



City of Venice
401 West Venice Ave., Venice, FL 34285
941-486-2626

DEVELOPMENT SERVICES - PLANNING & ZONING
PRELIMINARY PLAT AMENDMENT APPLICATION

A162

PZ-18-98

PRELIMINARY PLAT AMEND. 04 - 03 PP.1

Project Name: Willow Chase Community Landscape Amendment

Parcel Identification No.: 0376021471 (Common Areas) - Refer to attached exhibit A

Address: Nokomis, FL 34275

Parcel Size: 1,428,142 SF (32.78 ac.)

FLUM designation: Low Density Residential

Zoning Map designation: Residential, Single Family (RSF-4)

Property Owner's Name: Willow Chase Community Association, Inc.

Telephone: 941-412-9018 (Dawn Sweet, HOA President)

Fax: N/A

E-mail: dmswillowchase@gmail.com (Dawn Sweet)

Mailing Address: 2477 Stickney Point Rd Ste 118A, Sarasota, FL 34231

Project Manager: Edward Dean (Kimley-Horn)

Telephone: 941-379-7610

Mobile / Fax: 937-417-3861 (Mobile)

E-mail: ed.dean@kimley-horn.com

Mailing Address: 1777 Main Street, Suite 200, Sarasota, FL 34236

Project Engineer : N/A

Telephone: N/A

Mobile / Fax: N/A

E-mail: N/A

Mailing Address: N/A

Project Architect: Edward Dean (Kimley-Horn) - Landscape Architect

Telephone: 941-379-7610

Mobile / Fax: 937-417-3861 (Mobile)

E-mail: ed.dean@kimley-horn.com

Mailing Address: 1777 Main Street, Suite 200, Sarasota, FL 34236

Incomplete applications cannot be processed - See reverse side for checklist

Revised 12/10

Applicant Signature / Date:

 5.10.18

RECEIVED

MAY 22 2018

PLANNING & ZONING

APPLICATION CHECKLIST

Required documentation (provide one copy of the following, unless otherwise noted):

- ☐ Signed, Sealed and Dated Survey of Property, including legal description
- ☒ Agent Authorization Letter

Note: As this application is for a minor revision which only proposes revising the landscape plan, a survey has not been included as part of this submittal. Agent Authorization letters have been provided for all applicants of this project including 51 residential property owners of Willow Chase. Refer to the attached exhibit A for a complete list of property owners.

Fees

Application filing fee \$3,055 (major revision).

Application filing fee \$162 (minor revision).

Public notice fee in excess of \$50 will be billed to applicant and is not included in application fee.

RECEIVED

MAY 22 2018

PLANNING & ZONING

Exhibit A

Residential Lot Owners Affected by Residential Trees Shown on Current Approved Landscape Plan

Note: In addition to the parcel indicated on the application, the following parcels highlighted in yellow are also included as part of this amendment. Agent Authorization Letters for these property owners's as well as the HOA are attached.

	Indicates presence of tree shown on lot in original plan and inclusion in Application to Amend Preliminary Plat
	Indicates presence of tree shown on lot in original plan and exclusion from Application to Amend Preliminary Plat
	Indicates no presence of tree shown on lot in original plan and no modification to the subject property.

Address	Parcel ID	Lot No.	Proposed Trees (Per Approved Plan)					Approval Required to Amend Plan	Agent Authorization Letter Obtained
			Crape Myrtle	Live Oak	Magnolia	Black Olive	Total		
1021 Ancora Boulevard	N/A	140	-	-	-	-	-	N/A	N/A
1025 Ancora Boulevard	N/A	139	-	-	-	-	-	N/A	N/A
✓ 1029 Ancora Boulevard	0376021380	138	0	0	2	1	3	Required	Yes
1033 Ancora Boulevard	N/A	137	-	-	-	-	-	N/A	N/A
1037 Ancora Boulevard	N/A	136	-	-	-	-	-	N/A	N/A
1038 Ancora Boulevard	N/A	1	-	-	-	-	-	N/A	N/A
1041 Ancora Boulevard	N/A	135	-	-	-	-	-	N/A	N/A
1042 Ancora Boulevard	N/A	2	-	-	-	-	-	N/A	N/A
✓ 1045 Ancora Boulevard	0376021340	134	0	0	1	2	3	Required	Yes
✓ 1046 Ancora Boulevard	0376020030	3	0	0	2	3	5	Required	Yes
✓ 1049 Ancora Boulevard	0376021330	133	0	0	2	1	3	Required	Yes
1050 Ancora Boulevard	N/A	4	-	-	-	-	-	N/A	N/A
1053 Ancora Boulevard	N/A	132	-	-	-	-	-	N/A	N/A
1054 Ancora Boulevard	N/A	5	-	-	-	-	-	N/A	N/A
✓ 1058 Ancora Boulevard	0376020060	6	0	0	1	2	3	Required	Yes
1059 Ancora Boulevard	N/A	131	-	-	-	-	-	N/A	N/A
1062 Ancora Boulevard	N/A	7	-	-	-	-	-	N/A	N/A
✓ 1065 Ancora Boulevard	0376021300	130	0	0	1	3	4	Required	Yes
✓ 1066 Ancora Boulevard	0376020080	8	0	0	2	1	3	Required	Yes
1070 Ancora Boulevard	N/A	9	-	-	-	-	-	N/A	N/A
1071 Ancora Boulevard	N/A	129	-	-	-	-	-	N/A	N/A
1074 Ancora Boulevard	N/A	10	-	-	-	-	-	N/A	N/A
1077 Ancora Boulevard	N/A	128	-	-	-	-	-	N/A	N/A
1078 Ancora Boulevard	N/A	11	-	-	-	-	-	N/A	N/A
1082 Ancora Boulevard	N/A	12	-	-	-	-	-	N/A	N/A
1083 Ancora Boulevard	N/A	127	-	-	-	-	-	N/A	N/A
1086 Ancora Boulevard	N/A	13	-	-	-	-	-	N/A	N/A
1089 Ancora Boulevard	N/A	126	-	-	-	-	-	N/A	N/A
1090 Ancora Boulevard	N/A	14	-	-	-	-	-	N/A	N/A
1093 Ancora Boulevard	N/A	125	-	-	-	-	-	N/A	N/A
1094 Ancora Boulevard	N/A	15	-	-	-	-	-	N/A	N/A
1097 Ancora Boulevard	N/A	124	-	-	-	-	-	N/A	N/A
1098 Ancora Boulevard	N/A	16	-	-	-	-	-	N/A	N/A
✓ 1338 Calais Circle	0376021010	101	0	1	0	0	1	Required	Yes
✓ 1342 Calais Circle	0376021020	102	0	0	1	2	3	Required	Yes
✓ 1346 Calais Circle	0376021030	103	0	1	2	1	4	Required	Yes
1102 Cielo Court	N/A	42	-	-	-	-	-	N/A	N/A
✓ 1106 Cielo Court	0376020430	43	0	0	1	2	3	Required	Yes
✓ 1107 Cielo Court	0376020410	41	0	0	2	2	4	Required	Yes
1110 Cielo Court	N/A	44	-	-	-	-	-	N/A	N/A
✓ 1113 Cielo Court	0376020400	40	0	0	2	2	4	Required	Yes
1114 Cielo Court	N/A	45	-	-	-	-	-	N/A	N/A
✓ 1118 Cielo Court	0376020460	46	0	0	3	1	4	Required	Yes
✓ 1121 Cielo Court	0376020390	39	0	0	2	2	4	Required	Yes

