Passive Recreation (trails, bike paths, etc.)	\$200/acre

Source: CWP

Trees are ideal for all projects (see **Figure 6.19** below), including those where space is limited, in which trees can be placed along street frontages and in common space. Urban areas with higher numbers of trees exhibit hydrology more similar to natural conditions compared to urban areas without a tree canopy. Trees intercept storm water and retain a significant volume of the captured water on their leaves and branches, allowing for evaporation and providing runoff reduction benefits. For example, a large oak tree can intercept and retain more than 500 to 1,000 gallons of rainfall in a given year (Capiella, 2005). Since forest cover results in a lower runoff coefficient, areas of the development site under forest cover actually receive credit for runoff reduction in the Virginia Runoff Reduction Method Spreadsheet calculations. This is an additional incentive to conserve and restore forest cover on sites, since less total runoff means lower costs to manage the runoff.



Figure 6.19. Potential Tree Planting Areas at a Development Site

Source: MPCA (2006)

While the most effective interceptor trees are large canopied evergreen trees, deciduous trees can also provide a benefit. For example, a leafless Bradford Pear will retain more than one-half the amount of precipitation intercepted by an evergreen cork oak (Xiao et al., 2000b). The shade provided by trees keeps the ground under the trees cooler, thereby reducing the amount of heat gained in runoff that flows over the surface under the trees. This attenuation of heat in stormwater helps control increases in local stream temperatures. The presence of strategically located tree canopies also typically results in lower heating and cooling costs for adjacent buildings. Furthermore, on slopes, tree roots hold soil in place and prevent erosion.

The length of the slope of land draining toward tree cover should not exceed 150 feet from pervious areas and 75 feet from impervious areas. The gradient of land draining toward tree cover should not exceed 6 to 8 percent, depending upon the type of ground cover, unless a level spreader is used to convert runoff to sheet flow prior to entering the forested area (see Virginia Stormwater Design Specification No. 2, “Sheet Flow to a Vegetated Filter Strip or Conserved Open Space” – <http://www.vwrrc.vt.edu/swc/NonProprietaryBMPs.html>). Ideally, forested areas should have multiple layers of vegetation, including herbaceous vegetation on the ground surface and a layer of native shrubs as understory vegetation (**Figure 6.20** below).

When establishing or enhancing riparian buffers on a development site, it is important to manage the buffer in a way that reduces the risk of catastrophic wildfire. Designing defensible space around structures protects property from wildfire damage. Design that takes into consideration reduction and management of fuels on the site reduces risks to local ecosystems, property and lives. A Fire Hazard Rating System and National Wildland/Urban Interface Fire Protection Program has been established, which provides recommendations for target vegetation around structures. More specific guidance about this can be found in **Tables 6.6 and 6.7** in **Section 6.5.1.2** (the previous practice – #2, *Preserve Riparian Buffers*).




Figure 6.20. Preserve or Establish Multiple Layers of Vegetation
Source: Day and Crafton (1978)

It is important to note that existing trees that are being preserved on the development site must be protected from the impacts of the construction process. Protective measures may include the use of signs, geotextile web fencing, or visible flagging (**Figure 6.21** below). The critical root zone(s) (CRZ) must be delineated (**Figure 6.22**) and protective barriers erected to prevent equipment from moving over and compacting the soils over the CRZs (**Figure 6.23**). Furthermore, construction materials should not be stored over CRZs, because the weight of the stored materials can also result in compacted soils (see **Figure 6.24** below).




Figure 6.21. Tree Protection Sign
Source: Adapted from State of Maryland



Figure 6.22. Compacted Soil
Source: Center for Watershed Protection




Figure 6.23. Most of a Tree's Roots Exist in the Top 1-Foot of Soil Depth and Extend Well Beyond the Canopy Drip Line
Source: City of Broomfield, Colorado



Figure 6.24. Construction Materials Stored Within Critical Root Zones of Trees Being Preserved
Source: Center for Watershed Protection

Site reforestation involves planting trees on existing turf or barren ground at a development site with the goal of establishing a mature tree canopy that can intercept rainfall, maximize infiltration and increase evapotranspiration. Trees can also be planted in stormwater management practices (e.g., bioretention areas, constructed wetlands, etc.) and in sidewalk planting pits. Whatever the target area, once the sites are selected, they should be evaluated for soil quality and other pertinent features, and the planting sites should be improved as needed (e.g., soil amendments). Tree planting sites and tree species should be chosen to fit the purpose of the development project and to withstand the constraints of an urban setting (see **Figure 6.25** below). Typically, inexpensive saplings are planted, coupled with quick establishment of an appropriate native ground cover around the trees so as to stabilize the soil and prevent influx of invasive plants. Turfgrass should be kept at least 24 inches from tree trunks.



Figure 6.25. (a – upper left): residential trees; (b – upper right): street trees; (c – center left): trees at a commercial site; (d – center right): trees at a parking lot; (e – lower left): parking lot trees at a commercial office building; (f – lower right): trees, bioretention, and conserved open space around and within a parking lot. Source: Sacramento (2007)

Sustainable Sites Initiative: Applicable Benchmarks and Credits	
Benchmark	Points
4.2: Use appropriate, non-invasive plants	0 (Prerequisite)
4.7: Use native plants	1 - 4
4.13: Reduce the risk of catastrophic wildfire	3

6.5.1.4. Environmental Site Design Practice #4: Avoid Floodplains

KEY BENEFITS	USING THIS PRACTICE
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Preserving floodplains provides a natural right-of-way and temporary storage for large floods. Keeps people and structures out of harm's way Helps to preserve riparian ecosystems and habitats Can be combined with riparian buffer protection to create linear greenways 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Obtain maps of the 100-year floodplain from the local review authority Ensure that all development activities do not encroach on the designated floodplain areas

Floodplains are the low-lying flat lands that border streams and rivers. Floodplain areas should be avoided for homes and other structures to minimize risk to human life and property damage, and to allow the natural stream corridor to accommodate flood flows. When a stream reaches its capacity and overflows its channel after storm events, the floodplain provides for storage and conveyance of these excess flows. In their natural state they reduce flood velocities and peak flow rates by the passage of flows through dense vegetation.

Floodplains play an important role in reducing sedimentation and filtering runoff, recharging groundwater, and providing travel corridors and habitat for both aquatic and terrestrial life. They can also provide an urban oasis for human health, recreation and well-being. Development in floodplain areas can reduce the ability of the floodplain to convey stormwater, potentially causing safety problems or significant damage to the site in question, as well as to both upstream and downstream properties. Most communities regulate the use of floodplain areas to minimize the risk to human life as well as to avoid flood damage to structures and property.




Figure 6.26. Floodplain Boundaries in Relation to a Riparian Buffer

Source: Georgia Stormwater Management Manual (2006)

Ideally, the entire 100-year full-buildout floodplain should be avoided for clearing or building activities, and should be preserved in a natural undisturbed state. Floodplain protection is complementary to riparian buffer preservation. Both of these ESD techniques preserve stream corridors in a natural state and allow for the protection of vegetation and habitat. Depending on the site topography, the boundaries of the 100-year floodplain may lie inside or outside of a preserved riparian buffer corridor, as shown in **Figure 6.26**.

Maps of the 100-year floodplain can typically be obtained through the local review authority. Developers and builders should also ensure that their site design comply will any other relevant local floodplain and FEMA requirements.

Sustainable Sites Initiative: Applicable Benchmarks and Credits	
Benchmark	Points
1.2: Protect floodplain functions	0 (Prerequisite)

6.5.1.5. Environmental Site Design Practice #5: Avoid Steep Slopes

KEY BENEFITS	USING THIS PRACTICE
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Preserving steep slopes helps to prevent soil erosion and degradation of stormwater runoff Steep slopes can be kept in an undisturbed natural condition to help stabilize hillsides and soils Building on flatter areas will reduce the need for cut-and-fill and grading 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Avoid development on steep slope areas, especially those with a grade of 15% or greater Minimize grading and flattening of hills and ridges

Steep slopes should be avoided due to the potential for soil erosion and increased sediment loading. Excessive grading and flattening of hills and ridges should be minimized. Developing on steep slope areas has the potential to cause excessive soil erosion and stormwater runoff during and after construction. Past studies by the SCS (now NRCS) and others have shown that soil erosion is significantly increased on slopes of 15 percent or greater. In addition, the nature of steep slopes means that greater areas of soil and land area are disturbed to locate facilities on them compared to flatter slopes, as demonstrated in **Figure 6.27**.




Figure 6.27. Flattening Steep Slopes for Building Sites Uses More Land Area Than Building on Flatter Slopes

Source: Georgia Stormwater Management Manual (2006)

Therefore, development on slopes with a grade of 15% or greater should be avoided if possible to limit soil loss, erosion, excessive stormwater runoff, and the degradation of surface water. Excessive grading should be avoided on all slopes, as should the flattening of hills and ridges. Steep slopes should be kept in an undisturbed natural condition to help stabilize hillsides and soils.

On slopes greater than 25%, no development, regrading, or stripping of vegetation should be considered unless the disturbance is for roadway crossings or utility construction and it can be demonstrated that the roadway or utility improvements are absolutely necessary in the sloped area.

Sustainable Sites Initiative: Applicable Benchmarks and Credits	
Benchmark	Points
4.4: Minimize soil disturbance in design and construction	6

6.5.2. Using Low Impact Site Design Techniques

After a site analysis has been performed and conservation areas have been delineated, there are numerous opportunities in the site design and layout phase to reduce both water quantity and quality impacts of stormwater runoff. These primarily deal with the location and configuration of impervious surfaces or structures on the site and include the following practices and techniques covered over the next several pages:

- Fit the Design to the Terrain
- Locate Development in Less Sensitive Areas
- Reduce Limits of Clearing and Grading
- Utilize Open Space Development
- Consider Creative Development Design

The goal of lower impact site design techniques is to lay out the elements of the development project in such a way that the site design (i.e. placement of buildings, parking, streets and driveways, lawns, undisturbed vegetation, buffers, etc.) is optimized for effective stormwater management. That is, the site design takes advantage of the site's natural features, including those placed in conservation areas, as well as any site constraints and opportunities (topography, soils, natural vegetation, floodplains, shallow bedrock, high water table, etc.) to prevent both on-site and downstream stormwater impacts. **Figure 6.28** shows a development that has utilized several lower impact site design techniques. **Figures 6.29 through 6.31** show other aspects of low-impact development. Stormwater management practices that contain runoff volume on-site for reuse or infiltration are emphasized.




Figure 6.28. Development Design Using Several Lower Impact Site Design Techniques

Source: ARC (2006)



Figure 6.29. Composite Site Analysis of a Residential Lot
Source: Puget Sound LID Technical Manual (2005)




Figure 6.30. LID Practices Incorporated at a Residential Lot
Source: Puget Sound LID Technical Manual (2005)




Figure 6.31. Use of LID Practices on a Medium- to High-Density Lot
Source: Puget Sound LID Technical Manual (2005)

6.5.2.1. Environmental Site Design Practice #6: Fit the Design to the Terrain

KEY BENEFITS	USING THIS PRACTICE
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Helps to preserve the natural hydrology and drainageways of a site Reduces the need for grading and land disturbance Provides a framework for site design and layout 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Develop roadway patterns to fit the site terrain. Locate buildings and impervious surfaces away from steep slopes, drainageways and floodplains

The layout of roadways and buildings on a site should generally conform to the landforms on a site. Natural drainageways and stream buffer areas should be preserved by designing road layouts around them. Buildings should be sited to utilize the natural grading and drainage system and avoid the unnecessary disturbance of vegetation and soils. All site layouts should be designed to conform with or "fit" the natural landforms and topography of a site. This helps to preserve the natural hydrology and drainageways on the site, as well as reduces the need for grading and disturbance of vegetation and soils. **Figure 6.32** illustrates the placement of roads and homes in a residential development.

Roadway patterns on a site should be chosen to provide access schemes which match the terrain. In rolling or hilly terrain, streets should be designed to follow natural contours to reduce clearing and grading. Street hierarchies with local streets branching from collectors in short loops and cul-de-sacs along ridgelines help to prevent the crossing of streams and drainageways as shown in **Figure 6.33** below. In flatter areas, a traditional grid pattern of streets or "fluid" grids which bend and may be interrupted by natural drainageways may be more appropriate (see **Figure 6.34** below). In either case, buildings and impervious surfaces should be kept off of steep slopes, away from natural drainageways, and out of floodplains and other lower lying areas. In addition, the major axis of buildings should be oriented parallel to existing contours.




Figure 6.32. Preserving the Natural Topography of the Site
(Adapted from Sykes, 1989)




Figure 6.33. Subdivision Design for Hilly or Steep Terrain Uses Branching Streets from Collectors that Preserves Natural Drainageways and Stream Corridors
Source: ARC (2006)




Figure 6.34. A Subdivision Design for Flat Terrain Uses a Fluid Grid Layout that is Interrupted by the Stream Corridor
Source: ARC (2006)

Sustainable Sites Initiative: Applicable Benchmarks and Credits	
Benchmark	Points
4.4: Minimize soil disturbance in design and construction	6

6.5.2.2. Environmental Site Design Practice #7: Locate Development in Less Sensitive Areas

KEY BENEFITS	USING THIS PRACTICE
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Areas with highly permeable soils can be used as nonstructural stormwater infiltration zones • Helps to preserve the natural hydrology and drainageways of a site • Makes most efficient use of natural site features for preventing and mitigating stormwater impacts • Provides a framework for site design and layout 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Use soil surveys to determine site soil types • Lay out the site design to minimize the hydrologic impact of structures and impervious surfaces • Leave areas of porous or highly erodible soils as undisturbed conservation areas

Healthy soils effectively cycle nutrients; store carbon as organic matter; minimize runoff and maximize water holding capacity; absorb excess nutrients, sediments and pollutants; provide a healthy rooting environment and habitat to a wide range of organisms; and maintain their structure and aggregation. Porous soils, such as sand and gravels, provide an opportunity for groundwater recharge of stormwater runoff and should be preserved as a potential stormwater management option. Preserving soil horizons saves money by reducing the need for soil restoration and surface drainage improvements. Unstable or easily erodible soils should be avoided due to their greater erosion potential. By limiting grading, sites can also reduce costs for construction machinery and transport of imported soils.



Figure 6.35. Soil Mapping Information Can Be Used To Guide Development

Source: USDA-NRCS

Soils on a development site should be mapped in order to preserve areas with porous soils, and to identify those areas with unstable or erodible soils as shown in the Soil Survey (see **Figure 6.35**). Soil surveys can provide a considerable amount of information relating to all relevant aspects of soils. General soil types should be delineated on concept site plans to guide site layout and the placement of buildings and impervious surfaces.

