



City of Venice

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

Meeting Minutes City Council

Friday, June 23, 2017

9:00 AM

Council Chambers

Comprehensive Plan Transmittal Public Hearing (Continued from June 12, 2017)

CALL TO ORDER

Mayor Holic called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m.

ROLL CALL

Present: 7 - Mayor John Holic, Council Member Kit McKeon, Council Member Jeanette Gates, Council Member Bob Daniels, Council Member Deborah Anderson, Council Member Richard Cautero and Council Member Fred Fraize

ALSO PRESENT

City Attorney Dave Persson, Assistant City Attorney Kelly Fernandez, City Clerk Lori Stelzer, Assistant City Clerk Heather Taylor, City Manager Ed Lavallee, Recording Secretary Mercedes Barcia, Development Services Director Jeff Shrum, and Planning Commission Chair Barry Snyder.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Pledge of Allegiance was led by former County Commissioner Jon Thaxton.

Mayor Holic noted the meeting format.

I. STAFF AND PLANNING COMMISSION CHAIR BARRY SNYDER'S PRESENTATION TO RESPOND TO CONCERNS PRESENTED AT THE JUNE 12, 2017 MEETING

Mr. Shrum spoke regarding meeting goals, resident feedback, comprehensive plan amendments, presentation time, and comments received.

Discussion followed regarding audience participation.

Ms. Snyder spoke on responding to Jeffery Boone's comments, Laurel Road corridor, mixed use area designation, Strategy LU 1.2.9a - Downtown Mixed Use Designation (MUD) item no. 8 Intensity/Density, and floor area ratio (FAR).

Mr. Snyder spoke on the Laurel Road corridor, The Bridges project, future land use versus zoning, commercial mixed use, comments from the Venetian Golf Community Association, land development regulations (LDR) becoming form based codes, mixed use residential, planning commission's recommendation and factors considered regarding mixed use corridor, single versus multi-family housing, zoning, East Venice Avenue, concern with single-family residential driveways on the road, compatibility with multi-family residential within the corridor, properties entitled to single-family residential, and articulating the city's direction.

Mr. Snyder continued to speak regarding housing allocations, mixed use corridor (MUC), The Bridges property, number of acres, density, minimum and maximum acreage for residential and non-residential development, higher percentage of land devoted to non-residential, Portofino and S&J Properties, planning commission's direction, Seaboard area, percentage allocation of residential versus non-residential, joint planning area (JPA) associated with the county, commercial services, Laurel Road neighborhood MUC, and Northeast Venice neighborhood mixed use residential (MUR).

Discussion took place on the Laurel Road neighborhood MUC, zoning, maximum dwelling numbers per unit, corridor density based on The Bridges property, planned unit development (PUD)s, affordable housing, MUC not allowing single-family residential, concern with land rights, future land use map (FLUM) and zoning implications, policy language, and alternatives for The Bridges property.

Mr. Shrum and Kelley Klepper, consultant with Kimley-Horn and Associates, explained form based codes.

Discussion took place on form based codes to include current comprehensive plan, compatibility, intent, focus on land use, regulations, standards for development, latitude, property zonings, land development code (LDC) and regulations, LDRs being in compliance with the comprehensive plan, adoption and amendments of the 2010 comprehensive plan, and responses to Mr. Boone's and the development community's comments.

Mr. Snyder spoke on the current FLUM, planning and mixed use areas, Heritage Park, and Northern and Eastern Gateways planning areas, zoning, Venice Avenue, difference between the current and proposed comprehensive plan in terms of predictability for mixed use residential and non-residential, dwelling units in the Island Neighborhood MUC, number of acres, making a policy decision on whether there should be more residential in the corridor, downtown area corridor square footage, and 50% open space.

Discussion took place regarding building requirements on the hospital property, maintenance and update of comprehensive plan charts, Mr. Persson and Mr. Shrum discussing changes, available property along Airport Road, vacant property areas, district overlay, allowable units per acre in the district, and changing corridors.

Recess was taken from 10:36 a.m. until 10:45 a.m.

Discussion took place regarding giving direction to staff and the planning commission to make changes prior to the transmittal vote.

Mr. Snyder spoke on 50% open space requirement, functional and conservation open space, functional open space available to the public, level of service (LOS) standards, amount of open space in the city, parks master plan, amenities in gated communities, removing the word "public" from the definition of functional open space, minimum percentage, trails and waterways, and LOS standards on new developments.

Discussion followed regarding the Parks Master Plan.

Mr. Snyder spoke regarding Strategy LU 1.2.17-MUR Open Space Connectivity minimum of 25 feet wide requirement.

A motion was made by Mr. McKeon, seconded by Ms. Gates, that the plan being discussed and worked on is the proposed 2017 comprehensive plan.