Address	Parcel ID	Lot No.	Proposed Trees (Per Approved Plan)					Approval Required to Amend Plan	Agent Authorization Letter Obtained
			Crape Myrtle	Live Oak	Magnolia	Black Olive	Total		
✓ 1122 Cielo Court	0376020470	47	0	0	1	3	4	Required	Yes
✓ 1126 Cielo Court	0376020480	48	0	0	2	1	3	Required	Yes
✓ 1129 Cielo Court	0376020380	38	0	0	1	2	3	Required	Yes
✓ 1130 Cielo Court	0376020490	49	0	0	1	2	3	Required	Yes
✓ 1133 Cielo Court	0376020370	37	0	0	2	1	3	Required	Yes
✓ 1134 Cielo Court	0376020500	50	0	0	2	1	3	Required	Yes
1137 Cielo Court	N/A	36	-	-	-	-	-	N/A	N/A
✓ 1138 Cielo Court	0376020510	51	0	0	1	2	3	Required	Yes
1141 Cielo Court	N/A	35	-	-	-	-	-	N/A	N/A
✓ 1142 Cielo Court	0376020520	52	0	0	2	1	3	Required	Yes
1145 Cielo Court	N/A	34	-	-	-	-	-	N/A	N/A
1146 Cielo Court	N/A	53	-	-	-	-	-	N/A	N/A
1149 Cielo Court	N/A	33	-	-	-	-	-	N/A	N/A
1150 Cielo Court	N/A	54	-	-	-	-	-	N/A	N/A
1153 Cielo Court	N/A	32	-	-	-	-	-	N/A	N/A
1154 Cielo Court	N/A	55	-	-	-	-	-	N/A	N/A
1158 Cielo Court	N/A	56	-	-	-	-	-	N/A	N/A
1162 Cielo Court	N/A	57	-	-	-	-	-	N/A	N/A
1165 Cielo Court	N/A	31	-	-	-	-	-	N/A	N/A
✓ 1166 Cielo Court	0376020580	58	1	0	0	0	1	Required	Yes
✓ 1170 Cielo Court	0376020590	59	1	1	2	3	7	Required	Yes
✓ 1174 Cielo Court	0376020600	60	1	1	3	2	7	Required	Yes
✓ 1178 Cielo Court	0376020610	61	1	0	0	0	1	Required	Yes
1179 Cielo Court	N/A	30	-	-	-	-	-	N/A	N/A
1182 Cielo Court	N/A	62	-	-	-	-	-	N/A	N/A
1186 Cielo Court	N/A	63	-	-	-	-	-	N/A	N/A
1190 Cielo Court	N/A	64	-	-	-	-	-	N/A	N/A
1191 Cielo Court	N/A	29	-	-	-	-	-	N/A	N/A
✓ 1194 Cielo Court	0376020650	65	0	0	2	1	3	Required	Yes
1195 Cielo Court	N/A	28	-	-	-	-	-	N/A	N/A
✓ 1198 Cielo Court	0376020660	66	0	0	1	2	3	Required	Yes
1199 Cielo Court	N/A	27	-	-	-	-	-	N/A	N/A
✓ 1202 Cielo Court	0376020670	67	0	0	2	1	3	Required	Yes
✓ 1206 Cielo Court	0376020680	68	0	0	1	2	3	Required	Yes
1207 Cielo Court	N/A	26	-	-	-	-	-	N/A	N/A
✓ 1210 Cielo Court	0376020690	69	0	0	2	1	3	Required	Yes
1213 Cielo Court	N/A	25	-	-	-	-	-	N/A	N/A
1214 Cielo Court	N/A	70	-	-	-	-	-	N/A	N/A
✓ 1218 Cielo Court	0376020710	71	0	0	1	2	3	Required	Yes
1219 Cielo Court	N/A	24	-	-	-	-	-	N/A	N/A
1222 Cielo Court	N/A	72	-	-	-	-	-	N/A	N/A
✓ 1223 Cielo Court	0376020230	23	0	0	2	1	3	Required	Yes
1226 Cielo Court	N/A	73	-	-	-	-	-	N/A	N/A
✓ 1227 Cielo Court	0376020220	22	0	0	1	2	3	Required	Yes
✓ 1230 Cielo Court	0376020740	74	0	0	1	2	3	Required	Yes
✓ 1231 Cielo Court	0376020210	21	0	0	2	1	3	Required	Yes
1234 Cielo Court	N/A	75	-	-	-	-	-	N/A	N/A
1235 Cielo Court	N/A	20	-	-	-	-	-	N/A	N/A
1238 Cielo Court	N/A	76	-	-	-	-	-	N/A	N/A
1242 Cielo Court	N/A	77	-	-	-	-	-	N/A	N/A
1243 Cielo Court	N/A	19	-	-	-	-	-	N/A	N/A
1246 Cielo Court	N/A	78	-	-	-	-	-	N/A	N/A
1250 Cielo Court	N/A	79	-	-	-	-	-	N/A	N/A
1251 Cielo Court	N/A	18	-	-	-	-	-	N/A	N/A