To minimize the hydrologic impacts on the existing site land cover, the area of development should be located in areas of the site that are less sensitive to disturbance or have a lower value in terms of hydrologic function and ecosystem services. In much the same way that a development should be designed to conform to terrain of the site, a site layout should also be designed so that the areas of development are placed in the locations of the site that minimize the hydrologic and ecologic impact of the project, using the following methods:

- Avoid developing on land designated as prime farmland, unique farmland, or farmland of statewide importance, in order to conserve the most productive farmland for use by future generations. Once converted to industrial and urban uses, this farmland is lost and cannot be regained.
- Given the choice, select sites on brownfields or greyfields for redevelopment and/or otherwise within existing communities where necessary infrastructure already exists.
- Locate buildings and impervious surfaces away from stream corridors, floodplains, wetlands and natural drainageways. Use buffers to preserve and protect riparian areas and corridors.
- Areas on a site with highly erodible or unstable soils should be avoided for land disturbing activities and buildings to prevent erosion and sedimentation problems as well as potential future structural problems. These areas should be left in an undisturbed and vegetated condition.
- Areas of the site with porous soils should be left in an undisturbed condition, as much as is feasible, and/or used as stormwater runoff infiltration zones. Buildings and impervious surfaces should be located in areas with less permeable soils (**Figure 6.36**). These areas should ideally be incorporated into undisturbed natural or open space areas.




Figure 6.36. Avoid Building On or Disturbing Porous Soils

Source: Day and Crafton (1978)

Infiltration of stormwater into the soil reduces both the volume and peak discharge of runoff from a given rainfall event, and also provides for water quality treatment and groundwater recharge. Soils with maximum permeability (hydrologic soil group A and B soils such as sands and sandy loams) allow for the most infiltration of runoff into the subsoil.




Figure 6.37. Guiding Development to Less Sensitive Areas of a Site

Source: Georgia Stormwater Management Manual (2001)

Avoid land disturbing activities or construction on areas with steep slopes or unstable soils.

- Minimize the clearing of areas with dense tree canopy or thick vegetation, and ideally preserve them as natural conservation areas
- Ensure that natural drainageways and flow paths are preserved, where possible. Avoid the filling or grading of natural depressions and ponding areas.
- Design carefully around floodplains. Access to buildings and residences should be from the landward direction. Stream crossings should be as nearly perpendicular as possible (see Figure 6.38 below).

Figure 6.37 above shows a development site where the natural features have been mapped in order to delineate the hydrologically sensitive areas. Through careful site planning, sensitive areas can be set aside as natural open space areas (see Environmental Site Design Practice #9). In many cases, such areas can be used as buffer spaces between land uses on the site or between adjacent sites.




Figure 6.38. Design Carefully Around Floodplains

Source: Day and Crafton (1978)

Sustainable Sites Initiative: Applicable Benchmarks and Credits	
Benchmark	Points
1.1: Limit development of soils designated as prime farmland, unique farmland, and farmland of statewide importance	0 (Prerequisite)
1.2: Protect floodplain functions	0 (Prerequisite)
1.3: Preserve wetlands	0 (Prerequisite)
1.4: Preserve threatened and endangered species	0 (Prerequisite)
1.5: Select brownfields or greyfields for redevelopment	5 - 10
1.6: Select sites within existing communities	6

6.5.2.3. Environmental Site Design Practice #8: Reduce the Limits of Clearing and Grading

KEY BENEFITS	USING THIS PRACTICE
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Preserves more undisturbed natural areas on a development site Techniques can be used to help protect natural conservation areas and other site features 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Establish limits of disturbance for all development activities Use site footprinting to minimize clearing and land disturbance

Clearing and grading of the site should be limited to the minimum amount needed for the development function, road access, and the necessary infrastructure (e.g., utilities, wastewater disposal, and stormwater management). Minimal disturbance methods should be used to limit the amount of clearing and grading that takes place on a development site, preserving more of the undisturbed vegetation, good soils, and natural hydrology of a site. Unnecessarily removing forest cover will decrease infiltration and, thus, increase runoff and the possibility of erosion and siltation (**Figure 6.39**). Vegetation plays an enormous role in regulating stream flow and maintaining water quality. Areas which contain high-quality, stable, or unique vegetation should be identified and preserved.




Figure 6.39. Clearing Vegetation Decreases Infiltration and Baseflow and Increases Runoff

Source: Day and Crafton (1978)

Appropriate methods include the following:

- Avoiding mass grading and establishing physically marked limits of disturbance (LOD) based on maximum disturbance zone radii/lengths. These maximum distances should reflect reasonable construction techniques and equipment needs together with the physical situation of the development site such as slopes or soils. LOD distances may vary by type of development, size of lot or site, and by the specific development feature involved.
- Using site "footprinting" which maps all of the limits of disturbance to identify the smallest possible land area on a site which requires clearing or land disturbance for building

footprints, construction access, and safety setbacks. Examples of site footprinting are illustrated in **Figures 6.40 and 6.41**.

- Fitting the site design to the terrain.
- Use alternative site designs that incorporate open-space or “cluster” developments.
- Using special procedures and equipment which reduce land disturbance.




Figure 6.40. Establishing Limits of Clearing

Source: DDNREC (1997)




Figure 6.41. Example of Site Footprinting

Source: ARC (2006)

Sustainable Sites Initiative: Applicable Benchmarks and Credits	
Benchmark	Points
4.4: Minimize soil disturbance in design and construction	6
4.5: Preserve all vegetation designated as special status	5
4.6: Preserve or restore appropriate plant biomass on the site	3 - 8
4.8: Preserve plant communities native to the ecoregion	2 - 6

6.5.2.4. Environmental Site Design Practice #9: Use Open Space Development

KEY BENEFITS	USING THIS PRACTICE
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Can be used to help protect natural conservation areas and other site features • Can be used to preserve natural hydrology and drainageways and improve watershed protection • Reduces the need for grading and land disturbance • Reduces infrastructure needs and development costs • Increases community recreational space 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Use a site design which concentrates development and preserves open space and natural areas of the site
This practice reflects the CWP Better Site Design Principles #11 (Open Space Design), #15 (Open Space Management), and #21 (Conservation Incentives)	

Open space site designs (sometimes referred to as conservation development or cluster development) incorporate smaller lot sizes to reduce overall impervious cover while providing protection for open space and natural areas opportunities for on-site stormwater runoff reduction and treatment, and protection of local water resources. Open space development is typically applied to residential development. Where open space design is available as an option under local zoning codes, the localities typically relax minimum lot sizes, setbacks and frontage distances in order to maintain the same number of dwelling units at the site while achieving the conservation purposes.

The Department encourages localities to consider making open space development a by-right form of development, so that zoning variances or special use permits are unnecessary, and to provide incentives for developers to make greater use of this form of development. Incentives and flexibility in the form of density compensation, buffer averaging, and property tax reduction, among others, should be encouraged to promote conservation of stream buffers, forests, meadows, and other areas of environmental value. In addition, compensatory mitigation consistent with locally adopted watershed plans should be encouraged. More detailed guidance regarding such options can be found in the discussion of the Center for Watershed Protection's Better Site Design Principle No. 21 (in CWP 1998a).

The ability to implement open space designs depends to a great extent on the base zoning density of the open space design. Flexibility sharply declines as the density of the base zone increases. Generally, high density residential zones (more than six dwelling units per acre) are not feasible for open space developments, simply due to the lack of space.

Open space developments have many benefits compared with conventional commercial developments or residential subdivisions: they can reduce impervious cover, stormwater pollution, construction costs, and the need for grading and landscaping, while providing for the conservation of good soils, high quality, stable or unique vegetation, wildlife habitat, and

community open space. **Figure 6.42** and **Figure 6.43** below show examples of open space developments.




Figure 6.42. Open Space Subdivision Site Design Example
Source: DE DNREC (1997)



Figure 6.43. Aerial View of an Open Space Subdivision
Source: Chesapeake Bay Stormwater Training Partnership

Along with reduced imperviousness, open space designs provide a host of other environmental benefits lacking in most conventional designs. These developments reduce potential pressure to encroach on conservation and buffer areas because enough open space is usually reserved to accommodate these protection areas. As less land is cleared during the construction process, alteration of the natural hydrology and the potential for soil erosion are also greatly diminished. Perhaps most importantly, open space design typically results in 25 to 50 percent of the development site being placed in conservation areas that would not otherwise be protected.

Some measure of the value of open space design in reducing impervious cover can be gleaned from a series of “redesign” analyses (see **Table 6.9**). In each case, an existing conventional residential subdivision was “redesigned” using open space design principles. The resulting change in impervious cover was measured from the two plans. These studies suggest that open space designs can reduce impervious cover by 40-60 percent and stormwater runoff volume by 20-60+ percent, when compared to conventional subdivision designs, particularly if narrow streets can also be used at the site. The value of open space designs in reducing impervious cover is evident over most residential zones, although only minor reductions in impervious cover occur in areas which used very small lot size (1/8 acre lots and smaller) in the original zoning.

Table 6.9. Redesign Analyses Comparing Impervious Cover and Stormwater Runoff from Conventional and Open Space Subdivisions

Residential Subdivision Name	Conventional Zoning for the Subdivision	Impervious Cover at the Site			% Reduction in Stormwater Runoff (%)
		Conventional Design (%)	Open Space Design (%)	Net Change (%)	
Remlick Hall ¹	5 acre lots	5.4	3.7	-31	20
Duck Crossing ²	3-4 acre lots	8.3	5.4	-35	23
Tharpe Knoll ³	1 acre lots	13	7	-46	44
Chapel Run ³	1/2 acre lots	29	17	-41	31
Pleasant Hill ³	1/2 acre lots	26	11	-58	54
Prarie Crossing ⁴	1/2 to 1/3 acre lots	20	18	-20	66
Rappahannock ²	1/3 acre lots	27	20	-24	25
Buckingham Greene ³	1/8 acre lots	23	21	-7	8
Belle-Hall ⁵	High Density	35	20	-43	31
Sources: ¹ Maurer, 1996; ² CWP, 1998b; ³ DE DNREC, 1997; ⁴ Dreher, 1994; and ⁵ SCCCL, 1995.					

Source: CWP, 1998a

Decreased stormwater runoff translates to less stormwater pollution. Again, several redesign analyses have compared the stormwater pollution loads of conventional and open space developments using simple models (see **Table 6.10** below). Significant reductions in stormwater pollutant loadings generally occur when open space designs are used – comparable to what can be achieved if stormwater best management practices were installed at the conventional site.

Open space developments can also be significantly less expensive to build than conventional projects. Most of the cost savings are due to reduced infrastructure cost for roads and stormwater management controls and conveyances. The examples in **Table 6.11** below demonstrate infrastructure cost savings ranging from 11-66 percent.

Table 6.10. Redesign Analyses Comparing Stormwater Pollution Loads from Conventional and Open Space Subdivisions

Residential Subdivision	Change in Phosphorus Load (%)	Change in Nitrogen Load (%)	Other
Remlick Hall ¹	-42	-42	
Prarie Crossing ²	-81	N/A	92% TSS reduction
Rappahannock ³	-60	-45	
Belle-Hall ⁴	-67	-69	
Sources: ¹ Maurer, 1996; ² Dreher, 1994; ³ CWP, 1998b; and ⁴ SCCCL, 1995			

Source: CWP, 1998a

Table 6.11. Projected Construct Cost Savings for Open Space Designs from Redesign Analyses

Residential Development	Construction Cost Savings (%)	Notes
Remlick Hall ¹	52	Includes costs for engineering, road construction, and obtaining water and sewer permits
Duck Crossing ²	12	Includes roads, stormwater management, and reforestation
Tharpe Knoll ³	56	Includes roads and stormwater management
Chapel Run ³	64	Includes roads, stormwater management, and reforestation
Pleasant Hill ³	43	Includes roads, stormwater management, and reforestation
Rappahannock ²	20	Includes roads, stormwater management, and reforestation
Buckingham Greene ³	63	Includes roads and stormwater management
Canton, Ohio ⁴	66	Includes roads and stormwater management
Sources: ¹ Maurer, 1996; ² Dreher, 1994; ³ CWP, 1998b; and ⁴ NAHB, 1986		

Source: CWP, 1998a

While open space developments are frequently less expensive to build, developers find that these properties often command higher prices than those in more conventional developments. Several studies estimate that residential properties in open space developments garner premiums that are higher than conventional subdivisions and moreover, sell or lease at an increased rate (Zielinski, 2001). Open space development also reduces the heat island effect of urban areas, and the preserved vegetation can help to reduce heating and cooling costs, providing long-term economies. Many studies have shown that a well-designed and marketed open space development can be very desirable to home buyers. Some examples are presented in **Table 6.12** below.

Once established, common open space and natural conservation areas must be managed by a responsible party able to maintain the areas in a natural state in perpetuity. Typically, the conservation areas are protected by legally enforceable deed restrictions, conservation easements, and maintenance agreements.

A 1992 survey of local open space design regulations conducted by Heraty revealed that the open space requirements were poorly defined in most communities. For example, less than a third of local cluster ordinances required that open space be consolidated. Only 10 percent

required that a specified portion of the open space be maintained and managed in a natural state. Similarly, few communities clearly specify allowable uses for open space areas. Instead, most communities rely on community associations to manage open space and determine allowable uses.

Table 6.12. Examples of Successful Open Space Developments

Subdivision Name	Location	Percent Open Space	Notes
Farmview	Bucks County, PA	*	The fastest selling subdivision in its price range, with lots from 1/2 to 1/3 the size of competing projects (Arendt, et al., 1994)
Palmer Ranch	Sarasota, FL	36	93% of existing wetlands at the site were preserved. Accounted for 30% of the new home market in Sarasota in 1994 (Ewing, 1996).
Fields of St. Croix	Lake Elmo, MN	60	80% of home sites in the first phase were sold within 6 months (NAHB, 1997)
Westgreen	Leesburg, VA	39	Targeted to young professionals and empty-nesters. Every lot in Phase I sold during the first weekend (ULI, 1992)
* More than 23% was preserved as open space and 31% was preserved as productive farm land.			

Source: CWP, 1998a

Realistically, few community associations have the legal or financial resources to adequately manage open space, particularly if it is intended for active recreation. Furthermore, it is difficult for individual community associations to manage interconnected open spaces in a cohesive manner. The concern that homeowners lack the money, organization or technical ability to adequately maintain common areas is often cited as the reason for communities to prohibit or restrict open space designs.

However, open space managed in natural condition actually has minimal annual maintenance cost. This is one reason why communities should encourage designers to retain as much open space as possible in a natural condition. Communities should also explore more reliable methods to assure that the responsibility for open space management can be met within a development. The two primary options are to (1) create a community organization or (2) to shift the responsibility to a third party, such as a land trust or park, by means of a conservation easement. The latter technique is especially useful in developments that have high quality conservation areas retained in open space.

Communities that have cluster or open space ordinances should revisit them to ensure that open space is well planned and, where possible, connected. Clear performance criteria for open space consolidation, maintenance in natural condition, allowable uses, and future management should be carefully considered. More detailed guidance about managing open space can be found in the discussion of Principle No. 15 in CWP 1998a.

