



# City of Venice

401 West Venice Avenue  
Venice, FL 34285  
www.venicegov.com

## Meeting Minutes Planning Commission

---

Monday, November 18, 2024

1:30 PM

Community Hall Room

---

### [24-54AM](#)

Planned Unit Development (PUD) Code Amendment Land Development Regulations Text Amendment (Legislative)

Staff: Nicole Tremblay, AICP, Senior Planner

Applicant: City of Venice

Recess was taken from 3:32 p.m. until 3:42 p.m.

Chair Snyder announced this is a legislative hearing, read the memorandum regarding advertisement and written communications, and opened the public hearing.

Planning Zoning Director Clark and Senior Planner Tremblay, both being duly sworn, presented work done by consultant, definition of unified control, complexity of issue, examples of minor amendment, examples of major amendments, applicants requirements for major amendments, terminology definitions, criteria for decisions, the time it can take for the development of a Planned Unit Development (PUD), consideration of both developer's and owner's rights, Table 1.1 changes, decision authorities, Section 1.7.3 changes, new Section C on what is consider a amendment, changes to Section D, lot coverage, net developable land, new Section E on unified control, and answered Commission questions on after 50% buildout rule, and clarification of ability to request versus given right.

Attorney Fernandez spoke on review criteria for major plan amendments, property rights, and concept of unauthorized delegation of legislative authority.

Discussion took place regarding net developable land versus open space qualification, examples of net developable land, giving petitioners the ability to ask, land use categories, and how the 60% of owner consent was determined.

Senior Planner Tremblay continued regarding definitions, and decision criteria in Section 9.

Discussion took place regarding broad language proposed, a definition of final plat, and open space designations.

Carl Carlson, 811 Waterside Drive #201, being duly sworn, spoke in favor of amendment, and the importance of open space.

Jeff Boone, PO Box 1596, being duly sworn, spoke on the importance having a process to amend a PUD, past contentious PUD amendments, concerns for unintended consequences, homeowners association requested changes, concern for consent of 60% of owners, and whether terms will make PUD undesirable.

Dan McBride, 678 Bird Bay Drive West, being duly sworn, spoke in favor of amendment, example of Bird Bay past petitions, in favor of the 60% consent rule and the net developable land definition.

Chair Snyder closed the public hearing.

Discussion took place regarding the need for amendments, popularity of PUDs, importance of open space, amendment addressing recent concerns, the importance of the Master Plan requirement, concerns for open ended language, and the complexity of the issue.

**A motion was made by Vice Chair Willson, seconded by Ms. Schierberg, that based on review of the application materials, the staff report and testimony provided during the public hearing, the Planning Commission, sitting as the local planning agency, finds this Petition consistent with the Comprehensive Plan and in compliance with Florida Statutes Chapter 163, Part II, and therefore, recommends to City Council approval of Land Development Regulations Text Amendment Petition No. 24-54AM. The motion carried by the following electronic vote:**

**Yes:** 7 - Mr. Hale, Mr. Willson, Mr. Jasper, Ms. Schierberg, Chair Snyder, Mr. McKeon and Mr. Young