RECEIVED

MAY 22 2018

Address	Parcel ID	Lot No.	Proposed Trees (Per Approved Plan)					Approval Required to Amend Plan	Agent Authorization Letter Obtained
			Crape Myrtle	Live Oak	Magnolia	Black Olive	Total		
1254 Cielo Court	N/A	80	-	-	-	-	-	N/A	N/A
1257 Cielo Court	N/A	17	-	-	-	-	-	N/A	N/A
1258 Cielo Court	N/A	81	-	-	-	-	-	N/A	N/A
1262 Cielo Court	N/A	82	-	-	-	-	-	N/A	N/A
1266 Cielo Court	N/A	83	-	-	-	-	-	N/A	N/A
✓ 1270 Cielo Court	0376020840	84	0	0	2	1	3	Required	Yes
✓ 1274 Cielo Court	0376020850	85	0	0	2	1	3	Required	Yes
1278 Cielo Court	N/A	86	-	-	-	-	-	N/A	N/A
1282 Cielo Court	N/A	87	-	-	-	-	-	N/A	N/A
1285 Cielo Court	N/A	123	-	-	-	-	-	N/A	N/A
1286 Cielo Court	N/A	88	-	-	-	-	-	N/A	N/A
1289 Cielo Court	N/A	122	-	-	-	-	-	N/A	N/A
1290 Cielo Court	N/A	89	-	-	-	-	-	N/A	N/A
1293 Cielo Court	N/A	121	-	-	-	-	-	N/A	N/A
1294 Cielo Court	N/A	90	-	-	-	-	-	N/A	N/A
1297 Cielo Court	N/A	120	-	-	-	-	-	N/A	N/A
1298 Cielo Court	N/A	91	-	-	-	-	-	N/A	N/A
1301 Cielo Court	N/A	119	-	-	-	-	-	N/A	N/A
1302 Cielo Court	N/A	92	-	-	-	-	-	N/A	N/A
1305 Cielo Court	N/A	118	-	-	-	-	-	N/A	N/A
1306 Cielo Court	N/A	93	-	-	-	-	-	N/A	N/A
1309 Cielo Court	N/A	117	-	-	-	-	-	N/A	N/A
1310 Cielo Court	N/A	94	-	-	-	-	-	N/A	N/A
✓ 1313 Cielo Court	0376021160	116	0	0	1	2	3	Required	Yes
✓ 1314 Cielo Court	0376020950	95	0	0	2	1	3	Required	Yes
1317 Cielo Court	N/A	115	-	-	-	-	-	N/A	N/A
1318 Cielo Court	N/A	96	-	-	-	-	-	N/A	N/A
✓ 1321 Cielo Court	0376021140	114	0	0	2	1	3	Required	Yes
1322 Cielo Court	N/A	97	-	-	-	-	-	N/A	N/A
1325 Cielo Court	N/A	113	-	-	-	-	-	N/A	N/A
1326 Cielo Court	N/A	98	-	-	-	-	-	N/A	N/A
1330 Cielo Court	N/A	99	-	-	-	-	-	N/A	N/A
1334 Cielo Court	N/A	100	-	-	-	-	-	N/A	N/A
✓ 1350 Cielo Court	0376021040	104	0	1	0	0	1	Required	Yes
1354 Cielo Court	N/A	105	-	-	-	-	-	N/A	N/A
1358 Cielo Court	N/A	106	-	-	-	-	-	N/A	N/A
1359 Cielo Court	0376021120	112	0	1	0	0	1	Required	No
✓ 1362 Cielo Court	0376021070	107	0	1	0	0	1	Required	Yes
✓ 1363 Cielo Court	0376021110	111	0	1	0	0	1	Required	Yes
✓ 1366 Cielo Court	0376021080	108	0	1	0	0	1	Required	Yes
✓ 1367 Cielo Court	0376021100	110	0	1	0	0	1	Required	Yes
✓ 1370 Cielo Court	0376021090	109	0	1	2	2	5	Required	Yes
✓ 1502 Reina Lane	0376021410	141	3	0	0	0	3	Required	Yes
1506 Reina Lane	N/A	142	-	-	-	-	-	N/A	N/A
1510 Reina Lane	N/A	143	-	-	-	-	-	N/A	N/A
1514 Reina Lane	N/A	144	-	-	-	-	-	N/A	N/A
1518 Reina Lane	N/A	145	-	-	-	-	-	N/A	N/A
✓ 1522 Reina Lane	0376021460	146	1	0	0	0	1	Required	Yes
✓ 1526 Reina Lane	0376021470	147	1	0	0	0	1	Required	Yes
		Total Lots						52	51

RECEIVED

MAY 22 2018

PLANNING & ZONING

Exhibit B

Approved vs. Proposed Plant Quantities

		Quantity		
Code	Common Name	2004 Approved Plan	2018 Proposed Plan	Variation
TREES				
-	Street Tree (Species May Vary)	0	110	110
QV	Live Oak	186	9	-177
BB	Black Olive 'Shady Lady'	65	0	-65
LI	Muskogee Crape Myrtle	22	1	-21
LI2	Tonto Crape Myrtle	27	27	0
MG	Southern Magnolia	65	0	-65
TD	Bald Cypress	29	28	-1
WR	Washington Palm	16	13	-3
SP	Sabal Palm	161	161	0
PD	Date Palm	27	13	-14
MC	Wax Myrtle	29	25	-4
ML	Little Gem Magnolia	39	38	-1
LJ	Ligustrum	16	16	0
Totals		682	441	-241

