

Exhibit G



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

DEVELOPMENT SERVICES - PLANNING & ZONING
ZONING MAP AMENDMENT APPLICATION

147102
RECEIVED

JAN 17 2014

**PLANNING
& ZONING**

ZONING MAP AMENDMENT 14-1 RZ

VICA

| | | | |
|-------------------------------|--|------------------|-----|
| Project Name: | | | |
| Parcel Identification No.: | 0391-00-1000 and 0392-00-4000 | | |
| Address: | Laurel Road and Border Road | | |
| Parcel Size: | 368+/- acres | | |
| FLUM designation: | South Laurel Neighborhood | | |
| Current Zoning: | RMF-1 | Proposed Zoning: | PUD |
| Property Owner's Name: | Neal Communities of SW Fl, LLC | | |
| Telephone: | | | |
| Fax: | | | |
| E-mail: | | | |
| Mailing Address: | 5800 Lakewood Ranch Boulevard, Sarasota, Fl 34240 | | |
| Project Attorney: | Jeffery A. Boone, Esq. | | |
| Telephone: | (941) 488-6716 | | |
| Mobile / Fax: | Fax:(941) 488-7079 | | |
| E-mail: | jboone@boone-law.com | | |
| Mailing Address: | 1001 Avenida Del Circo, Venice Fl 34285 | | |
| Project Engineer : | Millard Yoder, PE, Stantec | | |
| Telephone: | (941)907-6900 | | |
| Mobile / Fax: | | | |
| E-mail: | Millard.Yoder@stantec.com | | |
| Mailing Address: | 6900 Professional Parkway, East Sarasota, Fl 34240 | | |
| Project Planner: | | | |
| Telephone: | | | |
| Mobile / Fax: | | | |
| E-mail: | | | |
| Mailing Address: | | | |

incomplete applications cannot be processed - See reverse side for checklist

Applicant Signature / Date:

17 Jan 14

APPLICATION CHECKLIST

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

- ☐ Statement of Ownership & Control
- ☐ Signed, Sealed and Dated Survey of Property
- ☐ Agent Authorization Letter
- ☐ Narrative describing the petition
- ☐ Public Workshop Requirements. Date held December 16th, 2013
 - ☐ Copy of newspaper ad.
 - ☐ Copy of notice to property owners.
 - ☐ Copy of sign-in sheet.
 - ☐ Written summary of public workshop.

When pertaining to the rezoning of land, the report and recommendations of the planning commission to the city council shall show that the planning commission has studied and considered the proposed change in relation to the following, where applicable:

- a. Whether the proposed change is in conformity to the comprehensive plan.
The subject property is located within the South Laurel Neighborhood Planning Area and the proposed change is consistent with the Planning Intent of Policy 16.7 and the Development Standards of Policy 16.18.
- b. The existing land use pattern.
The subject property is surrounded by existing or planned residential development in all directions. The proposed residential development will complement the range of housing options available in the area. Public infrastructure, including the recently completed Jacaranda Extension, is available to serve the project.
- c. Possible creation of an isolated district unrelated to adjacent and nearby districts.
The proposed PUD rezoning will allow for residential development consistent and compatible with adjacent and nearby properties.
- d. The population density pattern and possible increase or overtaxing of the load on public facilities such as schools, utilities, streets, etc.
The proposed PUD rezoning will reduce the residential density currently approved for the site and therefore diminish the possibility of overtaxing public facilities such as schools, utilities, streets, etc.
- e. Whether existing district boundaries are illogically drawn in relation to existing conditions on the property proposed for change.
Not applicable.
- f. Whether changed or changing conditions make the passage of the proposed amendment necessary.
The desire for PUD zoning which will ensure a unified plan of development for the property makes the passage of the proposed amendment necessary.
- g. Whether the proposed change will adversely influence living conditions in the neighborhood.
The proposed change will reduce the density currently approved for the property thereby reducing potential adverse impacts to living conditions in the neighborhood.
- h. Whether the proposed change will create or excessively increase traffic congestion or otherwise affect public safety.
The proposed change will reduce the currently approved density for the property and therefore will result in a reduction in potential traffic congestion.
- i. Whether the proposed change will create a drainage problem.
The proposed change will reduce the currently approved density for the property and therefore will diminish potential drainage impacts.
- j. Whether the proposed change will seriously reduce light and air to adjacent areas.
The proposed change will reduce the currently approved density for the property and will provide for in excess of 60% Open space and therefore will not reduce lot and air to the adjacent areas.

