

From: John Holic
Sent: Tuesday, July 04, 2017 7:06 PM
To: Teresa Smith <heycompgirl@gmail.com>; City Council <CityCouncil@Venicegov.com>
Subject: Re: Affordable housing proposal

Dear Ms. Smith,
On behalf of Venice City Council, thank you for your comments. You will note that the first reading vote for rezoning favored the affordable housing, and although I cannot comment further due to the quasi judicial nature of the topic, I can say it is premature to shame on council. Please don't try to kill mosquitoes with a sledged hammer. Your comments would have been far more meaningful had you researched the topic.

Sincerely,
John Holic
Mayor, City of Venice

Get [Outlook for iOS](#)

From: Teresa Smith <heycompgirl@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, July 4, 2017 6:30 PM
Subject: Affordable housing proposal
To: City Council <citycouncil@venicegov.com>

Ladies and Gentlemen

I do not live in Venice, but I saw a story on the local news about a proposed affordable housing project & the comments by one resident that it would be full of drug dealers & addicts, criminals & prostitutes.

I respectfully submit that the vast majority of people in need of affordable housing are decent, law abiding people whose only crime is that they cannot afford an expensive home. They are young families with working parents & a couple of kids, they are the disabled & elderly who want to live in quiet dignity in decent homes they can afford

To paraphrase George Bailey, Is it to much for people to expect to live in a couple of decent rooms & a bath?

Shame on him & shame on you if you lend him credence.

Thank you for your attention.

Sincerely,
Teresa B Smith
Sarasota
(941) 330-7261
teresabarnessmith@gmail.com

From: John Holic
Sent: Sunday, July 02, 2017 6:20 AM
To: Ed Martin <insidevenice@gmail.com>
Cc: City Council <CityCouncil@Venicegov.com>; David Persson <dpersson@swflgovlaw.com>
Subject: Re: Length of guarantee of housing pricing

Dear Mr. Martin,

On behalf of Venice City Council, thank you for your comments. As the Ordinance you are referring to is quasi-judicial in nature, there is very little I can comment on other than to say that the Ordinance is narrow in focus and is related only to the rezone of the property. The rest of the questions in your email are not related to the agenda item and therefore have not yet been presented.

Sincerely,
John Holic
Mayor, City of Venice

From: Ed Martin <insidevenice@gmail.com>
Sent: Saturday, July 1, 2017 4:05 PM
To: John Holic
Cc: City Council
Subject: Length of guarantee of housing pricing

Dear Mayor,

I read in the Gondolier of Council's approval on first reading, of the Knights Road housing.

The article did not mention the length of any price level guarantee. It also tends to be unclear on what guarantees tied to wages will, in fact, be. The proposers say it is not, "low income," "affordable" etc.

I would appreciate your answers to these questions, referred to Ed if you wish.

Affordable housing, (by any name, if affordable, is a plus for Venice.

Thanks,

Ed Martin

Sent from my iPad

From: mrgtrdoyle [mailto:mrgtrdoyle@aol.com]
Sent: Thursday, June 29, 2017 10:17 PM
To: City Council <CityCouncil@Venicegov.com>
Subject: Proposal of 118 homes next to Fox Lea Farm

Dear Council Members,

I'm strongly against this proposal and am a resident of Waterford.

Please consider the public's opinion against this proposal.

Thank you.

Margaret Doyle
1206 Berkshire

Sent from my Verizon, Samsung Galaxy

From: John Holic

Sent: Wednesday, June 28, 2017 5:03 AM

To: Ronni Shulman Mallozzi <ronnshul@gmail.com>

Cc: City Council <CityCouncil@Venicegov.com>; Lori Stelzer <LStelzer@Venicegov.com>; Tom Mattmuller <TMattmuller@Venicegov.com>; Mike Rose <MRose@Venicegov.com>; David Persson <dpersson@swflgovlaw.com>; Edward Lavalley <ELavalley@Venicegov.com>

Subject: Re: John Nolen Gardens workforce housing

Dear Ronni Shulman Mallozzi,

I believe paragraph 1 was answered for you by Ms. Stelzer. Paragraph 2 and 3 I believe refer to the Nolen Gardens apartment proposal; as this is a quasi-judicial item on today's agenda, I cannot comment on any specifics for that proposal.