SHRUBS				
NER	Oleander	734	675	-59
NEO	Oleander	94	47	-47
JUN	Parson's Juniper	1,165	941	-224
MUH	Muhly Grass	1,620	15	-1,605
PLU	Blue Plumbago	391	0	-391
TRI	Dwarf Fakahatchee Grass	2,154	0	-2,154
HIB	Hibiscus	61	0	-61
LCS	Chinese Fan Palm	69	67	-2
RAP	Indian Hawthorn	426	318	-108
STR	Bird of Paradise	49	0	-49
VIB	Sweet Viburnum	10	0	-10
PER	Perennials	352	131	-221
ILE	Schilling's Dwarf Holly		0	0
SCH	Dwarf Varigated Schefflera		38	38
IXO	Ixora		8	8
POD	Yew Podocarpus		24	24
COD	Croton		0	0
ZAM	Cardboard Plant		2	2
RUS	Firecracker Plant		6	6
MYR	Simpson's Stopper		0	0
PEN	Fountain Grass		0	0
SPA	Sand Cordgrass		0	0
TRJ	Star Jasmine		0	0
TRA	Minima Jasmine		0	0
TAT	Tri Color Jasmine		0	0
CAR	Ice Plant		0	0
Totals		7,125	2,272	-4,853

NOV 09 2013

04-03PP.1

PLANNING & ZONING



November 9, 2018

City of Venice Planning and Zoning Division
Attn: Mr. Roger Clark
401 West Venice Avenue,
Venice, FL 34285

Re: Willow Chase Amendment to the Preliminary Plat – Landscape Plan

Dear Mr. Clark and Planning Staff:

Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc. on behalf of Willow Chase Community Association, Inc. and fifty-one (51) residential property owners of the Willow Chase Community are submitting this application for amendment of the Willow Chase preliminary plat. The attached application is for the modification of the landscape plan approved by City Council on September 14, 2004. The application includes three (3) sets of plans which are the following:

2004 Approved Landscape Plans (For Reference)

- *As approved by City Council on September 14, 2004 consisting of six (6) sheets: L-1, L-2, L-3, D-1, D-2, and D-3.*

2004 Approved Landscape Plans with Areas of Proposed Revision Highlighted (For Reference)

- *Approved plans with proposed revisions highlighted corresponding the primary reason for the proposed change. This may include a species, location or quantity change as well as notes and calculations as applicable. Sheets D-1 and D-2 are not being revised as part of this amendment.*

2018 Proposed Landscape Plan (Preliminary Plat Amendment)

- *The proposed landscape plans include proposed modifications to sheets L-1, L-2, L-3, and D-3. Sheets D-1 and D-2 are not being revised as part of this amendment.*

The purpose of this modification being submitted is to:

1. Allow the continuation of the replacement of street trees within the neighborhood with trees that are appropriate for the planting conditions. The existing Live Oak trees planted along the street have caused damage to sidewalks, roads, and interfere with underground utility lines. Additionally, these trees have created tripping hazards for residents. As these issues are expected to become worse as the trees mature and root systems further develop, it has become a costly maintenance expense and liability for the Willow Chase Community Association. The proposed plan removes the existing street trees and provides new street trees with less intrusive root systems that are appropriate given the planting constraints. Language has been included in the proposed plan to provide flexibility on final installation locations and species selection within a provided tree list. Refer to the revisions as highlighted in blue on the

RECEIVED
NOV 09 2018

“2004 Approved Landscape Plans with Areas of Proposed Revision Highlighted” for a depiction of proposed plan modifications relating to this purpose.

2. Correct an issue on the 2004 approved plan which depicted trees, which do not exist, on individual residential lots. This will prevent future issues for the City and residential property owners regarding code enforcement, the proposed landscape plan removes these trees from the plan on 51 of 52 affected lots within the neighborhood that had a tree depicted on their lot in the 2004 approved landscape plan. Agent authorization letters have been included for all applicants of this project including these property owners. The one outstanding property not being modified as part of this project is lot 112. This results in removing the depiction of a total of one hundred and fifty-two (152) trees being removed from the proposed plan. Refer to the revisions as highlighted in red on the “2004 Approved Landscape Plans with Areas of Proposed Revision Highlighted” for a depiction of proposed plan modifications relating to this purpose.
3. Update the plan layout of landscape in common areas to reflect what exist today and provide flexibility for future replacement of landscape material with alternate species while remaining in compliance with City of Venice LDC requirements. It is important to note that the 2004 Approved Plans contained landscape above and beyond the code requirements. Much of the plant material that was above and beyond code requirements (as depicted on the approved plan) was installed, however there is some material that was not installed such as the total quantity of Medjool Date Palms at the neighborhood entry or the full abundance of ornamental grasses along Laurel Road. Refer to the revisions as highlighted in yellow on the “2004 Approved Landscape Plans with Areas of Proposed Revision Highlighted” for a depiction of proposed plan modifications relating to this purpose.

As you will compare the 2018 Proposed Landscape Plan vs. the 2004 Approved Landscape Plans, overall quantities have reduced based on the several reasons outlined above and as depicted in the “2004 Approved Landscape Plans with Areas of Proposed Revision Highlighted” exhibit. A separate exhibit B, “Approved vs. Proposed Plant Quantities”, has been included with a comparison of specific quantities between plans.

Regarding phasing and implementation of the proposed plan, the overall intent of this project is for the Willow Chase Community to maintain compliance with code enforcement. Upon final approval of the preliminary plat amendment, the community would be immediately in compliance with the proposed plan modifications as outlined in item 2 and 3 above. The proposed plans reflect the current condition of the neighborhood with respect to items 2 and 3.