Discussion followed regarding the proposed 2017 plan, writing LDRs, Mr. Shrum's request to clarify that the 2017 proposed plan is the plan being worked on, 2010 comprehensive plan, concerns from residents, ability to make changes if plan is approved, today's meeting is a transmittal hearing, number of public meetings held, planning commission's work on the draft plan, and public input.

Mr. Persson commented on Mr. McKeon's motion, regulatory language on the 2010 comprehensive plan, LDRs, and continuing regulations necessary to preserve the 2017 draft plan.

Discussion continued regarding a completed draft plan and public outreach.

The motion carried by voice vote 6 to 1 with Ms. Anderson opposed.

Mr. Snyder spoke regarding the planning commission's recommendations and providing a list to council, unique characteristic of 2010 plan regulations, LDR update, transitional language, planning areas, height restrictions and architectural structures are governed by the LDRs, conditional use process, policy 9.5 conditional use for building

height allowances, and policy 8.2 land use compatibility review procedures.

Mr. Shrum noted clarifying application of Policy 8.2.

Mr. Snyder spoke regarding Mr. Boone's comments, architectural requirements, timeframe for LDR updates, comments received by the planning commission, comprehensive plan amendment on planning area, mixed use residential FAR, and The Bridges property.

Discussion took place regarding Mr. Snyder addressing residents request for more open space, PUD and MUR requirement of 50%, planning area 25% requirement, zoning level and comprehensive plan protections, proposed FLUM, potential development, national average of acre per thousand, state mandate on park LOS, parks master plan, transition section, Policy 8.2, height restrictions, and compatibility with the 2010 comprehensive plan.

Mr. Fraize left the dais at 11:55 a.m.

II. ATTORNEY RESPONSES

Dan Bailey, on behalf of Gulf Coast Community Foundation, spoke regarding concerns with The Bridges property, potential development, preserving land developer's rights and plan, Laurel Road corridor, and item no. 3 under Policy LU 1.2.9.c- Corridor (MUC).

Mr. Fraize returned to the dais at 11:57 a.m.

Mr. Bailey continued to speak regarding single-family residential development, shifting The Bridges property to the northeast neighborhood, Laurel Road corridor, density cap, FAR in the northeast neighborhood, functional open space, and habitat corridors.

Jon Thaxton, Gulf Coast Community Foundation, commented on the number of dwelling units, preserving developer potential, contract pending on property, and property value.

Recess was taken from 12:03 p.m. until 1:05 p.m.

Jeffery Boone, Boone Law Firm, commented on the draft plan, and spoke on the Laurel Road MUC, allowance of single-family development, Hurt property and zoning rights, removing prohibition of single-family development, dwelling unit cap in the Laurel Road MUC, The Bridges, Portofino, and S&J property's potential building development, MUC density cap, property zoning rights, redevelopments, adding language to recognize existing zoning map and potential, open space connectivity, and prohibition of multi-family development in

commercial areas.

James Collins, Boone Law Firm, spoke regarding commercial land uses, land use and mixed use designations, and applying MUC to Fisherman's Wharf property in the Gateway Neighborhood.

Mr. Collins spoke on Strategy LU 4.1.1.-Transitional Language specific to Comprehensive Plan regulatory language, architectural standards, and LDRs.

Mr. Boone spoke regarding per parcel FAR.

Discussion followed regarding per parcel FAR limitations, comprehensive plan amendments, and knowing status of changes.

Mr. Persson commented on pending quasi-judicial applications.

Discussion took place regarding the Hurt property and Mr. Boone returning to another council meeting to discuss status of property, MUR zoning, and areas closer to Laurel Road having potential for commercial development.

Mr. Snyder noted concerns regarding meeting schedule and consultant's travel.

III. AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION

Jerry Jasper, 130 Burano Court, Venetian Golf and River Club Community Association, commented on the proposed comprehensive plan, The Bridges property, MUR designation, residential square footage, multi-family units, units per acre, affordable housing, and open space requirements.

Discussion followed on affordable and workforce housing.

Ronald Courtney, 435 Otter Creek, spoke regarding minimum standard on wildlife corridor, open space, sports park LOS, and doing the comprehensive plan and LDR concurrently.

Discussion followed regarding public input and meetings.

Dan Lobeck, representing Pinebrook South Homeowners Association, commented on reducing land use density and intensity, single-family residences, form based code, wildlife corridors, LDRs, and FAR.

Discussion followed on who Mr. Lobeck represents from Control Growth Now.

Mr. McKeon left the dais at 2:30 p.m.

Leslie Vilcone, 111 Auburn Woods Circle, spoke regarding the proposed comprehensive plan to include policies 13.1 and 10.2, property values, removing restrictions, and allowing commercial development.

Mr. McKeon returned to the dais at 2:35 p.m.

ATTORNEY RESPONSES - Continued

Mr. Shrum spoke regarding Mr. Lobeck's comments, 2010 comprehensive plan, public comments, Policy 2.7 Facade Design, environmental section, language in the current comprehensive plan, compatibility, parcel based FAR, development intensity and density, affordable housing cap, regulations, LDR update, plan changes since 2010, public input, June 8, 2010 adopted plan date, and school capacity.

