



# City of Venice

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

## Meeting Minutes Planning Commission

---

Tuesday, March 5, 2024

1:30 PM

Council Chambers

---

### [23-63RZ](#)

GCCF PUD Amendment (Quasi-Judicial)

Staff: Josh Law, Planner

Agent: Jeffery A. Boone, Esq., Boone Law Firm

Applicant/Owners: Border Road Investments LLC and Vistera Associates, LLC

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

City Attorney Fernandez questioned Commission members concerning ex-parte communications and conflicts of interest. Mr. Jasper and Mr. Hale disclosed site visits. Chair Snyder disclosed a site visit and conversation with Planning and Zoning Director Clark.

Planner Law, being duly sworn, presented general information, project background, previous approvals, unified control, aerial map, surrounding properties, future land use map, zoning maps, Comprehensive Plan analysis, Land Development Code compliance, Binding Master Plan, findings of fact, concurrency, conclusion, and answered Commission questions regarding currently approved land uses, platting for single family and multifamily, there being no changes to open space, and number of units per acre.

Attorney Jeffrey Boone, Agent, being duly sworn, spoke on only requesting to add density, that no purchase contracts have been signed for units at this time, land being owned by the developers, traffic study, unified control, property rights, consistency with Comprehensive Plan, Binding Master Plan, Land Development Regulations, and answered Commission questions on placement of multifamily development on property, number of units per acres in multifamily area. Pat Neal, Applicant, being duly sworn, spoke about project, prediction of and changes in growth in Northeast Venice, and number of units in multifamily tract.

Discussion took place regarding development throughout all tracts, keeping the 50% open space, density likely going in northwest tract of Planned Unit Development (PUD), density in surrounding PUDs, wetlands, meeting a need in market, multifamily already planned in area, potential

assisted living facility (ALF) housing, and density relating to affordable housing.

Gary Scott, 156 Pesaro Drive, being duly sworn, spoke on unified control, and against the petition.

Olen Thomas, 248 Acerno Drive, being duly sworn, spoke on open space transfer from Milano to Vistera, Binding Master Plan, decision criteria, increased traffic, and applicants responses.

Debbie Gericke 146 Bella Vista Terrace, being duly sworn, spoke on affordable housing, reason for density request now, affect on residents in area, and against the petition.

Barbara Puccia, 179 Valenza Loop, being duly sworn, spoke on Commission authority, unified control, traffic, affect on neighboring PUDs, and against the petition.

Anthony Demeo, 249 Mestre Place, being duly sworn, spoke on continued development in area, neighboring multifamily units already planned, affordable housing, assisted living, constant changing in plans, and against the petition.

Ruth Cordner, 246 Montelluna Drive, being duly sworn, spoke on unified control, transfer of control from developer to homeowners, Binding Master Plan, affordable housing, sidewalks, narrowness of roads, and eagles nest in area.

Lee Pirrotti, 114 Medici Terrace, being duly sworn, spoke on infrastructure needed for growth, safety on roads, following previous development plans, and overdevelopment of area.

Francis Recchuiti, 137 Cipriani Way, being duly sworn, spoke on intention of Commission, safety of community, traffic and against the petition.

Attorney Boone spoke regarding the number of multifamily units per acre, there being no homeowners in GCCF PUD at this time, unified control, developers having full ownership of PUD at this time, the process of amending a PUD, history of property density, traffic study done, transfer of open space, open space requirement, and further approvals required for development.

Chair Snyder close the public hearing.

Discussion took place regarding how decision criteria is reviewed, PUD

requirement of up to five units per acres, making decision today pending unified control workshop, changes in area over time, Commission's authority being for a recommendation to City Council, traffic, ability to make changes in development, affordable housing is not being requested today, the decision making process, and unified control.

**A motion was made by Mr. Jasper, 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, in compliance with the Land Development Code and with the affirmative Findings of Fact in the record, recommends to City Council approval of PUD Amendment Petition No. 23-63RZ. The motion carried by the following electronic vote:**

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