A tentative schedule has been established for the removal and replacement of street trees as outlined in item 1 as follows:

- Approval of Preliminary Plat Amendment (Date TBD)
- Procurement of Landscape Contracts and Plant Material (4 Months)
- Removal of existing street trees (To be completed during procurement of plant material)
- Replacement Tree Installation (10 Months following removal of existing trees)
- Irrigation for New Trees (1 Month)
- Total Time Frame from Approval of Preliminary Plat – 15 Months

The above schedule is subject to the timing of the proposed preliminary plat amendment approval and uncontrollable circumstances such as weather and plant availability. At the request of the city, progress reports could be provided by the applicant to keep planning staff updated on installation progress.

Kimley-Horn hosted a Public Workshop on April 4th, 2018 at Venice City Hall. A copy of the public notice, newspaper advertisement, meeting minutes and sign-in sheet have been included as part of this application. Following that meeting, Kimley-Horn and the Willow Chase Community Association worked closely to address any of the comments and concerns voiced in the April 4th workshop and subsequent communications with residents. As part of addressing these concerns, the proposed landscape plan includes modifications based on the public comments. To communicate the modifications that were made back to the residents of Willow Chase, Kimley-Horn attended a regularly scheduled Willow Chase Community Association meeting to provide residents updated information on the plan modifications prior to formally submitting the application. This meeting occurred on May 3rd, 2018. The following concerns were addressed:

- 1. The relocation of 40 street trees to the western edge of the community between the area between two 30-foot easements** *(Refer to comment 5 of the public workshop meeting minutes)*

Kimley-Horn and the Willow Chase Community Association explored alternate common areas to receive relocated trees. Multiple locations were visited and examined for available planting space. The result was the identification of 16 locations in common areas internal to the community that could receive a tree relocation. Due to limited planting areas internal to the community, the remaining 24 trees are being proposed in the Western common area adjacent to the property line. This western common area is 100' in width and contains a 30' easement to the west and 30' easement to the east, leaving 40' of available planting room.

- 2. Conditions of the western common area being proposed for relocations** *(Refer to comment 6, 7, 8, 11 12, 28 & 29 of the public workshop meeting minutes)*

There was concern over the suitability of this area to receive relocated trees. This area was previously heavily vegetated and contained a fair amount of invasive species which have been removed leaving large voids in the vegetation. There was concern raised over planting proximity to the Tuscana Isle property line wall and the existing dirt road located in the eastern 30' easement (along with utilities in this easement). The proposed location of relocated trees provides ample offsets from the noted features and does not pose a credible threat of interference with these features. The northern limits of this area adjacent to the wetland have been observed to incur flooded conditions in unseasonal heavy rainfall events. The reduction in trees in this area will allow for greater selective planting locations to avoid any low areas susceptible to flooding.

- 3. Replanting of Trees in an existing tree pit** *(Refer to comment 15 of the public workshop meeting minutes)*

During the phase of street tree removal that has already occurred, the contractor discovered that some of the original trees were planted with the wire basket from the nursery. This creates a more difficult tree removal process that doesn't allow for the use of auguring the old tree pit,

and doesn't allow for the complete removal and proper preparation for the installation of a new tree. As a result of this, there is a need to shift the location of the proposed trees which is what the proposed plan modifications account for.

4. Budget for Landscape Improvements *(Refer to comment 17, 18 & 34 of the public workshop meeting minutes)*

Due to the concerns from the public workshop, the HOA presented the landscape cost and budget for the proposed landscape modifications. While pricing for this had been developed and budgeted by the HOA prior to the initial replacement of street trees, updated figures based on pricing increases due to installation delays were presented to the community on May 3, 2018.

On October 26th, Kimley-Horn met with representatives from Sarasota County including Howard Berna, Tom Mallet, and James Dierolf to discuss compliance with Sarasota County tree requirements. It was agreed during this meeting, that the need to relocate trees was not needed so long as the project meets the required tree count. This eliminates the need to plant or replant trees in the western buffer, therefore the submitted plan contains no tree relocations as outlined in items 1 and 2 above.

Thank you for your cooperation as Kimley-Horn and the Willow Chase Community worked to revise the landscape plan and address the public feedback of this project. We look forward to working with you towards the approval of this request.

Very truly yours,

KIMLEY-HORN AND ASSOCIATES, INC.



Edward M. Dean, PLA
Project Manager

EMD(K:\SAR_URG\148859000 - Willow Chase Landscape Amendment\KHA_ADMIN\Submittals\20181109 - REV
3\20181109 - Application Cover Letter.docx)

**MINUTES OF PUBLIC WORKSHOP
WILLOW CHASE
April 4, 2018**

The Applicant was represented at the workshop by Edward Dean, PLA and Jennifer Daoulas, PLA, of Kimley-Horn and Associates. Members of the Willow Chase Owner's Association were also present including the president, Dawn Sweet.

Members of the public attending the workshop are shown in the attached sign in sheet.

The neighborhood workshop was convened at 6:00 p.m. on April 4, 2018 at Venice City Hall in Community Hall, located at 401 W. Venice Avenue in Venice, Florida. The purpose of the workshop was for the Applicant to inform the owners in Willow Chase, neighboring residents and the public, of the proposed amendment to the preliminary plat which would amend the original landscape plan and to solicit suggestions /questions. The workshop notice was published in the Sarasota Herald-Tribune; and notice was provided, by mail to adjacent property owners as identified by the City of Venice per section 86-41 of the code of ordinances.

The meeting was convened by Mr. Edward Dean, who described the neighborhood workshop structure and, then, he introduced Ms. Jennifer Daoulas.

Mr. Dean, communicated the purpose of the Public Workshop was to show the proposed plan and provide an opportunity for citizens to provide comments and questions before entering into the formal application process. He then discussed the process for this project which begins with the Public Workshop, the incorporation of comments into a finalized plan, the formal application to the city and ultimately review and approval by the city council.

Mr. Dean proceeded to discuss the original approved landscape plan and the issues currently facing the community including the requirement that this plan is to be maintained in accordance with the approved plan in perpetuity unless modified. The goals of the project were discussed and include: to allow the continued replacement of the existing Live Oak street trees, provide greater flexibility to the neighborhood for ongoing maintenance of landscape material, and remove the tree requirement currently affecting 52 individual lot owners.