Sustainable Sites Initiative: Applicable Benchmarks and Credits	
Benchmark	Points
4.5: Preserve all vegetation designated as special status	5
4.6: Preserve or restore appropriate plant biomass on the site	3 - 8
4.12: Reduce urban heat island effects	3 - 5

6.5.2.5. Environmental Site Design Practice #10: Consider Creative Development Design

KEY BENEFITS	USING THIS PRACTICE
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Allows flexibility to developers to implement creative site designs which include environmental site design practices May be useful for implementing an open space development 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Check with your local review authority to determine if the community supports Planned Unit Developments (PUDs) Determine the type and nature of deviations allowed and other criteria for receiving PUD approval

Planned Unit Developments (PUDs) allow a developer or site designer the flexibility to design a residential, commercial, industrial, or mixed-use development in a fashion that best promotes effective stormwater management and the protection of environmentally sensitive areas. A Planned Unit Development (PUD) is a type of planning approval available in some communities which provides greater design flexibility by allowing deviations from the typical development standards required by the local zoning code with additional variances or zoning hearings. The intent is to encourage better designed projects through the relaxation of some development requirements, in exchange for providing greater benefits to the community. PUDs can be used to implement many of the other stormwater-related ESD practices covered in this Handbook and to create site designs that maximize natural nonstructural approaches to stormwater management. Examples of the types of zoning deviations which are often allowed through a PUD process include:

- Allowing uses not listed as permitted, conditional or accessory by the zoning district in which the property is located
- Modifying lot size and width requirements
- Reducing building setbacks and frontages from property lines (e.g., zero lot line configurations, as shown in **Figure 6.44**).
- Altering parking requirements
- Increasing building height limits



Figure 6.44. Zero Lot Line Configuration
Source: Puget Sound LID Technical Manual (2005)

Many of these changes are useful in reducing the amount of impervious cover on a development site (see Environmental Site Design Practices #12 through #17). A developer or site designer should consult their local review authority to determine whether the community supports PUD approvals. If so, the type and nature of deviations allowed from individual development requirements should be obtained from the review authority in addition to any other criteria that must be met to obtain a PUD approval.

Sustainable Sites Initiative: Applicable Benchmarks and Credits	
Benchmark	Points
2.2: Use an integrated site development process	0 (Prerequisite)
4.4: Minimize soil disturbance in design and construction	6
4.5: Preserve all vegetation designated as special status	5
4.6: Preserve or restore appropriate plant biomass on the site	3 - 8
4.7: Use native plants	1 – 4
4.8: Preserve plant communities native to the ecoregion	2 – 6
4.9: Restore plant communities native to the ecoregion	1 – 5
4.10: Use vegetation to minimize building heating requirements	2 – 4
4.11: Use vegetation to minimize building cooling requirements	3 - 5
4.12: Reduce urban heat island effects	3 - 5

6.5.3. Reducing Impervious Cover in Site Design

The level of impervious cover – i.e. rooftops, parking lots, roadways, sidewalks and other surfaces that do not allow rainfall to infiltrate into the soil – is an essential factor to consider in ESD for stormwater management. Site by site and watershed by watershed, increased impervious cover means increased stormwater generation and increased pollutant loadings.

Thus by reducing the area of total impervious surface on a site, a site designer can directly reduce the volume of stormwater runoff and associated pollutants that are generated. It can also reduce the size and cost of necessary infrastructure for stormwater drainage, conveyance, and control and treatment. Some of the ways that impervious cover can be reduced in a development include:

- Reduce Roadway Lengths and Widths
- Reduce Building Footprints
- Reduce the Parking Footprint
- Reduce Setbacks and Frontages
- Use Fewer or Alternative Cul-de-Sacs
- Create Parking Lot Stormwater Islands

Figure 6.45 shows examples employing several of these principles to reduce the overall imperviousness of the development. The next several pages cover these methods in more detail.



Figure 6.45. Example of Reducing Impervious Cover (clockwise from upper left):
(a) Cul-de-sac with Vegetated Island; (b) Narrower Residential Street; (c) Vegetated Median in Roadway; and (d) “Green” Parking Lot with Vegetated Islands

Source: ARC (2001)

6.5.3.1. Environmental Site Design Practice #11: Reduce Roadway Lengths and Widths

KEY BENEFITS	USING THIS PRACTICE
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reduces the amount of impervious cover and associated runoff and pollutants generated Reduces the costs associated with road construction and maintenance 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consider different site and road layouts that reduce overall street length Minimize street width by using narrower street designs that are a function of land use, density and traffic demand Smaller side yard setbacks will reduce total street length
This practice reflects the CWP Better Site Design Principles #1 (Street Width), #2 (Street Length), and #3 (Right-of-Way Width)	

**Figure 6.46. Narrow Residential Street with Swale Drainage**

Source: Chesapeake Bay Stormwater Training Partnership

Roadway widths and lengths should be minimized on a development site where possible to reduce overall imperviousness, while still supporting expected traffic volume, on-street parking and access for emergency, maintenance and service vehicles. Furthermore, a wide right-of-way (ROW) is only needed when utilities and sidewalks are located some distance from the paved section of the roadway. While a wide ROW does not necessarily create more impervious cover, it can work against environmental site design for several reasons. First, it subjects a greater area to clearing during road construction. This may lead to needless loss of existing trees. Second, and more important, a wide ROW consumes land that may be better used for housing lots, making it more difficult to achieve a more compact site design. The right-of way in **Figure 6.46** above is just wide enough to account for the pavement and open channels. It is also narrower because there are no sidewalks and the utilities have been placed underground.

Consider the use of alternative road layouts (**Figure 6.47**) that increase the number of homes served per unit length, thus reducing the total linear length of roadways. This can significantly reduce overall imperviousness of a development site and associated runoff and pollutant generation. Reducing imperviousness also helps to reduce the urban heat island effect. Site designers are encouraged to analyze different site and roadway layouts to see if they can reduce overall street length. The length of local cul-de-sacs and cross streets should be shortened to a maximum of 200 ADT (average daily trips) to minimize traffic and road noise so that shorter setbacks may be employed.




Figure 6.47. Alternative Street Layouts

Source: Center for Watershed Protection

Residential streets and private streets within commercial and other development should be designed for the minimum required pavement width needed to support travel lanes, on-street parking, and emergency access. Many communities require minimum street widths that are much wider than needed to support travel lanes, on-street parking, and emergency access. Access streets in subdivisions often are wider than the collector and “higher order” streets that receive their traffic. Ironically, excessively wide streets encourage excessive speed as well.

Several time-honored sources of highway specifications such as the American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials (AASHTO) and the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) have established minimum pavement width and right-of-way width specifications which are unnecessarily large, especially when applied in zones of lower density where average lot size is large and traffic generation, even at build-out, is much less than traffic anticipated by such specifications. **Table 6.13** below illustrates the various national standards as compared to alternative standards developed by the Metropolitan Washington (DC) Council of

Governments. For comparison, **Table 6.14** below is a translation of the most recent VDOT subdivision street design standards (March, 2009) into the same criteria categories.

Table 6.13. Condensed Summary of National Residential Street Design Standards

Design Criteria	AASHTO	ITE	MWCOG
Residential Street Categories	1	3	4 depending on ADT
Minimum Street Width	26 ft. min.	< 2du = 22-27 ft. 2-6 du = 28-34 ft. < 6du = 36 ft.	< 100 ADT = 16 ft. 100-500 ADT = 20 ft. 0-6 du/ac = 32 ft.
Additional righty-of-way	24 ft.	24 ft.	8 to 26 ft.
Design speed, level terrain	30 mph	30 mph	15 to 25 mph
Curb and Gutter	Generally required	Generally required	Not required on collectors
Cul-de-Sac Radii	30 ft.	40 ft.	30 ft.
Turning Radii in Cul-de-Sac	20 ft.	25 ft.	17 ft.
AASHTO = American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials ITE = Institute of Transportation Engineers MWCOG = Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments (1995) ADT = Average Daily Trips Du = Dwelling Units			

Table 6.14. VDOT Residential Street Design Standards

Design Criteria	VDOT Curb & Gutter Street Section			VDOT Road & Ditch Street Section			
Minimum Street Width	No Parking	Parking 1 Side	Parking Both Sides	No Parking	Parking 1 Side	Parking Both Sides	Min. Width of Shoulder
	<2K ADT: 24 ft. 2-4K ADT: 26 ft.	<2K ADT: 24 ft. 2-4K ADT: 31 ft.	<2K ADT: 29 ft. 2-4K ADT: 36 ft.	<2K ADT: 24 ft. 2-4K ADT: 26 ft.	<2K ADT: 24 ft. 2-4K ADT: 31 ft.	<2K ADT: 29 ft. 2-4K ADT: 36 ft.	<2K ADT: 6 ft. 2-4K ADT: 8 ft.
Additional righty-of-way	8' to 12' from back of curb. Right-of-Way shall extend a minimum of 1' beyond any feature to be maintained by VDOT.			Minimum 28' beyond edges of pavement. Right-of-Way shall extend a minimum of 1' beyond any feature to be maintained by VDOT.			
Design speed, level terrain	<2K ADT: 25 mph 2K-4K ADT: 30 mph			<2K ADT: 25 mph 2K-4K ADT: 30 mph			
Curb and Gutter	Not required on collector streets						
Cul-de-Sac Radii	Circular Type Turnaround: 45 ft. to edge of pavement or face of curb Concentric or Offset Cul de Sac (unpaved center): Unpaved ctr area = min. 30 ft./max. 120 ft.						
Turning Radii in Cul-de-Sac	Minimum 45' radius to accommodate school buses, intercity buses and single unit trucks. Auto-TURN® shall be used when designing for larger vehicles.						
ADT = Average Daily Trips							

Source: Adapted from VDOT Road Design Manual, Appendix B(1): March, 2009

Even AASHTO's minimum pavement width of 26 feet is sometimes exceeded. For the type of "first order" street system designed to service low density residential subdivisions, this width is excessively costly to construct, requires expensive real estate, and creates far more stormwater than otherwise would result. Because of the way in which so much development is configured,

these streets are often times just networks of cul-de-sacs specifically designed to exclude through traffic. In most cases such streets will not receive significantly increased traffic as an area builds out. Consequently, traffic levels are not likely to increase much beyond the traffic generated by the homes lining the street.

Width reduction offers considerable potential benefit in terms of stormwater reduction. For the very smallest access street or lane (approximately 15 homes, with fewer than 100 vehicle trips per day), width can be decreased to 16 feet. Guidelines exist to increase width as the traffic increases (20 feet for 100-500 trips per day, 26 feet for 500-3,000 trips per day, and so forth). In conventional developments with conventional lots and house design, there is no need to provide on-street parking, although if tightly clustered configurations are used, on-street parking may be a desirable option and included in the design (add another 8-foot lane).

Figure 6.48 below shows different options for narrower street designs. Many times on-street parking can be reduced to one lane or eliminated on local access roads with less than 200 ADT on cul-de-sac streets and 400 ADT on two-way loops. One-way single-lane loop roads are another way to reduce the width of lower traffic streets.




Figure 6.48. Potential Design Options for Narrower Street and Roadway Widths

Source: Chesapeake Bay Stormwater Training Partnership

Some communities currently require residential streets as wide as 32-40 feet and which provide two parking lanes and two moving lanes (**Figure 6.49** below). Local experience has shown that residential streets can have pavement widths as narrow as 22-26 feet, and still accommodate all access and parking needs (ITE, 1997). Even narrower access streets can be used when only a handful of homes are served. Significant cost savings occur in both road construction and maintenance. Narrower streets also help reduce traffic speeds in residential neighborhoods which, in turn, improve pedestrian safety. Snow stockpiles on narrow streets can be accommodated if parking is restricted to one side of the street or alternated between the sides. Alternatively, the right-of-way may be used for snow storage. Narrow snowplows are available.

Eight foot wide snowplow blades mounted on pick-up trucks are common. Some companies manufacture alternative snowplows on small Bobcat®-type machines.




Figure 6.49. Traditional Street Width (left) and a Narrowed Street with “Queuing Lanes” (right). Source: MPCA (2006)

A narrower ROW can generally be accommodated on many residential streets without unduly compromising safety or utility access (see **Figure 6.50** and **Table 6.15** below). Some communities have recently narrowed ROWs for residential streets to 35-45 feet. This is done by redesigning each of the main components of the ROW. First, the *pavement width* is reduced on some streets. Second, *sidewalks* are either narrowed or restricted to one side of the street. Third, the *border width*, which separates the street from the sidewalk, is slightly relaxed. Last, *utilities* are installed underneath street pavement at the time of construction. When these design techniques are combined together, the width of most residential ROWs can be reduced to 10-25 feet. It should be noted that a narrow ROW may not be desirable if stormwater is conveyed by swales along the road (instead of curb and gutter).




Figure 6.50. Design Options for Narrower Rights-of-Way on Residential Streets
(Source: VPI&SU, 2000)

Table 6.15. Examples of Narrower Right-of-Way Widths

Source	Right-of-Way Width	Pavement Width and Purpose
Portland, OR	35 feet 40 feet	20-foot residential street 26-foot residential street
Montgomery County, MD	20 feet 44 feet 46 - 60 feet	16-foot residential alley 20 foot residential street 26 foot residential street
ASCE, 1990 (Recommendations)	24 - 26 feet 42 - 46 feet	22 - 24 foot residential alley 26 foot residential street

Road length also is an important issue. Road length should first be addressed from a macro level planning perspective. Obviously overall dense patterns of development result in dramatically less road construction than low density patterns, holding net amount of development constant. High density development and vertical development contrast sharply with low density sprawl, which has proliferated in recent years and has required vast new highway systems throughout urban fringe zones.

Furthermore, if the critical mass of density is achieved, other forms of transportation such as transit may be enabled. Concepts such as Transit Oriented Development (TOD) has extremely important stormwater benefits as well, where flows of all types – from stormwater to traffic – can be managed much better. The Department encourages the Virginia Department of Transportation (VDOT) to continue to consider appropriate revisions in its standards for subdivision roads and streets – which govern design criteria in most Virginia communities – to minimize street size and imperviousness while still maintaining traffic and pedestrian safety.

More detailed guidance about minimizing street imperviousness can be found in the discussion of Principles No. 1 (Street Width), No. 2 (Street Length), and No. 3 (Right-of-Way Width) in CWP 1998a.

Sustainable Sites Initiative: Applicable Benchmarks and Credits	
Benchmark	Points
4.12: Reduce urban heat island effects	3 - 5

6.5.3.2. Environmental Site Design Practice #12: Reduce the Impervious Footprints

KEY BENEFITS	USING THIS PRACTICE
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reduces the amount of impervious cover and associated runoff and pollutants generated Can result in slowing/calming traffic in residential neighborhoods 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Use alternate or taller building designs to reduce the impervious footprint of buildings Consolidate functions and buildings or segment facilities to reduce footprints of structures Reduce directly-connected impervious areas
This practice reflects the CWP Better Site Design Principles #13 (Sidewalks) and #14 (Driveways)	

Building Footprints

The impervious footprint of commercial buildings and residences can be reduced by using alternate or taller buildings while maintaining the same floor to area ratio. Sidewalk and driveway lengths and widths should be minimized where possible to reduce overall imperviousness. Reducing imperviousness also helps to reduce the urban heat island effect.

In order to reduce the imperviousness associated with the footprint and rooftops of buildings and other structures, alternative and/or vertical (taller) building designs should be considered. Consolidate functions and buildings, as required, or segment facilities to reduce the footprint of individual structures. **Figure 6.51** shows the reduction in impervious footprint by using a taller building design.




