

Palma Sola Bay Club

Community Landscape Strategy Input — Summary Report to the Board of Directors

July 14, 2026

Purpose and Method

Following the Board's decision to develop a new landscape strategy and dissolve the existing Landscape Committee, residents were invited to submit ideas on the key aspects of the strategy and how the community should be involved. This report summarizes the 48 comments received. Each comment was reviewed and coded against recurring themes; counts below are approximate because many comments touch several themes.

Executive Summary

Residents agree on far more than the recent conflict suggests. Nearly everyone wants more color and flowers, healthier turf, better-supervised vendors, protection of healthy mature plantings, and a written plan the community can see and the Association sticks to. The genuine divide is narrower than it appears: it concerns who should govern landscaping — a reinstated resident committee versus Board/management control with vendor execution — and, to a lesser degree, how strictly to favor native plants. A visible, well-communicated plan that delivers the shared priorities would likely satisfy the large middle of this community.

This report was produced with the help of Claude AI, Fable 5; which is the most competent model of Anthropic.

Theme Summary

Theme	Mentions (approx.)	Sentiment
More color and flowering plants (entrance, medians, building fronts)	14	Near-universal support; the single most-cited request
Committee structure: reinstate a landscape committee	14	Divided — the most contested topic (see Points of Divergence)
Vendor oversight, accountability, and pruning quality	12	Broad agreement; widespread criticism of the recent "hard cut" pruning
Maintain existing assets before new plantings; fix turf	10	Broad agreement; several call turf condition an "embarrassment"
Native / Florida-friendly plant emphasis	11	Mostly supportive (9); two prefer "resilient" or mixed palettes over strictly native
Use of qualified professionals (arborist, horticulturist, landscape architect, county extension)	9	Consistent support across both "camps"

Theme	Mentions (approx.)	Sentiment
Adopt and stick to a master plan (Building 8 cited as model)	8	Broad agreement
Governance, trust, and communication concerns	7	Critical of the dissolution process; calls for transparency
Financial transparency and budget structure	6	Itemize landscape costs; separate operating vs. capital spend
Community volunteer involvement (work groups, pop-up crews)	5	Supportive
Unfavorable comparisons to Palma Sola Trace	4	Cited as the standard to match

Points of Consensus

1. More color, especially at the entrance

The most frequent request across all viewpoints: flowering, seasonal color at the front entrance, medians, and building fronts. Several comments note this is achievable within either a native-leaning or traditional palette (bougainvillea, hibiscus, plumeria, seasonal annuals, Florida wildflowers were all suggested). Multiple residents contrast PSBC's entrance unfavorably with the community across 75th Street.

2. Care for what exists before buying new

A strong protective instinct runs through the comments: do not remove healthy, mature, hurricane-tested plants; replace only what is dead, diseased, or invasive; fill in gaps rather than start over; transplant from overcrowded areas rather than purchase new. Turf condition is the most concrete maintenance complaint — brown or dead grass at Buildings 14–16 was cited repeatedly, with irrigation, weed control, and fertilization named as likely root causes.

3. Vendor supervision and pruning standards

There is broad dissatisfaction with recent vendor work — the “hard cut” pruning was criticized from every faction, described as “lollipoping,” “hat-racking,” and haphazard hedge shaping. Residents converge on the same remedies: written care standards by species, specific contract scope language (e.g., hurricane-protection trimming vs. generic “trimming”), a named person accountable for vendor supervision, pre-work walkthroughs before any cutting, and follow-up on whether TruScape must replace plants killed by the cutback (comment 56 requests a damage survey while photos exist).

4. Qualified expertise

Both committee supporters and skeptics want professional input: an ISA-certified arborist for trees, a landscape architect or the existing paid design plan for structure, an irrigation specialist, and/or free guidance from the Manatee County extension agent. Few residents trust general landscape vendors to make horticultural decisions unsupervised.

5. A written plan, applied consistently

Residents repeatedly ask the Association to adopt one plan and stay with it across Board turnover. The professionally designed Building 8 planting is cited three times as the model to replicate. Related asks: enforce the existing Tree and Plant Policy and Plant Evaluation Worksheet, prevent unauthorized individual plantings, and pursue uniformity across buildings.