Mr. Dean then continued to present the proposed landscape plan and the changes from the original plan which consist of relocating 40 Live Oaks to the western common area adjacent to the property line, re-planting 110 street trees with varied species, removing trees shown on individual lots, reflecting the existing landscape in common areas and providing increased flexibility for future plant replacement and maintenance.

Following the conclusion of the presentation portion of the workshop, Mr. Dean then opened up the room to questions. The following comments or questions were proposed by members of the public and addressed by Kimley-Horn:

RECEIVED

MAY 22 2018

PLANNING & ZONING

1. *What if we do nothing, in regards to addressing the trees? Why do we need to do something?* Answer: In its current condition, the neighborhood is non-compliant with the current approved plan. The first phase of street tree removal was already completed and to allow for the continuation of replacement, a modified landscape plan would need to be approved. If nothing were done, the city would issue a letter of non-compliance and the HOA would be responsible for becoming compliant with the approved plan.
2. *What was wrong with the original plan, if it was approved?* Answer: The selection of Live Oaks as a street tree was a poor species selection given the limited soil volume and proximity to sidewalks, curbs and utilities that have resulted in maintenance issues for the community. Additionally, the specification and placement of trees on residential lots should not have been done and provides an unnecessary requirement on the homeowner.
3. *If Kimley Horn did the original plan, why did they not put in the correct variety of trees in the first place? Why did Kimley Horn use all live oaks?* Answer: I cannot respond to that directly, as the individuals with Kimley-Horn who prepared the original plan are no longer with Kimley-Horn. As a consultant, we represent our clients and it could have been a client driven preference. I can only speak to what we know today and work to address the current issues.
4. *The Live Oak in front of my house was chopped up during the first phase. Is this what you are referring to when you talk about relocating trees?*
Answer: No, we are planning for a relocation of 40 of the existing trees. This means not every existing street tree would be relocated and the others would be removed.
5. *Why can we not put similar trees in common areas where the community could benefit from them?* Answer: The current direction is to relocate the street trees to the western common area adjacent to the property line. As we move forward with finalized the landscape plan, this comment will be further evaluated.
6. *What are you proposing to do with the buffer, in terms of existing conditions (i.e.- the wetlands, swamp, hills) because the site plan does not appear to be reflecting existing conditions?* Answer: The landscape plan does not reflect the details of the existing conditions in question, but the plan acknowledges that this common area is not a cleared, flat piece of land. The plan includes notes stating that trees in this area would need to be field located to account for those existing conditions that are not depicted on the plan and should be planted at approximately 30 feet on-center. The plan is diagrammatically showing the placement of those trees.
7. *Will the final drawing reflect where the trees will actually go, in the buffer?* Answer: No, the final plans will not reflect the exact location where the trees will be placed. The intent of the plan, is to provide flexibility that allows the final locations to be determined based on the actual site conditions at the time of installation.
8. *Will the Live Oaks survive under water, along the swamp-like buffer?* Answer: Live Oaks have a high tolerance to flooding and can survive large amounts of water, however, being,

RECEIVED
MAY 22 2018

inundated with water for multiple months would be a concern and this potential condition will need to be further examined moving forward.

9. *What if the newly proposed plan is not approved, what happens to the trees that have already been changed?* Answer: If the proposed plan is not approved, the community would be in non-compliance with the original plan and the city would be authorized to enforce compliance with the original approved plan.
10. *I agree with the one of the previous comments and I think a lot of other people do too, that we have so many common areas that could use those trees. That would be a better use of the trees if they have to be moved.* Answer: Thank you.
11. *If the roots are doing damage to the sidewalks and utilities in our neighborhood, what do you think the roots will do to the wall at Tuscana Isle and the dirt road? It's a big liability. I drove around and there are lots of places within Willow Chase that you can plant 40 trees. For example: you took out trees originally from 40 people and have not replaced any of them. I'm sure there is opportunity to go back to the people that had trees removed along with common areas. It's a tree count, I know you have to make 3:1. But before we go outside the walls, let's look inside.* Answer: Regarding potential damage to the Tuscana Isle wall, the western common area along the property line is 100 feet in width and contains two 30-foot wide easements on either side of the common area, leaving 40 feet between the two easements. The proposed plan shows trees being planted in the unrestricted 40' area which is a minimum of 30 from the wall which is not a concern for root intrusion. Regarding the concern of planting trees in this western common area vs. internal common areas, we will take that into consideration as the plan is finalized. Regarding the comment on planting the trees within the community, we will evaluate that as we move forward.
12. *The eastern utility easement contains all the utilities, powerlines, 12" watermain feeding Venetian. Are the roots not going to affect any of that?* Answer: The Contractor is required to call 811 prior to digging to flag utilities per the notation on the proposed plan. The plan also specifies minimum utility offsets consist with city standards.
13. *What percentage of the trees transplanted to the western side do you anticipate not surviving? Those that do not survive, will another tree be replacing the dead tree? – Couldn't there be a variance to be able to plant saplings, instead of transplanting existing trees?* Answer: Tree transplant survival rates are difficult to predict as their survival rate is primarily based on contractor and their relocation practice. Using an experienced contractor who utilizes best practices when transplanting trees will result in a higher transplant success rate. Transplanted trees that do not survive would need to be replaced. The replacement tree would not need to be replaced with a tree of the same size. The planting of a new smaller tree at the code required size could be done and will be evaluated as the plan is finalized.
14. *When they redo the trees, I hope they don't do them like last time. The patched grass is not level with the surrounding turf and is not settling as I was told it would. I asked at the*

RECEIVED
MAY 22 2018

PLANNING & ZONING

last landscape meeting if there is some way they can come back and level my grass. I think before we go on, someone needs to figure out how to correct mine so we don't have the same mess. I was told the roots would deteriorate over time and nothing has happened yet. Answer: Kimley-Horn is here to act a professional consultant to the HOA board on the modification of the landscape plan. We will provide that comment to the HOA board for them to address.