Figure 6.51. Building Up Rather Than Out Can Reduce the Amount of Impervious Cover on the Site. Source: ARC (2006)

Sidewalk Footprints

Many communities require sidewalks that are excessively wide or are located adjacent to the street where the pedestrians are at risk from vehicles. While sidewalk design requirements

protect pedestrians, needless sidewalks can also increase the amount of site imperviousness, thereby preventing infiltration of stormwater runoff into the soil. In general, the placement and width of sidewalks can be modified without impairing travel access or minimizing pedestrian safety.

An environmental site design technique modifies the width and location of sidewalks to promote safer pedestrian mobility when linking pedestrian areas (**Figure 6.52**). Impervious cover is reduced when sidewalks are required on only one side of the street, reduced in width (to 3 or 4 feet) and are located away from the street. Sidewalks can also be disconnected so they drain to lawns or landscaping instead of the gutter and storm drain system. Slimmer sidewalks reduce and/or disconnect impervious cover, and thus reduce the generation of runoff. However, a minimum width of 4 feet should be provided, pursuant to the Americans with Disabilities Act. Other benefits include greater pedestrian safety, lower construction and maintenance costs, and reduced individual homeowner responsibility for snow clearance.



Figure 6.52. A Common Walkway Draining to Adjacent Vegetation and Linking Pedestrian Areas

Source: MPCA (2006)

Pedestrian safety is the usual reason for requiring sidewalks on both sides of a street. However, actual safety statistics show that having a sidewalk on only one side of the street provides approximately the same level of safety as providing sidewalks on both sides of the street (**Table 6.16** below).

**Table 6.16. Survey of Pedestrian Accidents
Related to the Presence of Sidewalks**

Sidewalk Location	% of Accidents
No sidewalk present	83.5%
Pedestrian sidewalk only	0.9%
Multi-use sidewalk	0.6%
Sidewalk present on both sides of street	7.3%
Sidewalk present on at least one side of street	7.7%
Total	100%

Source: NHI (1996)

While safety is probably the most important issue governing pedestrians and the use of sidewalks, more and more governments, well-insured organizations, and professionals are being sued as a result of accidents involving pedestrians. It is true that taking simple and straightforward steps can reduce the occurrence of legal challenges and reduce the liability involved. The most important factor involving a government official or design professional in protecting themselves from legal challenges is the use of “ordinary care.” Ordinary care means that design decisions are based on a basic level of care that can be expected of a reasonably experienced and prudent professional. Ordinary care is usually determined by using the “85 percentile rule.” This simply means that designs are based on accommodating the behavior that can be expected of 85 percent of the travelers who use the facility in a reasonable manner (NHI, 1996). **Table 6.17** provides recommended design elements for sidewalks.

Table 6.17. Design Elements for User-Friendly, Safe and Legally Defensible Sidewalks

Sidewalk Design Element	Use, Safety, and Liability Considerations
4 feet minimum width	Allows users to walk side-by-side, helping to keep one user from walking in the street
Provide a buffer from traffic	Limits potential accidents and resulting lawsuits
Provide access to streets and destinations	Provides linkage between automobiles, transit and other destinations, avoids “dumping” pedestrians out at unsafe locations
Provide shade where possible	Makes walking more pleasant in the heat of summer
Design to avoid areas of standing or flowing water across the sidewalk	Standing or flowing water can freeze in the winter, creating a hazard and a potential liability situation
Design at the street level	Encourages sidewalk use and awareness of traffic situations
Limit the amount and strictly regulate vending machines (e.g., news stands, FedEx boxes, etc.)	These items take up valuable sidewalk space, potentially hinder sight distances, and can infringe on sidewalk area at critical locations, such as road crossings
Provide places to sit	Provides rest spots and places for people to stop, out of the way of traffic and congestion
Provide adequate and well-designed crossings	Helps minimize one of the major reasons for pedestrian accidents (i.e., darting out in front of on-coming traffic)

Source: Partially adapted from NHI, 1996

The Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) does not specifically address sidewalks. However, it does require accessible routes. There must be at least one accessible route within the site boundary from public transportation stops, parking, and passenger loading zones. There must be at least one accessible route from public streets or sidewalks to the buildings or facilities they serve. Accessible routes must coincide with the routes for the general public *to the maximum extent feasible*. Sidewalks must be at least three feet wide (ADA Hotline, 1997; Dey, 1997).

Driveway Footprints

Driveways are linked very much to the configuration of a development and present another opportunity to practice environmental site design. Most local codes contain front yard setback requirements that dictate driveway length. In many communities, front yard setbacks for certain residential zoning categories may extend 50 or 100 feet or even longer. This increases driveway length well beyond what is needed for adequate parking and access to a garage. Furthermore, as lots have grown larger (sometimes much larger than one acre), minimum setback criteria typically are exceeded significantly. Houses often sit back considerable distances; driveways and total impervious cover increase significantly. As much as 20 percent of the impervious cover in a residential subdivision consists of driveways (Schueler, 1995).

As houses have grown larger and car-per-household ratios have increased, greater accommodation has been required for the automobile, which translates into increased impervious surface of different types. A 20-foot driveway fans out into a three-car garage. Turnaround aprons are increased in size accordingly. More aesthetic side-loading garages mean even longer driveways. The end result has been a substantial increase in the amount of impervious area created per person or per dwelling.

Shorter setbacks reduce the length and impervious cover for individual driveways. In addition, driveway width can be reduced from 20 feet to 18 feet, and more permeable driveway surfaces allowed (**Figure 6.53**). Another way to reduce impervious cover is to allow shared driveways (with enforceable maintenance agreements and easements) that provide street access for up to six homes (**Figure 6.54** below). Shorter driveways help reduce infrastructure costs for developers since they reduce the amount of paving or concrete needed. Another option, intrinsic to Traditional Neighborhood Design (TND), is the elimination of the driveway altogether, as garages open onto alleys – the new common driveways – with small aprons.



Figure 6.53. Alternative (Permeable) Driveway Surfaces

Source: ICPA



Figure 6.54 Example of a Shorter Driveway (left) and a Shared Driveway (right)

Source: MPCA (2006)

Minimize Clearing of Existing Vegetation

Last, but certainly not least among techniques to minimize building footprints is the concept of minimizing the amount of landscape that is cleared and will require maintenance following development. Ideally, clearing of vegetation and disturbance of soil is carefully limited to a prescribed distance from proposed structures and improvements (see **Section 6.5.2.3**, ESD Practice #8). At issue are construction phase impacts as well as long-term operation and maintenance of the development. The objective should be to maximize existing (hopefully natural/native) vegetation and to minimize creation of an artificial landscape that will perpetually require chemical nutrients and routine cutting/trimming.

Sustainable Sites Initiative: Applicable Benchmarks and Credits	
Benchmark	Points
4.12: Reduce urban heat island effects	3 - 5

6.5.3.3. Environmental Site Design Practice #13: Reduce the Parking Footprints

KEY BENEFITS	USING THIS PRACTICE
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reduces the amount of impervious cover and associated runoff and pollutants generated 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reduce the number of parking spaces Minimize stall dimensions Consider parking structures and shared parking Use alternative porous surface for overflow areas
<p>This practice reflects the CWP Better Site Design Principles #6 (Parking Ratios), #7 (Parking Codes), #8 (Parking Lots), #9 (Structured Parking, and #10 (Parking Lot Runoff)</p>	




Figure 6.55. Multiple Stormwater Management Strategies Applied to Parking Lot
Source: Chesapeake Bay Stormwater Training Partnership

Stormwater management requirements can be met in many cases by applying environmental site design principles to parking lot design. Overall imperviousness associated with parking lots can be reduced by eliminating unneeded spaces, providing compact car spaces, minimizing stall

dimensions, incorporating efficient parking lanes, using multi-storied parking decks, and using permeable pavers or pavement surfaces in overflow parking areas, where feasible, to reduce and treat stormwater runoff. Reducing imperviousness and replacing it with valuable green space also helps to reduce the urban heat island effect.

A complete discussion of all of the relevant parking/stormwater issues links to larger macro planning issues quite quickly. Stated simply, low density development sprawling into the countryside – widely scattered subdivisions, office parks and shopping centers along major roadways and at expressway interchanges – typically forces maximum reliance on the automobile for transportation. This means more trips will be generated on a per-resident or per-capita basis, so there is a need for more parking accommodations. By contrast, with Transit Oriented Design (TOD) or Traditional Neighborhood Design (TND), the total number of auto trips is reduced as the result of walking, biking or using available transit services, so parking needs are reduced. Furthermore, the mixture of uses as found in these neo-traditional TOD/ TND configurations also means that opportunity for creative “sharing” of spaces can be devised so that daytime spaces can be used for nighttime parking demand as well. This minimizes the suburban separation of uses with its vast zones of single-purpose parking lots. Additionally, this blending of uses and sharing of parking spaces can help to deflect the peak demand factor (i.e., the shopping mall at Christmas) that has driven so many municipal parking requirements. But there are also ESD techniques that can minimize parking-related imperviousness, even when more conventional modes of development are used.

For example, the aerial photo in **Figure 6.56** below shows a parking lot in Minneapolis, Minnesota. The University of Minnesota’s Metropolitan Design Center redesigned the lot to demonstrate how impervious area can be reduced while maintaining the same number of required parking spaces. **Figure 6.57** is a graphic of the parking lot as originally designed, showing that the drive aisles and several of the parking spaces in the lot *exceed* the city’s minimum parking requirements. The drive lanes are 28-feet wide. However, the city requires a minimum of 22 feet for two-way driving lanes and 20 feet for one-way lanes in parking lots with 90° parking stalls. The green spaces do not effectively capture stormwater runoff and the trees do not shade the parking lot.

Figure 6.58 shows the redesign. By reducing the interior driving lanes to 20-feet wide and increasing the percentage of compact spaces, green space can be increased to 22 percent. Effective use of the minimum parking space and aisle dimensions as permitted in the city’s zoning code allows the number of parking spaces to remain the same, while adding valuable green space to the parking lot.



Figure 6.56. Original Parking Lot. Source: Philadelphia Stormwater Manual




Figure 6.57. Original Design
Source: Philadelphia Stormwater Manual

255 standard parking spaces
70 compact parking spaces
325 total parking spaces
Total green space: 6.5%




Figure 6.58. Redesigned Lot
Source: Philadelphia Stormwater Manual

244 standard parking spaces
81 compact parking spaces
325 total parking spaces
Total green space: 22%

The bottom line is that smaller parking lots can sharply reduce impervious cover and provide more effective treatment of stormwater pollutants. In addition, smaller parking lots reduce both up front construction costs and long term operation and maintenance costs, as well as the size and cost of stormwater practices. Parking lot landscaping makes the lot more attractive and comfortable for customers, and promotes safety for both vehicles and pedestrians. In addition, trees and other landscaping help screen adjacent land uses, shade people and cars, reduce summertime temperatures and improve air quality and bird habitat. In many communities, parking lots are over-sized and under-designed. Local parking and landscaping codes can be modified to allow the following ESD techniques to be applied within parking lots:

- Minimize standard stall dimensions for regular spaces
- Provide compact car spaces
- Use of pervious pavement (asphalt, concrete, blocks, sand amendments)
- Incorporate efficient parking lanes
- Reduce minimum parking demand ratios for certain land uses
- Treat the parking demand ratio as a maximum limit (rather than a minimum, which can be increased arbitrarily)
- Create stormwater “islands” in traffic islands or landscaping areas to treat runoff using bioretention, filter strips or other practices
- Encourage shared parking arrangements
- Use structured parking

Parking Space Ratios

Many localities rely on parking ratio standards prepared by recognized agencies and authorities. The common practice is to set parking ratios to accommodate the highest hourly parking need during the peak season. The trend in recent years has been to increase these ratios, perhaps reflective of the general increase in land development and traffic and congestion and the concern on the part of most localities to err on the conservative side. In some cases, minimum parking requirements are actually exceeded by the developer interested in promoting business. Municipalities typically establish *minimum* parking ratios, but rarely establish *maximum* parking ratios (the maximum possible number of spaces *allowed to be built* at a project). This typically results in parking lot designs with far more spaces than are actually required, where the vast majority of parking spaces are unused most of the time. By determining average parking demand instead, a lower maximum number of parking spaces can be set to accommodate most of the demand. **Table 6.18** provides examples of conventional parking ratio requirements and compares them to average parking demand. **Figure 6.59** below shows the variation in parking space sizes across the nation.

Table 6.18. Conventional Minimum Parking Ratios

Land Use	Parking Requirement		Actual Average Parking Demand
	Typical Parking Ratio	Typical Range	
Single family homes	2 spaces per dwelling unit	1.5 – 2.5	1.11 spaces per dwelling unit
Shopping Centers	5 spaces per 1000 sq. ft. gross <i>floor</i> area (GFA)	4.0 – 6.5	3.97 per 1000 sq. ft. GFA
Convenience Store	3.3 spaces per 1000 sq. ft. GFA	2.0 – 10.0	--
Other Retail	4 spaces per 1000 sq. ft. GFA	--	--
Restaurant	1 space for 50 sq. ft. of gross <i>leasable</i> area	--	--
Industrial	1 space per 1000 sq. ft. GFA	0.5 – 2.0	1.48 per 1000 sq. ft. GFA
Professional Office	5 spaces per 1000 sq. ft. GFA	4.5 – 10.0	4.11 per 1000 sq. ft. GFA
Church	1 space per 5 seats	--	--
Golf Course	4 spaces per hole	--	--
GFA – Gross floor area of a building, not counting storage or utility spaces			

Source: Adapted from CWP (1998a) and Chesapeake Bay Stormwater Training Partnership

The first parking-related objective of ESD is to avoid inflated parking ratios. All parking requirements should be revisited, compared with neighboring municipalities, and compared with actual experience. In the ideal, a study of actual developments and their respective experiences should be undertaken. However, elaborate studies can be circumvented by quick phone calling

and other creative ways to assess the local situation. Ratios such as the typical 5 spaces per 1,000 square feet of gross leasable floor area should be downwardly adjusted as much as possible. Depending upon the specific use involved, ratios driven by peak demand such as for shopping centers may be able to be further reduced if combined with special parking overflow provisions.




Figure 6.59. Variation in Parking Space Sizes Across the U.S.

Source: Schueler (1995)

However, it is important that adjustment of ratios is done with care. Some office parks, for example, are experiencing “employment intensification” which is certainly compatible with many growth management principles being espoused nationally. As companies grow, more employees typically are hired (downsizing excepted); and ratios of employees per square foot of work area increase. Therefore, cars usually increase, along with the demand for more parking.

In light of this, communities should re-evaluate their parking demand ratios based on local surveys of actual parking lot use rates for a mix of common land uses or activities. Localities should also make it clear that their parking ratios should be interpreted as the *maximum* number of spaces that can be built at a project, unless compelling data justify that more parking spaces are actually needed (based on actual parking demand studies). Reducing parking spaces to numbers reflecting actual use can also reduce construction costs significantly. Costs per space ranged from \$1,200 to \$1,500 in 1995 (Markowitz). Reducing a commercial parking ratio from 5 spaces to 4 spaces per 1,000 square feet of gross floor area could result in savings of tens of thousands of dollars, even then. Savings would likely be much greater today.