- k. Whether the proposed change will adversely affect property values in the adjacent area.
The proposed change will reduce the currently approved density for the property and will not reduce property values.
- l. Whether the proposed change will be a deterrent to the improvement or development of adjacent property in accord with existing regulations.
The proposed change will allow for the development of the property under a unified plan of development which is anticipated to stimulate improvement of adjacent property.
- m. Whether the proposed change will constitute a grant of special privilege to an individual owner as contrasted with the public welfare.
The proposed change will reduce the currently approved density for the property, is consistent with the goals and objectives of the City's Comprehensive Plan, and will not constitute a grant of special privilege.
- n. Whether there are substantial reasons why the property cannot be used in accord with existing zoning.
A PUD zoning designation, with a unified plan of development, is the preferred zoning designation for larger properties such as the subject property.
- o. Whether the change suggested is out of scale with the needs of the neighborhood or the city.
The proposed change will reduce the currently approved density for the property to a density which is in scale with the needs of the neighborhood and the City.
- p. Whether it is impossible to find other adequate sites in the city for the proposed use in districts already permitting such use.
Not applicable. The proposed change does not seek to change the uses currently approved for the property.

Fees

Application filing fee \$2,908.

Application filing fee for the following zoning districts \$4,732: CMU, PUD, CSC, PCD, PID, RMH.

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

JAN 17 2014

PLANNING
& ZONING

Policy 8.2 Land Use Compatibility Review Procedures. Ensure that the character and design of infill and new development are compatible with existing neighborhoods.

Compatibility review shall include the evaluation of:

- A. Land use density and intensity.
The proposed PUD rezoning will significantly reduce the currently permitted density.
- B. Building heights and setbacks.
The proposed PUD rezoning will reduce the building heights and increase the required perimeter setbacks.
- C. Character or type of use proposed.
The proposed PUD rezoning will not change the type of use already permitted on the property, but will significantly reduce the density permitted.
- D. Site and architectural mitigation design techniques.
The proposed PUD rezoning will reduce density, increase perimeter setbacks and increase required open space while requiring architectural designs consistent with the surrounding neighborhood.

Considerations for determining compatibility shall include, but are not limited to, the following:

- E. Protection of single-family neighborhoods from the intrusion of incompatible uses.
The proposed PUD rezoning will allow for the types of uses already existing in the area while reducing the currently approved density.
- F. Prevention of the location of commercial or industrial uses in areas where such uses are incompatible with existing uses.
Not applicable. No commercial or industrial uses are proposed.
- G. The degree to which the development phases out nonconforming uses in order to resolve incompatibilities resulting from development inconsistent with the current Comprehensive Plan.
Not applicable.
- H. Densities and intensities of proposed uses as compared to the densities and intensities of existing uses.
The proposed PUD rezoning will reduce the density already approved for the property to a level comparable to existing uses in the area.

- I. Potential incompatibility shall be mitigated through techniques including, but not limited to: Providing open space, perimeter buffers, landscaping and berms.
The proposed PUD rezoning will increase the required open space on the property while providing appropriate perimeter buffers and landscaping.
- J. Screening of sources of light, noise, mechanical equipment, refuse areas, delivery and storage areas.
Not applicable.
- K. Locating road access to minimize adverse impacts.
Road access will be primarily via Jacaranda Boulevard. Access to the project via Laurel Road and Border Road will be limited in order to minimize impacts to existing developments.
- L. Adjusting building setbacks to transition between different uses.
The perimeter setbacks within the proposed PUD will be one times the building height at a minimum.
- M. Applying step-down or tiered building heights to transition between different uses.
Not applicable.
- N. Lowering density or intensity of land uses to transition between different uses.
The proposed PUD rezoning will reduce the density currently permitted on the property.