15. *There were two experiments done in locations new trees were not going to put. So this scientific experiment put new trees back in pits where trees were removed. So they went back in the same spot. So maybe for some of us that don't have a tree we could go back and do that same experiment?* (This was answered following question 16. Refer to question 16 response.)

16. *We had a very healthy live oak doing absolutely no damage, away from utilities and I didn't see that careful process removing it. I didn't understand why it couldn't go to a common area. It was a beautiful tree that I felt was sacrificed. I didn't think it got that consciences treatment you were talking about. Which I would hate see us spend all that money to uproot a plant as opposed to the previous comment about prosing saplings.* Answer: This will be taken into consideration as we look to finalize the landscape plan. (This answer was addressing both comment 15 and 16, as question 16 directly followed question 15)

17. *Suppose your proposal is approved, what is the cost for an approved proposed plan?* Answer: Kimley-Horn has not been asked to provide estimate cost for this project. Kimley-Horn could provide that information if needed by the HOA board.

18. *What is an average cost to transplant a tree?* Answer: Tree transplanting cost widely vary based on the size of the tree and conditions surrounding the tree.

19. *Is there a consideration in removing the street trees altogether?* Answer: At the time the original plan was approved, a street tree was required to be planted for every 50 linear feet. Based on current code requirements, the City does not have a street tree requirement. Based on Kimley-Horn's involvement, there has not been consideration to remove street trees all together and the feasibility of this would require additional consideration. This will be evaluated in conjunction with the HOA as the plan in finalized for the application.

20. *I thought you said it was your understanding there is a water main somewhere?* Answer: Yes, it is my understanding that there is water main running down the center of the easement under the access road.

21. *I guess my thought would be is that rather than having understandings about something, before we submit the plan. We should know absolutely for sure exactly what is where or we are going to be back doing this again. So, it seems we ought to know what we are getting into before we get into the plan. If your assuming something, we need to get out of assuming and get into facts?* Answer (from Peter Constant with Willow Chase): That

utility was flagged by an underground utility evaluation firm recently and we have photos of exactly where it is.

22. *Just a comment about a prior question that was asked about the city requiring oak trees or trees be planting between a curb and sidewalk. I have been on council for 8 years, and two of them just went through last week. We do not require that. That is something that comes through by the developer or landscape architect. I can tell you this, it will no longer be approved because of what is happening with us. No Oak tree is going to be allowed. I know things may have changed like you said, who knows what it was in 2004 or 05 when this was approved.* Answer: That's good to understand, because that's something moving forward that can be discussed if that's the right approach. The issue we are talking about today is not an issue specific to Willow Chase. The issue of Oak trees being planted too close to utilities and sidewalks in neighborhoods such as this is happening many other places. It's not always done in the correct way and we along with other neighborhoods are left with the results. I definitely agree that I would not recommend Live Oaks in a condition such as this.
23. *Once this proposed plan is finished, can I move trees around on my lot per my liking (I am located at lot 42)?* Answer: The proposed plan would remove the trees that are shown on specific lots allowing greater flexibility for home owners. The proposed plan would result in no binding requirements on home owners outside of any applicable county removal requirements.
24. *Why was this meeting not had before any of the trees were removed?* Answer: I cannot respond to that directly, as Kimley-Horn was brought under contract with the HOA after the first phase of tree replacement.
25. *How involved will Kimley-Horn be, once the plan is approved?* Answer: Kimley-Horn is currently under contract to see the project through the plan approval process. Once approved, Kimley-Horn would not have any involvement in the project. At the discretion of the HOA board, Kimley-Horn's services could be continued through installation.
26. *As landscape architects, would you be able to recommend good contractors to our community?* Answer: Yes, Kimley-Horn could provide recommendations for quality landscape contractors.
27. *Going back to the lots. If they accept the proposed plan, do my trees have to be in the same place as the plan or can I simply be sure to keep the same number of trees on my lot, and be fine?* Answer: In the proposed plan, there would be no requirements on your individual lots. We are taking those requirements off of your lot. In the existing plan, you would have to have your trees in the exact same locations.
28. *Were you aware of negotiations with Venetian to give them a fire easement on the existing dirt access road and if that does happen, that road would need to be checked to ensure it can support fire equipment.* Answer: Yes, but we have not gotten into the

RECEIVED

MAY 22 2018

PLANNING & ZONING

specifics of that other than understanding that we cannot plant trees in the existing easement and maintaining proper offsets.

29. *So we have to be aware that the tree roots cant disturbed that road?* Answer: Correct, we are showing the proposed trees being outside of that easement and far enough away from the road to avoid disturbance of the road.
30. *Do you see maintaining that area being an issue?* Answer: That would really be at the discretion of the community. Live Oaks don't require a lot of maintenance when planted in the correct setting after they become established.
31. *How much cost has Kimley-Horn's service's been to the HOA and did other firms submit proposals as well?* Answer: Approximately \$12,000 for services through plan approval. We are not aware of who else the HOA contacted and cannot speak to that.
32. *Is Kimley-Horn fee anticipated to be another \$12,000 once focus on Laurel Road is addressed?* Answer: No. Kimley-Horn's current contract is to update the entire landscape plan including Laurel Road as applicable.
33. *I'm assuming that at this point that all Live Oaks are planned to be removed?* Answer: That is correct, all Live Oaks street trees are to be removed or relocated according to the proposed plan.
34. *Before submitting to the planning board and city council, the board has an obligation to provide the residents the cost of the plans once complete (i.e. including- maintenance, irrigation, relocation, new material)?* Answer: Kimley-Horn will provide that comment back to the board.
35. *I thought that according to the city of Venice, we didn't have a choice to do nothing? We have to do something correct?* Answer: We have to proceed in a direction to make the community compliant with the plan either through being compliant with the original plan or modifying the plan as we are proposing.
36. *Are there tree species you could recommend for us to plant? Will there be more species than the original 30 or 40 trees?* Answer: The proposed plan specifies a list of appropriate trees that has been coordinated with both Sarasota County and the City of Venice. The plan allows for the flexibility to plant any of the trees on the tree list as shown on the plan providing more species diversity than exist today.
37. *Do we have a say as community what should be done in regards to the street tree issue? Legally, who has a say?* Answer: Legally speaking, the street trees are planted in common areas, under the control of the HOA board. The HOA board, which is elected as a representation of its residents, has the final authority over common areas. As to the trees being removed from the plan which are located on private lots, this falls under the

RECEIVED

MAY 22 2018

PLANNING & ZONING

direction of each individual homeowner. Homeowners properties impacted by the removal of a tree (erased from plan) on their lot have been asked to become a co-applicant of this application and provide an agent authorization letter.