Parking Stall and Aisle Dimensions

Parking lots are the largest component of impervious cover in most commercial and industrial zones, but conventional design practices do little to reduce the paved area in parking lots. The size of a parking lot is driven by stall geometry, lot layout and parking ratios. A parking space is composed of five impervious components, of which the stall is only one part:

- The overhang at the edge of the stall (beyond the car)
- A narrow curb (or curb stop)
- The parking stall
- The parking aisle that allows access to the stall; and
- A share of the common impervious area (e.g., fire lanes, entrances, and traffic lanes)

In terms of parking stall design standards, parking stall size can be reduced without compromising performance of the parking lot. In most parking codes, stall size itself can range from 162 to 200 square feet. A standard dimension in years past has been approximately 10-by-20 feet, borne out of the large car era. Schueler, assuming a 9.5-by-19 foot space dimension further points out that with the typical overhang zone provided plus the appropriate share of the parking aisle, this parking space impervious area increases to 400 square feet, nearly twice the area of the parking stall itself (see **Figure 6.60** below).

With the downsizing of vehicles, even full size vehicles such as SUVs, a reasonable size adjustment to the parking stall would be 9-by-18 feet, nearly a 20 percent reduction in impervious area lot-by-lot, or even 7.5-by-15 feet for compact stalls (a reduction of nearly 50 percent), which comprise 40-50 percent of all cars on the road. A fixed percentage of these compact stalls should be specified (perhaps 20 to 35 percent of the total number of stalls, depending upon use, local experience, etc.).

Another component of the lot layout is the internal geometry or traffic pattern. The traffic flow of the parking lot design can be optimized to eliminate unneeded lanes (drive aisles). For example, two-way traffic aisles require greater widths than one-way aisles (for example, from 24 to 18 feet). One-way aisles used in conjunction with angled parking stalls can significantly reduce the overall size of the parking lot. Depending upon the size and configuration of the parking lot, total impervious area of the parking lot may decrease by as much as 10 percent.

Structured Parking

Most communities do not specify the type of parking structure to be built (e.g., surface lot or parking garage). The type of parking facility constructed in a given area is a reflection of the cost of land and construction expenses. In suburban and rural areas, where land is relatively inexpensive, surface parking costs much less than a parking garage. However, in highly urban areas with higher land costs, multi-deck garages may be more economical per car space than open lots. Also, if neo-traditional TND/TOD concepts are put into practice, densities can be increased sufficiently so that structured parking can make economic sense. Structured parking decks are one method to significantly reduce the overall impervious area footprint. **Figure 6.61** below shows a parking deck used for a commercial development.

Local governments should consider providing incentives (e.g., tax credits, stormwater waivers, or density, floor area, or height bonuses) to encourage the construction of multi-level, underground, and under-the-building parking structures. In this manner, developers can reduce the land cost chargeable to parking.




Figure 6.60. Parking Stall Dimension Analysis

(Source: Schueler, 1997)



Figure 6.61. Structured Parking at an Office Park Development

Source: ARC (2001)

Shared Parking Spaces

Depending on site conditions (i.e., proximity to mass transit or a mix of land uses), it is possible to reduce the number of parking spaces needed. Parking can be shared in mixed-use areas by creatively pairing uses wherever possible, especially when the adjoining parking demands occur at different times during the day or week (see **Table 6.19**). A shared parking arrangement could include usage of the same parking lot by an office space that experiences peak parking demand during weekdays with a church that experiences parking demands during the weekends and evenings.

Table 6.19. Land Uses with Different Peak Daily Operating Times

Land Uses with Daytime Peak Hours	Land Uses with Evening Peak Hours
Banks Business Offices Professional Offices Medical/Dental Clinics Service Stores Retail Stores Manufacturer/Wholesale Grade Schools/High Schools	Bowling Alleys Hotels (without conference facilities) Theaters Restaurants Bars Night Clubs Auditoriums Meeting Halls

Source: CWP (1998a)

Mass transit (light rail, transit buses, etc.) can lower parking demand directly by reducing the number of vehicles driven and, therefore, the number of vehicles that need to be parked. Furthermore, mass transit is a key strategy for reducing traffic congestion and air pollution.

Developers often don't even attempt such sharing because of the perception that officials would simply reject the concept. Municipalities should incorporate such sharing concepts into their requirements. There are straightforward guidelines which can be used to make sharing operate reasonably. Localities should even consider providing incentives for developers to use sharing options. Sharing is another effective way to reduce parking demand and impervious surfaces.

Alternate (More Permeable) Parking Area Surface Materials

A variety of other design-linked techniques should be evaluated, including altered approaches to spillover parking where pervious pavement approaches can be used. Gravel in these rarely used zones should be considered, or perhaps some version of grid pavers (several types are now available). Even grass may be a possible option. Pervious paving materials are usually less durable than asphalt, but they are appropriate for less traveled spillover areas.

Figures 6.62 and 6.63 below are examples of porous paver used at overflow parking areas. Alternative pavers can also capture and treat runoff from other site areas. However, porous pavement surfaces generally require proper installation and more maintenance than conventional asphalt or concrete. For more specific information using these alternative surfaces, see the Specification for *Permeable Pavement* on the Virginia Stormwater BMP Clearinghouse web site at: <http://www.vwrrc.vt.edu/swc/>.

Construction costs for permeable pavement materials are generally higher than for conventional pavements. However, cost savings due to reduced curb and gutter and reduced stormwater management requirements can offset this initial cost difference. Similarly, reduced storm sewer and stormwater management facility maintenance requirements may offset the generally greater maintenance requirements associated with permeable pavement.



Figure 6.62. Grass Paver Surface Used for Parking
Source: ARC (2001)



Figure 6.63. Other Options for Permeable Surfaces in Fringe Parking Areas

Source: Cahill & Associates

Incorporation of Additional Parking Lot Stormwater Control Measures

Parking lots are significant sources of stormwater pollutants in the urban/suburban landscape, particularly in commercial areas. These large impervious areas also generate significant volumes of stormwater runoff, which typically carries the pollutants into nearby streams. *During the design stage*, parking lot layout and BMP choice are two linked and important considerations for an effective design. The most practical layout should be chosen for the lot. The BMPs used in the design should be located at the lowest point(s) of elevation of the parking lot. Whenever possible, plan to integrate bioretention areas, filter strips, and permeable paving materials into parking lots and required landscaping areas and traffic island. These practices will remove pollutants and infiltrate much of the runoff into the ground, rather than merely transferring it into local surface waters. The application of green parking techniques in various combinations can dramatically decrease times of concentration and detention times of a site. Reducing the volume of runoff discharged into receiving streams and stretching out the time during which it is discharged also helps to protect the structural and biological integrity of the receiving channels.

The two photos below (**Figure 6.64** below) show the parking lot of a public school in Portland, Oregon. The school used a better layout to increase the number of spaces available and to capture the runoff and treat and infiltrate it through vegetated infiltration beds (e.g., Virginia Stormwater Design Specification No. 10, Bioretention, or Virginia Stormwater Design Specification No. 11, Dry Swale). **Figure 6.65** below shows a grass channel receiving runoff from a parking area, and **Figure 6.66** below shows a more robust bioretention installation in a parking area median.



Figure 6.64. Glencoe Elementary School Parking Lot (Before and During Storm), Portland, Oregon
Source: Philadelphia Stormwater Manual




Figure 6.66. Bioretention in Parking Median.
Source: Center for Watershed Protection

Figure 6.65. Grass Channel Receiving Parking Lot Runoff. Source: CWP

Sustainable Sites Initiative: Applicable Benchmarks and Credits	
Benchmark	Points
3.5: Manage stormwater on the site	5 - 10
3.6: Protect and enhance on-site water resources and receiving water quality	3 - 9
4.12: Reduce urban heat island effects	3 - 5

6.5.3.4. Environmental Site Design Practice #14: Reduce Setbacks and Frontages

KEY BENEFITS	USING THIS PRACTICE
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reduces the amount of impervious cover and associated runoff and pollutants generated 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reduce building and home front and side setbacks Consider narrower frontages
This practice reflects the CWP Better Site Design Principle #12 (Setbacks and Frontages)	

Many subdivision codes have very strict requirements that govern the geometry of the lot. These include side yard setbacks, minimum lot frontages, and lot shape (see **Figure 6.67**). Although the precise requirements vary from locality to locality, most localities require structures, especially residences, to be set back specific distances from street and highway rights-of-way, which are typically somewhat landward of the edge of the street to begin with. Structures typically must be set back from lot lines on the side and rear as well, all of which effectively requires lots to be quite large. Similarly, yard requirements (front, side, and rear) often are comparably overstated. Typically, lot-by-lot street frontage requirements are excessive, making concentrated development configuration difficult or impossible. From this perspective, such setbacks must be viewed as contrary to the goals and objectives of ESD. These criteria constrain and, in some cases, prevent site planners from designing open space or cluster developments that can reduce impervious cover.




Figure 6.67. Setback Geometry of a Typical 1-Acre Lot

Source: Schueler (1995)

Setbacks and frontage distance requirements can increase impervious cover in the following ways:

- Front yard setbacks, which dictate how far houses must be from the street, can extend driveway length.
- Large side setbacks and frontage distances (usually larger as housing density increases) directly influence the road length needed to serve individual lots.

Smaller setbacks and frontage distances, which are often essential for open space designs, are typically not permitted or require a zoning variance, which may be difficult to obtain.

Setbacks and frontage widths have evolved over time and have been used in local jurisdictions to satisfy a variety of community goals. Often setback and frontage distances are used to ensure uniform appearance and equally-sized lots. Setbacks are often used for fire safety purposes (i.e., to prevent fire from spreading from forests to a house or from one house to another) and traffic concerns. Frontage distances are often set to provide for residential parking. The availability of on-street parking is largely determined by the street length serving each lot, which is set by minimum frontage distance.

Reduction in setbacks is integral to clustering and reducing imperviousness. Communities can reduce impervious cover by relaxing or reducing front and side yard setbacks and allowing for narrower frontage distances. Allowing for narrower side yard setbacks leads to narrower lot widths. With narrower lots, shorter roads are needed, which reduces overall imperviousness. Relaxing front yard setbacks leads to shorter front yards. This eliminates the need for long driveways, which are found in many conventional subdivisions. Flexible setback and frontage requirements allow developers to be creative in producing attractive and unique lots, more interesting neighborhood aesthetics, and more compact lots that provide sufficient room for personal living and recreation while still creating common open space areas. This can allow the flexibility to preserve open space on the development site.

Building and home setbacks should be shortened to reduce the amount of impervious cover from driveways and entry walks. A setback of 20 feet is more than sufficient to allow a car to park in a driveway without encroaching into the public right of way, and reduces driveway and walkway pavement by more than 30% compared with a setback of 30 feet (see **Figure 6.68** below). Reducing imperviousness also helps to reduce the urban heat island effect.

Further, reducing side yard setbacks and using narrower frontages can reduce total street length, especially important in cluster and open space designs. **Figure 6.69** below shows residential examples of reduced front and side yard setbacks and narrow frontages.

Flexible lot shapes and setback and frontage distances allow site designers to create attractive and unique lots that provide homeowners with enough space while allowing for the preservation of natural areas in a residential subdivision. **Figure 6.70** below illustrates various non-traditional lot designs. Market research and homeowner surveys have shown that, for the most part, flexible setbacks and frontage requirements can provide communities that are attractive to both homeowners and potential home buyers (ULI, 1992).






Figure 6.68. Reduced Impervious Cover by Using Smaller Setbacks
(Source: MPCA, 1989)




Figure 6.69. Examples of Reduced Frontages and Side Yard Setbacks
Source: ARC (2001)



Zipper Lots



Angled Z-Lots



Alternative Lot Widths

Figure 6.70. Non-Traditional Lot Designs
(Source: ULI, 1992)

Parking

One concern of this approach is that by reducing overall street length, reduced frontages result in less on-street parking. However, a frontage distance of fifty feet allows for on-street parking of two cars for each lot. Parking concerns can usually be addressed through site design in most residential zones.

A common parking concern relates to ownership of extra cars, boats, or large recreational vehicles. In the unlikely event that additional parking demand cannot be met through site design, communities may consider providing a common (shared) overflow parking area in the neighborhood (this is often done at apartment developments). When many homeowners are expected to own RVs or boats, expanding existing driveways using permeable pavement surfaces could provide the needed parking area.

Safety

Safety considerations include fire protection and adequate sight distances for drivers. Fire protection concerns focus on the proximity of structures to each other. When front and side setbacks are reduced, homes are closer together. This has led to the concern that fire could spread easily from one home to another. However, with the development of fire-retardant materials and the use of fire walls, the need for large setbacks has been reduced.

Adequate sight distance is an important aspect of safe road design. Site designers tend to rely on state and local government street criteria (e.g., minimum horizontal and vertical curve criteria) and rarely consider site (and lot) specific conditions when developing road layouts. According to AASHTO (1994), potential sight distance impairments can be avoided if visual obstructions (e.g., garages, front porches, etc.) are placed 1.5 feet or more from the curb. That small distance is considerably less than the 30-foot front setback required by many communities.

Sustainable Sites Initiative: Applicable Benchmarks and Credits	
Benchmark	Points
4.12: Reduce urban heat island effects	3 - 5

6.5.3.5. Environmental Site Design Practice #15: Use Fewer or Alternative Cul-de-Sacs

KEY BENEFITS	USING THIS PRACTICE
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reduces the amount of impervious cover and associated runoff and pollutants generated 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consider alternative Cul-de-Sac designs
This practice reflects the CWP Better Site Design Principle #4 (Cul-de-Sacs)	

Cul-de-sacs are local access streets with a closed circular end that allows for vehicle turnarounds. Many of these cul-de-sacs can have a radius of more than 40 feet. From a stormwater perspective, cul-de-sacs create a huge bulb of impervious cover, increasing the amount of runoff. For this reason, reducing the size of cul-de-sacs through the use of alternative turnarounds or eliminating them altogether can reduce the amount of impervious cover created at a site.

Site designers should minimize the number of residential street cul-de-sacs and incorporate landscaped areas to reduce their impervious cover. The radius of a cul-de-sac should be the minimum required to accommodate emergency and maintenance vehicles. Alternative turnarounds should also be considered. Alternative turnarounds are designs for end-of-street vehicle turnarounds that replace cul-de-sacs and reduce the amount of impervious cover created in developments. Reducing imperviousness also helps to reduce the urban heat island effect.

Numerous alternatives create less impervious cover than the traditional 40-foot cul-de-sac. These alternatives include reducing cul-de-sacs to a 30-foot radius and creating hammerheads (“tees”), and loop roads (see **Figures 6.71**). Sufficient turnaround area is a significant factor to consider in the design of cul-de-sacs. In particular, the types of vehicles entering into the cul-de-sac should be considered. Fire trucks, service vehicles and school buses are often cited as needing large turning radii. However, some fire trucks are designed for smaller turning radii. In addition, many newer large service vehicles are designed with a tri-axle (requiring a smaller turning radius) and many school buses usually do not enter individual cul-de-sacs.