Points of Divergence

Committee governance — the central split

Fourteen comments ask for a resident committee to be reinstated, several conditioning membership on Florida horticulture knowledge and adherence to county rules, and five of those specifically ask for the former co-chairs by name. Five comments oppose or would sharply limit a committee, arguing the Board, management, and vendors should run landscaping with at most an advisory or “beautification” role holding a small plant budget. A middle position appears in several comments: a committee (or volunteer work groups) that clearly works at the direction of the Board, with defined scope and no authority over vendors or tree work.

Native plants — a softer divide

Nine comments endorse transitioning to native or Florida-friendly plants as replacements become necessary, citing lower long-term cost, storm and salt resilience, reduced watering, and wildlife benefit; two cite the prior community survey (reported by one commenter as roughly 60% support). The dissent is mild rather than opposed: prioritize proven resilience whether or not a plant is native, and keep the palette inclusive of color. Notably, almost no one advocates ripping out existing non-native plantings — the near-universal position is gradual transition at end of life.

Site-Specific Requests

Location / Item	What residents asked for
Front entrance and median	Most-cited location: seasonal color, remove succulents on entrance island, restore polish (comments 3, 13, 21, 24, 26, 28, 46)
Fence buffer, Buildings 21–23	Named a top priority for screening/beautification; dead bamboo across from 22–23 (comments 3, 21, 26)
Turf, Buildings 14–16	Brown/dead grass repeatedly flagged; requests to fix root cause, review irrigation and weed control (comments 8, 32, 33, 38)
Irrigation system	Failed drip lines and buildings receiving no sprinkler coverage; request an irrigation specialist (comments 32, 38, 49)
Building 8 landscape design	Cited three times as the professional plan to replicate elsewhere (comments 3, 35, 49)
Palm restoration	Restore the three corner palms from original plans; queen palms for buildings that never received them; low-maintenance Christmas palms (comments 2, 11, 26, 43)
Shell path / Lake Charlotte walkway	Complete border repair, address algae (comments 3, 49)
Amenity ideas	Benches around Lake Lucy, BBQ near Building 7, community raised-bed garden near Buildings 6/7 (comments 39, 40)

Additional Observations

Tone and trust

Roughly a quarter of comments express frustration with how the committee's dissolution was handled, and several reference the surrounding interpersonal conflict directly. A few are sharply critical of the Board's process for developing strategy from open submissions. At the same time, many comments — including critical ones — thank the Board for asking and explicitly call for rebuilding trust, mutual respect, and hearing “quiet voices.” Whatever structure the Board chooses, several commenters state the decisive factors will be transparency (regular landscape updates, itemized costs, stated rationale for decisions) and a visible plan.

Financial structure suggestions

Two detailed comments propose practical budget changes: itemize landscape costs (irrigation, water, mowing, sod, tree trimming, replacements, wetland mowing) rather than lumping them, and separate routine operating expense from capitalized landscape investment so long-term projects can be prioritized — starting with bringing the construction lot up to baseline before enhancements elsewhere.

Cost-saving ideas worth noting

Residents offered several low-cost ideas: an on-site nursery propagating from existing plants, transplanting from overcrowded beds to bare areas, perennials in place of mulch and annuals in low-visibility spots, dwarf and low-maintenance species selection, and planting only in the September–March window. One outlier proposed artificial turf and artificial plants community-wide; it was a single submission and runs counter to the sustainability preferences expressed elsewhere.

Considerations for the Board

The comments themselves point toward a workable sequence: publish a written landscape plan and standards (building on the paid professional design and the existing Tree and Plant Policy); fix the visible basics first — turf, irrigation, entrance color — where consensus is total; tighten vendor contracts with species-specific care standards and a named supervisor; bring in independent expertise (arborist and county extension) whose guidance is shared publicly; and decide the governance question explicitly, whether a reconstituted committee with a Board-approved charter and defined scope, structured volunteer work groups, or a paid part-time horticultural professional. Several residents across both camps indicated they can accept different governance outcomes if the process and finances are transparent. Verbatim comments are preserved in the source file for the Board's reference.