Paragraph 4 I think is in reference to the Comprehensive Plan Transmittal meeting on June 12 and June 23. At the June 12 meeting I actually took an audience vote (that is the first and I hope the only time in seven years for an audience vote) as to preference after the staff update. In order to have time for attorney and audience participation, I allowed each Council Member only one question.

The audience in attendance had the choice of being heard immediately after the council questions or have the attorneys present their questions and comments immediately afterwards. The clear majority of audience participants voted to have the attorneys present first and I followed the wishes of the audience. Upon the completion of the attorneys presentations, the floor was opened for audience participation. All persons wishing to speak were given the opportunity to do so. I believe there was only one audience participant who had left and did not return to comment during that time but I may be mistaken and will ask the City Clerk to verify that data.

For your question in paragraph 5, I am not aware of Mr. Caution repeatedly asking for a noise study since the concrete plant began operations. He is, of course, more than welcome to submit that request on an agenda under Council Action and ask council to approve an expenditure for said study. I am aware of occasional emails and have followed through on all complaints for noise on the northeast portion of Venice. I believe there have been several occasions where Venice Police Department responded to complaints and have used electronic devices to measure the noise; I know that the City Manager has responded on several occasions as well. I have copied VPD and the City Manager so that they can verify the facts.

Finally, for paragraph 6, I cannot answer as to why people voted the way they did, I can only answer for myself. I try to vote in the direction most of the people of Venice would want me to vote. There will always be those who have opposing points of view and will be disappointed in the way a vote went; I believe that is what is called democracy and I will defend each person's right to vote in the manner they feel best represents their point of view and that of their constituents.

I am sorry it has taken so long to answer your questions, but we were in a meeting all day yesterday and will be continuing that meeting at 8:00 a.m. this morning, probably meeting most of today as well.

Sincerely,
John Holic

From: Lori Stelzer
Sent: Tuesday, June 27, 2017 2:41 PM
To: Ronni Shulman Mallozzi <ronnshul@gmail.com>; John Holic <JHolic@Venicegov.com>
Cc: City Council <CityCouncil@Venicegov.com>
Subject: RE: John Nolen Gardens workforce housing

Ronni,

I can answer your question re: the campaign funds/contributions. You may view the council campaign reports on the city's website – www.venicegov.com; select "Departments"; "City Clerk"; "Election".

This includes this year's candidates to date (qualifying period has not ended yet) and reports for the past 6 years. Thanks.

Lori Stelzer, MMC, City Clerk
401 W. Venice Avenue
Venice, FL 34285
941-882-7390
941-480-3031 (fax)

From: Ronni Shulman Mallozzi [<mailto:ronnshul@gmail.com>]
Sent: Tuesday, June 27, 2017 2:09 PM
To: John Holic <JHolic@Venicegov.com>
Cc: City Council <CityCouncil@Venicegov.com>; Lori Stelzer <LStelzer@Venicegov.com>
Subject: Re: John Nolen Gardens workforce housing

Mayor Holic:

You have the means to look into the contributions from developers and lawyers that represent developers towards campaign funds. Please do so and sent me a list of any current council people who have received campaign funds from these two groups. Are there any citizens currently running for council who have now or in the past received campaign funds from developers and/or their lawyers? Can you make this information available to me?

Were there any traffic studies required to determine the impact on the road with the addition of over 500 new apartments? Were traffic studies taken out of the new comprehension plan as a requirement for developers?

I understand the developer asked for waivers from the city and county for impact fees to make the project more profitable for him. That means that the citizens of the City of Venice and Sarasota County will have to pay for the impact of his development.

Why did the citizens have to wait for several hours to be heard on Friday and at the meeting before? Because you didn't want to adjust your agenda? Or was it a ploy to get the citizens to leave? Why did the citizens have to listen to hours of lawyer testimony before they were able to voice their concerns? Whose interests are most important to you?

Northeast Venice residents have reason to feel left out. Rich Cautero has asked repeatedly for a noise study to be done since the concrete plant began operation. This has been ignored by council. Yet, 10 citizens speak to the conditions of Harbor Drive and the need for sidewalks and you are ready to allocate over a million dollars for the construction of sidewalks that not all of the homeowners want. You instantly installed stop signs and responded. That's great that you responded to their concerns, yet you ignored ours.