Figure 6.71. Four Turn-Around Options for Residential Streets
(Source: Schueler, 1995)

Another way to reduce the imperviousness of traditional cul-de-sacs is to create a loop road, as shown in **Figure 6.72** below. Still another method is to create a pervious island or stormwater bioretention area in the middle of the cul-de-sac (**Figures 6.73 through 6.75** below).




Figure 6.72. Use of a loop road to avoid creating a cul-de-sac.

Source: Chesapeake Bay Stormwater Training Partnership



Figure 6.73. Trees and vegetation planted in the landscaped Island of a cul-de-sac (left) and a loop road (right)

Source: MPCA (2006)




Figure 6.74. Alternative cul-de-sac design. Source: Connecticut Stormwater Quality Manual




Figure 6.75. Recessed bioretention area in cul-de-sac
Source: Connecticut Stormwater Quality Manual

Of course, another solution to the cul-de-sac problem is to apply site design strategies that avoid or minimize dead-end streets and cul-de-sacs altogether. Implementing alternative turnarounds will require addressing local regulations and marketing issues. Communities may have specific design criteria for cul-de-sacs and other alternative turnarounds that need to be modified.

Sustainable Sites Initiative: Applicable Benchmarks and Credits	
Benchmark	Points
4.12: Reduce urban heat island effects	3 - 5

6.5.3.6. Environmental Site Design Practice #16: Create Parking Lot Stormwater “Islands”

KEY BENEFITS	USING THIS PRACTICE
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reduces the amount of impervious cover and associated runoff and pollutants generated • Provides an opportunity for the siting of structural control facilities • Trees in parking lots provide shading for cars and are more visually appealing 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Integrate porous areas such as landscaped islands, swales, filter strips and bioretention areas in a parking lot design

Provide stormwater treatment for parking lot runoff using bioretention areas, filter strips, and/or other practices that can be integrated into required landscaping areas and traffic islands (**Figure 6.76**). Parking lots should be designed with landscaped stormwater management “islands” which reduce the overall impervious cover of the lot as well as provide for runoff treatment and control in stormwater facilities.

When possible, expanses of parking should be broken up with landscaped islands which include shade trees and shrubs. Fewer large islands will sustain healthy trees better than more numerous very small islands. The most effective solutions in designing for tree roots in parking lots use a long planting strip at least 8 feet wide, constructed with sub-surface drainage and compaction resistant soil.



Figure 6.76. Parking Lot Stormwater Island

Structural practices such as filter strips, dry swales and bioretention areas can be incorporated into parking lot islands. Runoff is directed into these landscaped areas and is temporarily detained. It then flows through or filters down through the bed of the facility and is infiltrated into the subsurface or collected for discharge into a stream or another stormwater facility. These facilities can be attractively integrated into landscaped areas and can be maintained by commercial landscaping firms. It is important to examine runoff volumes and velocities and ensure runoff enters bioretention facilities in a distributed manner and at non-erosive velocities. It is also important to ensure that bioretention facilities have proper pre-

treatment. For detailed specifications of such practices, refer to the Virginia Stormwater BMP Clearinghouse website at: <http://www.vwrrc.vt.edu/swc/>.

Sustainable Sites Initiative: Applicable Benchmarks and Credits	
Benchmark	Points
3.5: Manage stormwater on the site	5 - 10
3.6: Protect and enhance on-site water resources and receiving water quality	3 - 9
4.12: Reduce urban heat island effects	3 - 5

6.5.4. Using Natural Features and Runoff Reduction to Manage Stormwater

An ESD strategy seeks to maximize the use of pervious areas at the site to help filter and infiltrate runoff generated from impervious areas and to spread excess runoff from these surfaces over pervious areas. Most development sites have extensive areas of grass or landscaping where runoff can be treated close to the source where it is generated. Designers should carefully look at the site for pervious areas that might be used to disconnect or distribute runoff.

Traditional stormwater drainage design tends to ignore and replace natural drainage patterns and often results in overly efficient hydraulic conveyance systems. Structural stormwater controls are costly and often can require high levels of maintenance for optimal operation. Through use of natural site features and drainage systems, careful site design can reduce the need and size of structural conveyance systems and controls.

Almost all sites contain natural features which can be used to help manage and mitigate runoff from development. Features on a development site might include natural drainage patterns, depressions, permeable soils, wetlands, floodplains, and undisturbed vegetated areas that can be used to reduce runoff, provide infiltration and stormwater filtering of pollutants and sediment, recycle nutrients, and maximize on-site storage of stormwater. Site design should seek to utilize the natural and/or nonstructural drainage system and improve the effectiveness of natural systems rather than to ignore or replace them. These natural systems typically require low or no maintenance and will continue to function many years into the future.

Soils are the foundation for successful planting, and the water holding capacity of soils can significantly reduce the volume of runoff from a site. In addition to successful plant growth, soils can be engineered to improve water holding capacity. For example, tight soils can be amended with compost to recover soil porosity lost due to the soil's natural materials, compaction as a result of past construction activities, soil disturbance, and on-going human traffic. The amendment process seeks to recover the porosity and bulk density of soils by incorporating soil (McDonald, 1999). The humus material of compost has a water holding capacity of up to 80 percent by weight. This quality is very significant when trying to decrease runoff and increase filtration.

On-site soils can be amended by incorporating compost into the soils or by laying a one to three inch "blanket" of compost on top of the soils. Fiber amendments can assist in maintaining soil structure even with heavy surface loads. The method chosen depends on site characteristics and the purpose it is intended to serve, such as promoting infiltration or reducing nutrient and sediment loading to surface waters. Some of the methods of incorporating natural features into an overall stormwater management site plan include the following practices:

- Manage stormwater outfalls to protect natural receiving waters
- Use buffers and undisturbed areas
- Use natural drainageways instead of storm sewers
- Use vegetated swales instead of curb and gutter
- Drain runoff to pervious areas
- Amend tight soils with compost




Figure 6.77. Residential Site Design Using Natural Features for Stormwater Management
(Source: Northern Shenandoah Valley Regional LID Manual, 2005)

The following pages cover each practice in more detail.

6.5.4.1. Environmental Site Design Practice #17: Use Buffers and Undisturbed Filter Areas

KEY BENEFITS	USING THIS PRACTICE
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Riparian buffers and undisturbed vegetated areas can be used to filter and infiltrate stormwater runoff Natural depressions can provide inexpensive storage and detention of stormwater flows 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Direct runoff towards buffers and undisturbed areas using a level spreader to ensure sheet flow Use natural depressions for runoff storage Disconnect these areas from the flow from impervious areas

With proper design, undisturbed natural areas, such as forested conservation areas and riparian buffers, or vegetated filter strips, can be used to receive runoff in the form of sheet flow from upslope areas of the development site. Runoff can be directed towards grass filter strips, riparian buffers and other undisturbed natural areas delineated in the initial stages of site planning to infiltrate runoff, reduce runoff velocity and remove pollutants (see Stormwater Design Specification No. 2, Sheet Flow to Vegetated Filter Strip or Conserved Open Space). Natural depressions can be used to temporarily store (detain) and infiltrate water, particularly in areas with porous (hydrologic soil group A and B) soils. Vegetated filter strips may use existing vegetation or may be planted during the course of development.

The objective in utilizing natural areas for stormwater infiltration is to intercept runoff before it has become substantially concentrated and then distribute this flow evenly (as sheet flow) to the buffer or natural area. This can typically be accomplished using a level spreader, as seen in **Figure 6.78**. A mechanism for the bypass of higher flow events should be provided to reduce erosion or damage to a buffer or undisturbed natural area.




Figure 6.78. Using a Level Spreader with a Riparian Buffer
(Adapted from NCDENR, 1998)

Redirecting stormwater runoff from impervious surfaces to filter strips could also be categorized as “hydrologic disconnection” where the objective is to minimize stormwater conveyance through wide-scale distribution close to the point of generation. In these cases, sidewalks and driveways and other impervious features are designed to drain evenly onto adjacent pervious,

presumably vegetated zones. Such zones may be lawn areas or planted groundcover, possibly even preexisting vegetation. In cases where contributing areas are relatively small in size and estimated flows are not great, provisions can be simple (e.g., roof drains discharging onto splash blocks). Carefully constructed berms can be placed around natural depressions and below undisturbed vegetated areas with porous soils to provide for additional runoff storage and/or infiltration of flows.

In the discussion here, Vegetated Filter Strips and Buffers are combined, although there are differences. One frequently cited difference is that filter strips often are created and planted, whereas buffers use existing vegetation. Another distinction is that filter strips ideally are located as close to the source of the runoff as possible, and are carefully integrated into the development landscape design (i.e., grassed filter strips often receive runoff from adjacent parking areas). In contrast, buffers are typically recommended as a technique to protect sensitive environmental features such as wetlands or stream corridors. Environmental site design includes proper buffering of these sensitive features from impact-generating uses.

Most filter strips have limited stormwater management capabilities and therefore, while still useful, are best suited for relatively low density development (i.e., flows generated by higher density development may be too intense). Also, their functions are maximized when only smaller storm events are treated (i.e., larger event flows should bypass the filter strip to prevent erosion). In many cases, filter strips are designed to treat up to the ½-inch rainfall, although both size of storm and density of development need to be taken into account. If designed properly, filter strips can be used to hold pre- to post-development runoff volumes constant. Practically speaking, this pre-to-post volume control is feasible only in relatively low density situations with the filter strip approach. Once runoff is concentrated and increases in rate and volume, the size of the required filter strip would need to be quite large – often impractically large – and provisions for managing the increased volume, such as use of berms, should be considered.

Another important aspect of quantity is peak rate control. Filter strips help to control peak rate as volume is controlled. As runoff passes through the filter strip and is infiltrated, peak rate is reduced. Although filter strips and buffers can infiltrate a certain amount of the runoff, they are often not adequate to satisfy peak rate criteria, especially when the contributing area is quite large. In these cases, they can be managed most effectively when used in conjunction with other ESD Practices and/or other stormwater control measures.

In terms of water quality, filter strips, when properly designed, are reasonably effective at reducing suspended solids and pollutants such as phosphorus that are bound to soil particles. The pollutants moving with infiltrated stormwater undergo physical, chemical, and biological removal processes. As stormwater moves through surface vegetation, resistance slows overland flow and promotes deposition of particulate pollutants (especially the larger particles). Pollutants are also removed through uptake by the vegetation itself. Plants absorb nutrients and even some metals. Over time, the sediment deposited, if not excessive, is incorporated into the soil mantle, aided by plant growth and decay. In low density applications and for small storm events, pollutant removal of non-soluble pollutants can be excellent. Specific design information and specifications on filter strips can be found on the Virginia Stormwater BMP Clearinghouse website at: <http://www.vwrrc.vt.edu/swc/>.

Sustainable Sites Initiative: Applicable Benchmarks and Credits	
Benchmark	Points
3.3: Protect and restore riparian, wetland, and shoreline buffers	3 - 8
3.5: Manage stormwater on the site	5 - 10
3.6: Protect and enhance on-site water resources and receiving water quality	3 - 9

6.5.4.2. Environmental Site Design Practice #18: Use Creative Site Grading, Berming and Terracing (Terraforming)

KEY BENEFITS	USING THIS PRACTICE
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Creative site grading can be used to temporarily slow, capture or direct runoff to areas for infiltration • Natural depressions can provide inexpensive storage and detention of stormwater flows 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reserve or define and create specific zones for infiltration • Use creative grading to direct flow there • Location should not interfere with use of the site or integrity of structures • Do not compact permeable soils
This practice reflects the CWP Better Site Design Principle #19 (Clearing and Grading)	




Figure 6.79. Components of a Berm Created for Stormwater Control

Source: Philadelphia Stormwater Manual

Many communities allow clearing and grading of an entire development site except for a few specially regulated areas such as jurisdictional wetlands, steep slopes, and floodplains. Very few communities restrict clearing and grading of buffers, open space and native vegetation during construction. As noted in the discussion of ESD Practice #1 (Preserve Undisturbed Natural Areas), sustainable design conserves as much of the site as is feasible in its natural state. Such conserved areas retain their natural hydrology and do not erode during construction. As a rule, clearing should be limited to the minimum area required for building and traffic footprints, construction access, and safety setbacks.

Terraforming is a term applied to a careful grading process designed to achieve specific objectives, such as infiltration rather than disposal of stormwater. Exact configurations resulting from this special grading may vary. For example, subtle, sometimes nearly imperceptible depressions or saucers can be integrated into the graded landscape to receive residential rooftop runoff or stormwater from the driveway or turnaround (see **Figures 6.80** below). Terraforming can be achieved at a micro-scale, replicated lot-by-lot, possibly replicating specific concepts throughout a development to facilitate both installation and ongoing maintenance (e.g., rear yard depressions, use of the driveway or elevated roadway to create subtle upslope dams, etc.).

Terraforming can be integrated effectively into larger scale site planning, such as at recreational areas or office parks, and can be independent of or integrated with BMPs such as bioretention or infiltration.



Figure 6.80. Berm Creates Small Bioretention Area.

Source: Philadelphia Stormwater Manual

A basic principle of environmental site design is to achieve an area-wide watershed build-out that minimizes total disturbance of natural vegetation and soil mantle to the extent possible. However, there are instances where the grading process can contribute to a positive solution, rather than resulting in environmental problems. Some communities have grading ordinances that prescribe maximum and minimum slopes for house lots. However, to maximize preservation of trees and other vegetation, some flexibility regarding slope criteria should be considered. For example, allowing a slightly steeper engineered slope in a limited area of the site than authorized by code may allow for preservation of more trees and native vegetation (see **Figure 6.81**).




Figure 6.81. Allowing a Grading Variance Results in More Tree Protection

Source: CWP (1998a)

Disturbance of the natural vegetation and soil, if deemed necessary, can be accomplished carefully and with imagination so that natural processes can be exploited and enhanced to the maximum, and the full range of stormwater management objectives can be achieved. This particular technique, like so many others, is best used in conjunction with other techniques. Specific concepts range in scale and application from micro site-by-site terraformed saucers to creative use of subtle earthen berms placed in zones of existing vegetation.

In all cases, the objective is to achieve comprehensive stormwater management functions, including reduction of stormwater volumes, management of peak rates of discharge, and reduction of pollutant loadings. These objectives are accomplished as the runoff is collected and infiltrated through the soil mantle and the vegetative root zone, enabling a full range of physical, chemical, and biological processes to affect the stormwater.

However, because this technique is very reliant on the process of infiltration, all the factors constraining the use of infiltration-oriented BMPs come into play. Soil characteristics are critical. Tight soils with extremely poor permeability will suffer even worse compaction if graded and regraded, so they should not be considered for terraforming. Depth to bedrock and the seasonal high water table must be considered. Of course, berming in areas with existing vegetation and a developed root zone can be expected to provide better soil permeability.

Creative terraforming may not work in all developments. To the extent that concentrated development configurations are used, any lot-by-lot approach might be difficult to implement. Even in such settings there may be opportunities to use terraforming elsewhere on the site, such as in recreational open spaces. However, for those developments that have large lots with ample space for onsite stormwater management, the feasibility of terraforming should be considered.