38. *What is the code compliance complaint that has been made? Mr. Daniels referred to a complaint?* Answer (from Mr. Bob Daniel's, resident and city councilman): A complaint was filed with the city and the city manager and planning director met with former HOA manager. It was over dead landscape and landscape that was not replaced. Answer (from Mr. Dean): Kimley-Horn would need to follow up with the HOA board and the City to better understand the referenced complaint. What we are talking about is in the current state, the neighborhood is non-compliant with the approved plan.
39. *Why is it non-compliant if trees have been replaced?* Answer: The issue is that the trees have been replaced don't match the current approved plan. The existing plan states the street trees are to be Live Oaks. Because these trees are not Live Oaks, it is non complaint because it deviates from the approved plan.
40. *Can't we modify the plan to match what's been done as of today, and stop? And those of us who want to have Live Oaks uproot our sidewalks, that's on us?* Answer: That is a possibility and will be evaluated as the plan is finalized.
41. *If an oak tree is on a resident's property because it could not be planted in a common area, and the home owner did not want it on their property and it needed to be removed, would the removal be at the home owner's expense?* Answer: This would need to be further discussed with the HOA directly.
42. *I want to clarify one thing. Mr. Palmer (former board member) made a list of dead plants which the board approved and funded the replacement of those dead plants to address the non-compliance complaint to the city.* Answer: Thank you for that comment.
43. *I'm confused. Our non-compliance is one issue and this is another issue?* Answer: I think what is currently being discussed is a separate non-compliance issue in which some of the understory plantings didn't match the approved plan.
44. *Is a shady lady root system better than a live oak root system?* Answer: Based on the constraints with sidewalks, utilities, and curb; the root system of a Shady Lady Black Olive is less intrusive.
45. *By approving all this new stuff, will we be in compliance both regarding the non-compliant (understory) and street trees?* Answer: Yes, part of what we are proposing is including language for flexibility of shrub material so if a species dies out, that material can be replaced with another without being non-compliant.
46. *Let me see if I am thinking of this right. The first issue that was brought up for non-compliance was for shrubbery that was not replaced or things that were different along*

RECEIVED
MAY 22 2018
PLANNING & ZONING

Laurel Road and the entrance. But, our tree people went ahead and did the tree stuff without any regard for the plan, so then they made the plan non-compliant. Am I right in saying that? They never went to the board with the first plan? Did you go to the city?

Answer (from Willow Chase resident): The board had 12 meetings about the tree replacement program. We went to the city, your husband brought us to the city. The City approved the tree replacement plan. Three months later he went and brought us to the City and they disagreed with the tree replacement plan. Answer (Mr. Dean): Again, I can't speak to that as I was not hired until after all of that took place.

47. *Is there a magic number of trees that need to be in the Willow Chase property?* Answer:

Yes. Based upon an agreement with City and County staff, 150 trees are required. The current plan proposed 110 street trees and 40 relocated trees.

48. *Will residents be told, during Phase 2, if there will be trees removed on their lots and they are not being replaced with a new tree?* Answer: The removal of street trees from common areas in front of lots would be communication coming from the HOA to the residents. This question will be provided to the HOA.

49. *How many residents will not have trees in the 2nd phase?* Answer: Generally speaking, the overall quantity will be less than that of what we have today. There will be instances where a tree is removed and tree is not put back in its place. We have to keep in mind, our planting areas are limited due to utilities, sidewalks, curb, and old tree pits. This limits the spaces we can propose new trees.

50. *Fifty-two lots are non-compliant currently, should we not contact those owners to see if we could plant a tree on their lot and be done with the issue?* Answer: Kimley-Horn recommends removing the requirement from the plan to create greater flexibility for the homeowners. In many cases, a homeowner's lot does not support the planting of the specified tree because other improvements including trees exist in place. Kimley-Horn and the HOA have reached out to all 52 lot owners to have these owners as co-applicants on this plan amendment.

51. *What is the 150 required trees based on?* Answer: This was an agreement with the city/county and the board based on the actual quantity of street trees being proposed to be removed.

52. *It is actually the county requires that for every tree the developer takes out you gotta replace it with three. Its three to one, I know that. They have to tag all the trees they are going to take out.* Answer: What the county requires is that when you remove a tree, it triggers a 1 tree per 2000sf requirement. They require 1 tree, whether existing or proposed for every 2000sf.

53. *I do understand now why you are doing the individual lots and I think it's a good plan to protect the residents. I just want to strongly suggest that look at the 40 home sites that have already suffered tree removal. You have two that testified about the tree experiment*

RECEIVED
MAY 22 2018

that the board did that they are living. Number two, I do think we have common areas such as the bridge entrance that would go down much better with us and the city and not using the dirt road to plant any trees there. I would really encourage us to look at that. It would be more palatable with residents, the planning board, city staff and the city manager. The city manager has been out there already to look at the dirt road and would be upset with that. Answer: Thank you, we will take that into consideration as we finalize the plan. It's worth pointing out that in some of the natural locations we are restricted by the wetlands and wetland buffers.

Mr. Dean thanked everyone for attending and announced that he and the Kimley-Horn team would be available to answer individual questions. Additionally, Mr. Dean invited anyone to review the original approved and proposed plan in more detail at the front of the room.

The meeting adjourned at approximately 7:30 p.m.

RECEIVED

MAY 22 2018

PLANNING & ZONING