On another note, I was pleased that the council agreed to pursue actions to fight climate change, but why was it not unanimous? Because the council was afraid the governor might "retaliate" against Venice? It is appalling that there was a 4-3 vote on this. I am extremely disappointed at

the three council members who put politics above the people's right to have their representatives ensure clean air and water.

Ronni Shulman Mallozzi

On Wed, Jun 21, 2017 at 2:47 PM, John Holic <JHolic@venicegov.com> wrote:

Dear Ms. Mallozzi,

On behalf of Venice City Council, thank you for your comments.

Just a few points of clarification that I need, I know of no impact fees that have been waived by council; please let me know which ones you have information on that have been waived and I will be happy to bring those up to council for discussion.

Please let me know which council members you are referring to that have had their campaigns funded by developers and we can check to see if anything unethical or illegal occurred.

At the last Comprehensive Plan meeting the City Staff updated everyone on the Plan and that was followed by one question from each council member. After the break, a vote of the audience was taken with the vote of an overwhelming majority of the residents at the meeting requesting a presentation by the attorneys before audience participation. After the attorneys' presentation, audience participation opened and continued until all who signed up had a chance to speak.

Speaking for myself, but I think applies to all, we listened very closely to the concerns of residents and that is one of the reasons why we are having another meeting this Friday.

Finally, I think it safe to say that all of council is concerned about the northeast portion of the city and that we listen and act in the interest of all citizens of Venice. When acting in the interest of all citizens, it also means that the decisions will not be what all citizens want but rather what the perception is that most people want.

Thank you for your comments and I hope this addresses some of the concerns.

Sincerely,

John Holic

Mayor, City of Venice

Get [Outlook for iOS](#)

From: Ronni Shulman Mallozzi <ronnshul@gmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, June 21, 2017 1:13 PM

Subject: John Nolen Gardens workforce housing

To: City Council <citycouncil@venicegov.com>

Cc: Lori Stelzer <lstelzer@venicegov.com>

It is apparent to the citizens of northeast Venice that we are a “dumping ground” for all the facilities the island doesn’t want in their own backyard. The city council, with a majority of island residents, does not seem to care about the residents here. NIMBY is the prevailing attitude, it seems.

As far as workforce housing, the concept seems fine. The density - 510 units - is preposterous. And the notion that residents will not own cars is absurd. I’m sure PJT and Tervis Tumbler do not believe that, and they’re hoping we will.

What about the impact on our roads, schools, police and fire departments of those 510 units? It’s interesting that the developers, who fund the campaigns of many council members, expect that the financial and other burdens will be borne by the taxpayers - not themselves. Look at all the instances where impact fees were waived. Follow the money and it’s obvious who holds all the cards in Venice.

Everyone seems afraid to offend PJT and Tervis because they provide a large tax base in Venice. They get what they want. Interestingly, when we held a sold-out charity fundraiser right up the road, both PJT or Tervis denied our request for a donation. Not even a set of plastic tumblers. (Virtually every merchant on West Venice Avenue and Miami Avenue donated).

Are you just going through the motions of opening your meeting to citizens? Seems that way. The developers and the lawyers run the show, and the practice of seeking citizen input (for a few minutes) is simply a guise.

Northeast Venice is the fastest growing part of Venice. Right now, we don’t have the big money of PGT and Tervis, the developers and their lawyers, but we will have votes.

We are very concerned about the overly dense proposal of John Nolen Gardens. Do you care to listen and act in the interest of all citizens of Venice? Your actions will answer that question.

Ronni Shulman Mallozzi

From: Matthew Cary [mailto:mattcary12@yahoo.com]

Sent: Tuesday, June 27, 2017 8:49 AM

To: City Council <CityCouncil@Venicegov.com>

Subject: John Nolen Gardens

To Whom It May Concern,

Please rezone the property located at 2201 Knights Trail Rd from RMF 2 to RMF 4 to allow for the future development of John Nolen Gardens as rental housing for hourly workers, a critical need in our area.

Thank you,
Matthew Cary