Basic Criteria

Basic criteria or principles must be respected. In extremely heavy clayey soils, soil compaction may prevent infiltration. As with any infiltration-driven concept, avoid zones near structures, septic system drainfields, and so forth. Setback distances should vary with topography and other factors (e.g., infiltration downslope of basements requires less separation distance than infiltration upslope of basements). Furthermore, location of any terraformed areas should be evaluated from a user perspective. Ideally, the location should not interfere with but rather should enhance use of the site, such as sports playing fields. Usually this is not difficult to accomplish.

To the extent that this micro-scale site-by-site or grouped-site approach can be implemented, the terraforming concept is quite similar to designing for onsite septic system drainfields. The objective is to define and reserve specific areas of the site to accommodate these natural functions, whether the need be wastewater effluent management or stormwater management.

Berms

Berms are landscape features located along existing contours in moderately sloping areas. They are usually designed to intercept and direct runoff or to promote stormwater detention and infiltration. Berms and shallow depressions are suitable terraforming tools for both small and large projects. In most cases, berming is most effective when used in conjunction with other environmental site design principles and practices discussed in this chapter:

- A berm and depression can act as pre-treatment (e.g., a sediment forebay) before stormwater enters a BMP such as a bioretention basin or infiltration facility.
- A berm placed downslope of such facilities can increase their detention capacity without additional excavation.
- A shallow depression can be created behind a berm to provide an small detention or infiltration area without the need for a more complex stormwater control measure.
- A berm can be placed across a slope to divert water to a nearby channel or BMP.
- A series of small berms and depressions can be placed along a slope to provide infiltration and detention while stabilizing the slope (see **Figure 6.82** below). However, as the slope increases, berms become more challenging to construct and the extent of natural area disruption increases.




Figure 6.82. Successive Berms on Slope Create Multiple Bioretention Areas.

Source: Philadelphia Stormwater Manual

Conceptually, the fundamental work of the berm is to block the passage of runoff, retain it, and allow it to infiltrate naturally into vegetated areas upslope. In the ideal, a berm would simply be an impermeable wall, the top of which would assure sheet flow from larger storms onto vegetated areas downslope. It is critical that areas upslope be able to infiltrate stormwater and that areas downslope be able to handle overflow.

Although stormwater can be piped and conveyed down to the berm itself, the best use of berms includes level-spreading of runoff well upslope, allowing for sheet flow down to the berm itself.

This approach maximizes opportunity for recharge prior to the berm and minimizes the volume or runoff that must be retained and infiltrated thereafter.

When flooding is likely to occur (i.e., within a flood plain), a system of mounds or berms can be created to reduce the velocity of flood waters, creating a more gradual flooding process. If berms are placed correctly (see **Figure 6.83**), they can divert peak flows away from structures and trap sediments before runoff carries them into the stream. **Figure 6.84** illustrates several creative ways in which earth mounds may be incorporated into playground configurations as significant play features as well as flood diversions. Of course, flood routing must be performed to assure that creation of berms or mounds in the flood plain will not result in an increase of the flood elevation at downstream sites.




Figure 6.83. Berms Controlling Flood Flows
Source: Day and Crafton (1978)




Figure 6.84. Creative Berm Configurations
Source: Day and Crafton (1978)

Berミング includes both residential and nonresidential applications, ranging from individual lots to broader site-wide installations. Berms can be incorporated with individual driveways, lot-by-lot, in order to direct and infiltrate runoff from roads and driveways. Such berm systems may intersect a vegetated swale, with the berms extending along the contours into the respective lot and providing volume control as needed.

Berミング can be carefully integrated into total site development by taking advantage of areas of existing vegetation. Larger volumes of stormwater can be directed to these natural areas, where volume control can be provided through placement of a berm. Depending upon the configuration of the development, some sort of level spreading device may be necessary to properly distribute the larger flows to the natural area. It is important to note that slope is a key determinant of whether this approach can be used. If large areas of relatively flat land with existing vegetation (ranging from dense forest to scrub growth) are available to receive stormwater runoff, then such an approach is ideal and can be accomplished with minimal difficulty. If the stormwater initially is evenly spread upslope of the area, sheet flow will be generated. Sheet flow not infiltrated from the larger storms will be detained by the berm. Once contained, this stormwater will be infiltrated, aided and abetted by the enhanced permeability of the vegetated floor of the natural area.

Berms may be designed to detain and contain storms of any size (see **Figure 6.85**). If the size of the bermed area is sufficient to detain the difference between pre-development and post-development flow for up to the 2-year storm (a reasonable recharge target), then larger storms will have to bypass the berm. In such cases, the berm itself becomes a level spreading device, and reinforcement of the berm may be necessary for structural stability. Here, the berm top and sides can be reinforced through use of “geowebbs” or “geogrids” which significantly increase stability if significant erosive forces must be withstood. Of course, reinforcement increases the cost. Reinforcement may be also necessary when flows are substantial and slopes are considerable.



Figure 6.85. Berms Form a Basin to Detain Runoff from Larger Storms

Berm Design

Berms should be designed within the context of stormwater quality, channel protection, and flood protection requirements applicable to the site and as part of the stormwater management system for the site.

- Create a conceptual stormwater management plan for the entire site, and determine what portion of the sizing requirements berms and retentive grading will help to meet. Determine the general location of these features and the role they will play on the site. The ideal berm location is on moderately rolling terrain, rather than more severe slopes, where channelization upslope of the berm is not necessary in order to achieve storage volumes and where natural vegetation remains undisturbed up to the base of the berm.
- Placement of the berm must be accomplished carefully. The objective is to avoid significant disruption of the natural area, whether in mature forest, dense scrub growth, or meadow. Berm dimensions have an important bearing on the extent of disruption created. The berm

must be stable, but at the same time it should be no taller and no longer in base area than is absolutely necessary for stability. Only the minimum volume of fill material should be used for the berm.

- Create a conceptual design for the berm(s), including height of the berm and depth of the depression. Suggested starting design values for berms are 6-24 inches for berm height and 6-12 inches for ponding depth behind the berm. If more volume is needed that can be provided behind a 24-inch high berm, additional berms should be considered. The width of the top of the berm and the thickness of the berm itself should be a function of slope and stormwater volume to be handled. This must be evaluated on a case-by-case basis in order to guarantee structural stability.
- Berm slopes should not exceed a 3:1 (H:V) ratio. If the berm is to be mowed, the slope should not exceed a 4:1 ratio in order to avoid “scalping” by the mower blade. If trees are to be planted on the berm, the slope should not exceed a ratio ranging from 5:1 to 7:1. The top of the berm should be level so as prevent concentrating (at lower spots) any overflow during larger storms.
- If the berm will be linked with a depression intended to promote infiltration, an soil infiltration test should be performed. If infiltration is feasible, determine the engineer’s best estimate of saturated vertical infiltration rate, with an appropriate factor of safety. These test results should be included with site plans provided to the local plan review authority for approval.
- Estimate the amount of runoff reaching the system during the design storm and the maximum ponding depth or elevation at the berm. The design infiltration rate may be subtracted from stage at each time step in this calculation.
- Using the infiltration area and the saturated vertical infiltration rate of the native soil, estimate how long the surface ponding will take to drain. The maximum drawdown time for the entire storage volume should not exceed 72 hours; a drawdown period of 24-48 hours is recommended, based on site conditions and owner preference. If routings indicate the stored water will not drain in the time allowed, adjust the berm height and depression depth until the time constraints are met. These routings should be included with the site plans provided to the local plan review authority for approval.
- Design an overflow or bypass mechanism for large storms, accounting for appropriate erosion protection. The contours of the site may allow water to flow around the edge of the berm, provided that erosion will not occur or sufficient protection is provided.
- To minimize cost, check the volume of cut and fill material and adjust the berm height and depression depth to more closely balance the two.
- Consider maintenance activities when choosing berm materials and shape (see **Figure 6.79** on page 108 above).

Berm Construction

Berm construction should first include channel excavation parallel to contours and then mounding of excavated material into berm formation at the lower edge of the channel (**Figure 6.86** below). Upslope of the berm itself, a broad flat cleared area is created. This approach readily provides a storage volume. If excavation volume and berm fill balances, this approach is quick and easy. However, excavation for channelization should be avoided, in order to minimize

disruption and compaction of soils in the areas upslope of the berm where infiltration is so critical.




Figure 6.86. Example of a Filter Strip with “Terraforming” Berming

The following is additional guidance on the construction of berms:

- It is very important that areas where infiltration berms will be established must be clearly marked before any site work begins, to avoid soil disturbance and compaction during construction. Also, construction runoff must be directed away from the proposed infiltration berm location. Berm excavation and construction should not be done until other site grading is complete and the drainage area has been fully stabilized.
- Existing soil surfaces of any proposed infiltration area should be manually scarified, so the in-situ soils will not be compacted. Heavy equipment must not be used in the berm area.
- Topsoil should be stripped and stockpiled carefully and saved for replacement, using a small loader. It is important that organic material be stripped down to a solid mineral base in order to make sure that the interface between the berm fill material and the parent soil is tight.
- The excavated area should be backfilled as soon as the subgrade preparation is complete to avoid accumulation of debris. Place the berm granular fill, free of organic matter. Use appropriate construction equipment so as to prevent disturbance and compaction of up-slope areas as well as down-slope areas (protection up-slope areas is most critical). The berm should be created in 8-inch lifts, tamped lightly. The berm should be graded as fill is added and compacted consistent with applicable standards for fill material. Topsoil should be replaced following berm compaction.

- The surface ponding area at the base of the berm should be protected from compaction. If compaction occurs, the soil should be scarified to a depth of at least 8 inches.
- After allowing for settlement, final grading should be completed to within 2 inches of the proposed design elevations. The crest and base of the berm should be level along the contour.
- The top and downslope side should be stabilized with a non-erosive covering (e.g., erosion control netting or matting, etc.). When the side slopes are steeper than 5:1 (H:V), then the lip of the berm should be stabilized with a light-duty geoweb-type product. Then the surface should be seeded and planted with vegetation specified in the project plans and specifications. It is critical that the plant materials are appropriate for the soil, hydrologic, light and other site conditions. Native trees, shrubs and grasses are strongly recommended, but turf grass is acceptable. Although the plants will be subject to ponding, they may also be subject to drought, especially in areas that get a lot of sunlight or are in otherwise highly impervious areas.
- Mulch should be placed to prevent erosion and protect the new vegetation, manually grading the berm to its final elevations. Ideally, the area should be watered at the end of each day for two weeks following the completion of planting.

Berm Maintenance

- Periodically remove trash, debris and invasive plants from the area.
- If turfgrass is present, mow the grass to maintain a 2-4 inch height.
- Inspect periodically for erosion, and repair and stabilize eroded areas.

Economics of Terraforming

The economic benefits associated with minimizing clearing and grading and use of terraforming are two-fold. First, designing in sync with the terrain minimizes earthwork costs, often by thousands of dollars per acre. Second, through minimizing clearing, the volume of stormwater runoff generated on the site is reduced, resulting in lower stormwater management costs. As has been mentioned elsewhere, the cost of maintaining forests and open space is minimal compared to maintaining impervious surfaces and managed turf.

Sustainable Sites Initiative: Applicable Benchmarks and Credits	
Benchmark	Points
3.5: Manage stormwater on the site	5 - 10
3.6: Protect and enhance on-site water resources and receiving water quality	3 - 9
4.8: Preserve plant communities native to the ecoregion	2 - 6
4.9: Restore plant communities native to the ecoregion	1 - 5
4.13: Reduce the risk of catastrophic wildfire	3

6.3.5.3. Environmental Site Design Practice #19: Use Natural Drainageways and Vegetated Swales Instead of Storm Sewers and Curb & Gutter

KEY BENEFITS	USING THIS PRACTICE
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Use of natural drainageways reduces the cost of constructing storm sewers or other conveyances, such as roadway curbs and gutters, and may reduce the need for land disturbance and grading • Natural drainage paths are less hydraulically efficient than man-made conveyances, resulting in longer travel times and lower peak discharges • Can be combined with buffer systems to allow for stormwater filtration and infiltration • Reduces the cost of road and storm sewer construction 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Preserve natural flow paths in the site design • Direct runoff to natural drainageways, ensuring that peak flows and velocities will not cause channel erosion • Use vegetated open channels (enhanced wet or dry swales or grass channels) in place of curb and gutter to convey and treat stormwater runoff
This practice reflects the CWP Better Site Design Principle # 5 (Vegetated Open Channels)	



Figure 6.87. Dry swale along a suburban connector street (no curb and gutter).

Source: Chesapeake Bay Stormwater Training Partnership

Where density, topography, soils and slopes permit, the natural drainageways of a site, or properly designed and constructed vegetated channels and swales, should be used to convey and treat stormwater runoff instead of constructing underground storm sewers, concrete open

channels, or roadway curb and gutter structures. Streets, in particular, contribute higher loads of pollutants to urban stormwater than any other source in residential developments (Bannerman, et al., 1993 and Steuer, et al., 1997). Research has indicated that residential streets contribute a majority of the sediment, phosphorus, copper, zinc, and fecal coliform bacteria found in urban stormwater runoff. Some examples of these pollutant sources (see **Figure 6.88**) are as follows:

- Atmospheric pollutants settle or are washed onto the street during rain events
- Pavement fragments contribute to stormwater pollution
- Vehicles contribute emissions and tire and brake system particles and residues
- Snow collected at the street edge melts and contributes salts
- Leaves and pollen from trees are blown into the street
- Curb and gutter systems channel polluted stormwater directly into streams




Figure 6.88. Street-Related Runoff Pollutant Pathways

Source: Schueler (1995)

Structural drainage systems and storm sewers are designed to be hydraulically efficient in removing stormwater from a site. However, these systems also tend to increase peak runoff discharges, flow velocities and the delivery of pollutants to downstream waters. A preferred alternative is the use of natural drainageways and vegetated swales (where slopes and soils permit) to carry stormwater flows to their natural outlets, particularly for low-density development and residential subdivisions. It is critical that natural drainageways be protected from higher post-development flows by ensuring that runoff volumes and velocities provide adequate residence times and non-erosive conditions and, as needed, by applying downstream channel protection methods (e.g., check dams and channel or outlet armor).

The conventional structural conveyance system in most cases provides no water quality management function and returns no stormwater back into the ground. Velocities and erosive forces of stormwater are actually worsened by such systems. Although vegetated swales vary in their intended objectives and design, the overall concept of a vegetated swale is to slow stormwater flows, capture some proportion of stormwater pollutants through biofiltration or bioretention, and hopefully infiltrate some portion of flow back into the ground.

Swales can act in two ways to affect stormwater flows. First, simple conveyance in a vegetated channel causes a decrease in the velocity of the flow. As the water passes over and through the vegetation, it encounters resistance. This resistance translates into increased times of concentration (slowing the flow) within the watershed, more temporary storage of stormwater on-site during the storm, and reduced peak discharge rates. The result can be a reduction in habitat destruction and streambank erosion that often is caused by peak flows of small storms, which comprise a majority of the rainfall events. Some of the flow will also infiltrate, depending on the design of the swale and the residence time.

Secondly, water quality can be affected by passage through vegetation. All the physical, chemical, and biological processes previously described can significantly reduce the pollutant loadings in stormwater. For example, total suspended solids are often reduced by settling, as a result of decreased flow velocity. Vegetation can also directly absorb nutrients and utilize them in growth.

Vegetated channels can be designed to meet a broad array of stormwater management objectives and to accommodate a variety of site specific situations. They are commonly used in single family residential areas with low to moderate impervious cover in place of curb and gutter systems as part of a drainage easement. They are also often used along roadsides, in the medians of highways, or in recessed areas of parking lots.

Where density, topography, soils, slope, and safety issues permit, vegetated open channels can be used in the street right-of-way to convey and treat stormwater runoff from roadways. Curb and gutter and storm drain systems allow for the quick transport of stormwater, which results in increased peak flow and flood volumes and reduced runoff infiltration. Curb and gutter systems also do not provide treatment of stormwater that is often polluted from vehicle emissions, pet waste, lawn runoff and litter.




Figure 6.89. Example of a Subdivision Using Natural Drainageways to Treat and Convey Stormwater
Source: ARC (2001)

Open vegetated channels along a roadway (see **Figures 6.90** through **6.92** below) remove pollutants by allowing infiltration and filtering to occur, unlike curb and gutter systems which move water with virtually no treatment. Engineering techniques have advanced the roadside ditches of the past, which suffered from erosion, standing water and break up of the road edge. Grass channels and enhanced dry swales are two such alternatives and with proper installation under the right site conditions, they are excellent methods for treating stormwater on-site. In addition, open vegetated channels can be less expensive to install than curb and gutter systems. Further design information and specifications for grass channels and enhanced swales can be found on the Virginia Stormwater BMP Clearinghouse website at: <http://www.vwrrc.vt.edu/swc/>



Figure 6.90. Using Vegetated Swales Instead of Curb and Gutter

Source: ARC (2001)



Figure 6.91. Grass Channel in Median.

Source: Center for Watershed Protection



Figure 6.92. Subdivision Street Swale Drain.

Source: Center for Watershed Protection

Sustainable Sites Initiative: Applicable Benchmarks and Credits	
Benchmark	Points
3.5: Manage stormwater on the site	5 - 10
3.6: Protect and enhance on-site water resources and receiving water quality	3 - 9

6.5.4.4. Environmental Site Design Practice #20: Drain Runoff to Pervious Areas

KEY BENEFITS	USING THIS PRACTICE
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Harvesting rooftop runoff keeps the water on-site for reuse and reduces domestic water and sewer costs • Sending runoff to pervious vegetated areas increases overland flow time and reduces peak flows • Vegetated areas can often filter and infiltrate stormwater runoff 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Minimize directly connected impervious areas and drain runoff as sheet flow to cisterns or pervious vegetated areas
This practice reflects the CWP Better Site Design Principle # 16 (Rooftop Runoff)	

Where possible, direct runoff from impervious areas (e.g., rooftops, roadways and parking lots) to cisterns for on-site reuse or to pervious areas such as yards, open channels or vegetated areas to provide for water quality treatment and infiltration. Avoid routing runoff directly to the roadway or structural stormwater conveyance system. Sending runoff over a pervious surface before it reaches an impervious surface can decrease the annual runoff volume from residential development sites by as much as 50 percent (Pitt, 1987). This grading and design technique can significantly reduce the annual pollutant load as well.

Stormwater quantity and quality benefits can be achieved by routing the runoff from impervious areas to pervious areas such as lawns, landscaping, filter strips and vegetated channels. Much like the use of undisturbed buffers and natural areas (Environmental Site Design Practice #17), revegetated areas such as lawns, engineered filter strips and vegetated channels can act as biofilters for stormwater runoff and provide for infiltration in porous soils (hydrologic group A and B). In this way, the runoff is “disconnected” from a hydraulically efficient structural conveyance such as a curb and gutter or storm drain system. Some of the methods for disconnecting impervious areas include:

- Designing roof drains to flow to infiltration trenches or vegetated areas
- Directing flow from paved areas such as driveways to stabilized vegetated areas (see **Figure 6.93** below)
- Breaking up flow directions from large paved surfaces
- Carefully locating impervious areas and grading landscaped areas to achieve sheet flow runoff to the vegetated pervious areas

For maximum benefit, runoff from impervious areas to vegetated areas must occur as sheet flow and vegetation must be stabilized. Specific design information and specifications for rainwater harvesting, sheet flow to vegetated filter strips and open space, and grass channels, dry swales, bioretention, and infiltration can be found on the Virginia Stormwater BMP Clearinghouse website at: <http://www.vwrrc.vt.edu/swc/>.




Figure 6.93. Using Vegetated Swales Instead of Curb and Gutter
Source: NC DENR (1998)

Sustainable Sites Initiative: Applicable Benchmarks and Credits	
Benchmark	Points
3.5: Manage stormwater on the site	5 - 10
3.6: Protect and enhance on-site water resources and receiving water quality	3 - 9

6.5.4.5. Environmental Site Design Practice #21: Infiltrate Site Runoff or Capture It for Reuse

KEY BENEFITS	USING THIS PRACTICE
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Helps to preserve the natural hydrology of a site Helps to recharge groundwater and thus maintain the baseflow of local streams Removes pollutants that would otherwise be exported from the site Lower runoff volumes leaving the site protects receiving waters from degradation Capturing and/or reducing runoff volume on-site can reduce the amount and cost of drainage infrastructure for the site Reusing captured runoff on-site (e.g., irrigating landscaping) can reduce owner costs for potable water 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Direct rooftop runoff to pervious areas such as yards, open channels, vegetated areas or infiltration practices or capture it in rain tanks or cisterns for reuse May be used for roadway or parking impervious areas if adequate pre-treatment is provided Use permeable pavement only in low traffic areas or for pedestrian walkways/plazas

Direct runoff from rooftop areas to pervious areas or use “vegetated roof” strategies to reduce rooftop runoff volumes and rates. Use infiltration trenches, basins, or leaching chambers to provide groundwater recharge, mimic existing hydrologic conditions, and reduce runoff and pollutant export. Permeable paving surfaces may also be used where site conditions are appropriate.

Capturing rainwater and rooftop runoff on-site provides an opportunity to not only reduce runoff volume discharging from the site, but also to use the water on-site, reducing the amount of potable water required for routine use. For example, roof downspouts discharging to rain tanks (Figure 6.94) can store water to be used for irrigating landscaped borders, washing vehicles, etc. Sophisticated capture systems can even be connected to the building’s plumbing for use in flushing toilets, bathing, etc. While not as adaptable to older buildings, such systems incorporated into new construction can achieve payback in just a few years. Vegetated roofs (Figure 6.95) actually store the water in the vegetation’s growing media, providing moisture to the plant materials that would otherwise need to be provided from potable sources.



Figure 6.94. Rain Barrel



Figure 6.95. Vegetated Roof

Surface disconnection spreads runoff from small parking lots, courtyards, driveways and sidewalks into adjacent pervious areas at the site where it is filtered and infiltrated into the soil. Most development sites have extensive areas of grass or landscaping where runoff can be treated close to the source where it is generated. In some cases, minor grading of the site may be needed to promote overland flow and vegetative filtering. Using infiltration trenches (Figure 6.96) and basins to filter runoff back into the ground helps to reduce the amount of stormwater runoff volume and associated pollutants that would otherwise be discharged from the development site. Rooftop runoff may be discharged directly to dry wells or infiltration chambers (Figure 6.97) or into perforated pipes spreading underground to provide moisture for a lawn (Figure 6.98).



Figure 6.96. Infiltration Trench



Figure 6.97. Dry Well




Figure 6.98. Downspout Connected to Infiltration Trenches Spread Out to Provide Underground Moisture to Lawn. Source: Baltimore SWM Manual

Porous paving materials should be used only in low traffic areas or for pedestrian walkways, plazas, and outdoor playing surfaces (e.g., basketball and tennis courts) (**Figures 6.99 and 6.100**)

In order to employ infiltration practices, the site must have soils with moderate to high infiltration capacities and must have adequate depth to groundwater and underlying geology. Poor soils will inhibit or even preclude aggressive infiltration. However, site soils can be amended with compost and other appropriate materials to improve the infiltration capacity. Care must be taken to avoid infiltrating runoff from stormwater hotspots unless adequate pre-treatment is provided. Infiltration on sites developed in karst areas should be limited to micro- and small-scale infiltration practices. Large-scale infiltration practices will likely increase the risk of sinkhole formation.



Figure 6.99. Porous Asphalt Bike Path



Figure 6.100. Porous Asphalt Playing Court

For more specific information about using rainwater harvesting, vegetated roofs, infiltration devices, soil amendments, or permeable paving surfaces see the Specifications for these practices on the Virginia Stormwater BMP Clearinghouse web site at: <http://www.vwrrc.vt.edu/swc/>.

Traditionally, landscaping and stormwater management have been treated separately in site planning. In recent years, engineers and landscape architects have discovered that integrating stormwater into landscaping features can improve the function and quality of both. The basic concept is to adjust the planting area to accept stormwater runoff from adjacent impervious areas and utilize plant species adapted to the modified runoff regime (**Table 6.20**). Excellent guidance on how to match plant species to stormwater conditions can be found in Cappiella et al. (2005).

Table 6.20. Environmental Factors to Consider When Integrating Stormwater and Landscaping

Factor	Problem Addressed
Duration and depth of inundation	Invasive plants
Frequency of inundation	Pollutants and toxins
Available moisture during dry weather	Soil compaction
Sediment loading	Susceptibility to erosion
Salt exposure	Browsers (deer and beavers)
Nutrient loading	Slope

Source: Adapted from Shaw and Schmidt (2003)

A landscaping area may provide full or partial stormwater treatment, depending on site conditions. An excellent example of the use of landscaping for full stormwater treatment is bioretention. Even small areas of impervious cover should be directed into landscaping areas since stormwater or melt water help to reduce irrigation needs.

Sustainable Sites Initiative: Applicable Benchmarks and Credits	
Benchmark	Points
3.1: Reduce potable water use for landscape irrigation by 50 percent from the established baseline	0 (Prerequisite)
3.2: Reduce potable water use for landscape irrigation by 75 percent from the established baseline	2 - 5
3.5: Manage stormwater on the site	5 - 10
3.6: Protect and enhance on-site water resources and receiving water quality	3 - 9

6.5.4.6. Environmental Site Design Practice #22: Restore or Daylight Streams at Redevelopment Projects

KEY BENEFITS	USING THIS PRACTICE
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Restores historic drainage patterns and habitats Provides better runoff attenuation Helps reduce pollutant loads 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Daylighting should be considered whenever a culvert replacement is scheduled Stream restoration should also be considered for degraded open streams Consider runoff pre-treatment and erosion potential of the restored stream

Urban streams are arguably the most extensively degraded and disturbed aquatic systems in North America. Research over the last three decades has revealed that urban development has a profound impact on the hydrology, morphology, water quality and biodiversity of urban streams (Schueler, 1995). The quality of an urban stream depends on the interaction of many different physical and biological processes, each of which is strongly influenced by the degree of impervious cover present in its contributing watershed.

Urban stream degradation is a classic example of the difficulty in addressing long-term environmental change at the local level. Development is a gradual process that spans decades and occurs over a wide region of the landscape. However, it is composed of hundreds of individual development projects completed over a much shorter time-span, which transform just a few acres at a time. Consequently, the true scope of stream degradation may not be fully manifested at the watershed scale for many years.

When viewed from the air, headwater streams dominate the landscape (**Figure 6.101**). Their scale, proximity, and vulnerability to changes in land use make them an excellent choice for local water resources management.




Figure 6.101. Headwater Streams in the Urban Landscape: Montgomery County, Maryland. Source: Schueler (1995)

The commitment to restore a degraded stream on a development or redevelopment site can result in improvements throughout the watershed, especially if done as part of a coordinated local stream system or watershed improvement plan. A restored stream channel connected integrally with its floodplain can be an important part of a design strategy that incorporates the natural drainage system into a sustainable stormwater management system for the site. **Figures 6.102** and **6.103** show before- and after-photos of two different stream restoration projects. These are examples of the kinds of outcomes that can be expected when natural stream channel design concepts are applied.



Figure 6.102. Waukegan Brook Restoration, Washington Park, Michigan

Source: Stormwater Magazine (July-August, 2009)




Figure 6.103. Juday Creek, University of Notre Dame Golf Course, South Indiana. Source: Stormwater Magazine, (July-August, 2009)

Where feasible and practical, daylight streams that have been paved or piped to reconnect the streams to the floodplain, restore natural habitats, better attenuate runoff, and help reduce pollutant loads. Daylighting confined streams restores the historic drainage pattern by removing the closed drainage system and constructing a stabilized, vegetated stream. Restored streams also provide educational and recreational opportunities and can help to revitalize neighborhoods. In many ways, paved or piped streams are a metaphor for the way we have “buried” our connection with nature. Daylighting these streams restores not only natural ecological processes, but it can restore a sense of place and the natural importance of water even in the most urban settings (Jessica Hall, Landscape Designer and stream advocate). Prior to taking this step, flooding potential must be carefully evaluated, as well as the potential impact on utilities and the risks associated with contaminated sites.

The following series of photos (**Figures 6.104 through 6.110**) display a stream daylighting project at the Dell, on the grounds of the University of Virginia (UVA).




Figure 6.104. Location Map: University of Virginia Stream Daylighting Project (The Dell)

Source: Nelson Byrd Woltz Landscape Architects



Figure 6.105. The UVA Dell Project Site Before Restoration

Source: Nelson Byrd Woltz Landscape Architects



Figure 6.106. The UVA Dell Project Site. Location of the Piped Stream, Connecting Pipes, and the Daylighted Stream Configuration. Source: Nelson Byrd Woltz Landscape Architects



Figure 6.107. UVA Dell Project Site. Location of Rain Gardens and the 1-Year Flood Zone. Source: Nelson Byrd Woltz Landscape Architects



Figure 6.108. UVA Dell Project Site. Location of Rain Gardens and the Maximum Flood Zone.
Source: Nelson Byrd Woltz Landscape Architects



Figure 6.109. UVA Dell Project Site. View of the Stream from Upstream of the Tennis Courts.
Source: Nelson Byrd Woltz Landscape Architects




Figure 6.110. UVA Dell Project Site. Daylighted Stream Leading to Pond (lower center).

Source: Nelson Byrd Woltz Landscape Architects

For more in-depth guidance on stream restoration, including procedures to assess existing conditions, refer to the following resources:

- *The Virginia Stream Restoration & Stabilization Best Management Practices Guide*, at: <http://www.deq.virginia.gov/Programs/Water/StormwaterManagement/Publications.aspx>
- *Stream Restoration: A Natural Channel Design Handbook*, at: http://www.bae.ncsu.edu/programs/extension/wqg/srp/sr_guidebook.pdf
- *Stream Restoration Design Handbook (2007)*I, by the USDA-NRCS
- *Restoring Streams in Cities: A Guide for Planners, Policy Makers, and Citizens (1998)*, by A. L. Riley and Luna Leopold

Sustainable Sites Initiative: Applicable Benchmarks and Credits	
Benchmark	Points
3.4: Rehabilitate lost streams, wetlands, and shorelines	2 - 5