Ms. Anderson left the dais at 2:58 p.m.

Mr. Shrum spoke on school plan requirement and Policy 5.3 review of petitions.

Ms. Anderson returned to the dais at 3:00 p.m.

Mr. Shrum commented on Strategy PS 1.1.1 and Policy 1.1 Adequate School capacity.

Clif Tate, Transportation Planner with Kimley-Horn & Associates, spoke on transportation LOS and concurrency, LOS standards, Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT) recommendations, and financial feasibility requirement.

Mr. Daniels left the dais at 3:08 p.m.

Mr. Tate spoke regarding statute changes, mobility fees, defining LOS, traffic volume analysis, and speed limits.

Mr. Daniels returned to the dais at 3:14 p.m.

Ms. Fernandez joined the meeting and took over for Mr. Persson.

Mr. Tate spoke regarding road LOS standards and consistency with the county.

Mayor Holic left the dais at 3:19 p.m.

Mr. Tate spoke regarding road impact fees and the county's

transportation concurrency policy.

Mayor Holic returned to the dais at 3:23 p.m.

Mr. Tate spoke on concurrency language and road LOS standard "D".

Mr. Shrum commented on traffic analysis and mobility fees.

Discussion followed regarding the city's character, traffic concerns, impact on residents, concurrency, using other methods of transportation, limiting development, control from the state level on transportation, level "C" roads, pedestrian and bicyclist LOS, road LOS based on volume, road improvement options, capital improvement schedule, controlling growth, zoning requirements, county's comprehensive plan, City of North Port's roadway LOS, county roads LOS, and maintaining level "C" standard for all city local roads and distinction from arterials and collectors.

Mr. Cautero left the dais at 4:00 p.m.

Discussion continued regarding the bypass LOS and roadway speeds.

Ms. Gates left the dais at 4:03 p.m.

Discussion continued on roadway LOS thresholds, average travel speeds, and number of vehicles accommodated on the road.

Mr. Cautero returned to the dais at 4:05 p.m.

Discussion continued on improving the city's LOS by widening the road.

Ms. Gates returned to the dais at 4:07 p.m.

Discussion continued regarding changes to the comprehensive plan, continuing the public hearing to August 31, 2017, and having Ms. Stelzer checki on a date council members are available during summer recess.

Mr. Snyder spoke regarding the planning commission's reason for reducing the LOS standard from "D" to "C", consistency with other jurisdictions, widening roads, and LOS standard "C" commits the city to fix the road.

Mr. McKeon left the dais at 4:24 p.m.

Mr. Tate noted a comprehensive plan amendment requires the city to evaluate transportation impact and improvements needed to achieve LOS standard for 5 years. Discussion followed on funding and financial

feasibility requirement.

Mr. McKeon returned to the dais at 4:27 p.m.

Discussion continued on improving intersections and/or synchronizing traffic lights, improvement funding, resident traffic concerns, Pinebrook expansion, and raising LOS standards on local roads.

Mayor Holic and Mr. Fraize left the dais at 4:40 p.m.

Mr. Lobeck spoke on transportation concurrency and LDRs, statute requirement, plan amendments, and Sarasota County's comprehensive plan.

Mr. Fraize returned to the dais at 4:42 p.m.

Mayor Holic returned to the dais at 4:43 p.m.

Mr. Lobeck continued to speak regarding transportation concurrency in the LDRs, Sarasota County's comprehensive plan, plan amendments, improving roadway designations, LOS for local roads, mobility fees and funding mobility improvements, traffic impact study, certificate of concurrency, maintaining adopted LOS, and updating LDR concurrent with the comprehensive plan.

Mr. Cautero left the meeting at 4:57 p.m. and did not return.

Mr. Lobeck commented on keeping concurrency in the comprehensive plan and growth control.

Mr. Tate clarified that Winter Park had an adopted LOS "E", and commented on Sarasota County's transportation policy 1.3.12 and the Sarasota County memorandum regarding transportation planning staff report.

Jim Dooley, 1325 Pinebrook Way, expressed support of city council and staff's work with the comprehensive plan and spoke to regulatory language being removed from the 2010 comprehensive plan, development that abuts Pinebrook South, importance of timing, protections against compatibility, and recommended spending time to understand concerns raised and working on LDRs.

Discussion took place regarding Mr. Loebeck's suggestions, level of interest of residents, and establishing a strong comprehensive plan and LDR for future council members.

There was council consensus to continue the transmittal public hearing to

August 31, 2017 from 9 a.m. to 5 p.m.

Ms. Fernandez stated there would be a readvertisement of the meeting.

IV. COUNCIL DISCUSSION

There was none.

[ORD. NO.
2017-22](#)

An Ordinance of the City of Venice, Florida, Adopting a 2017-2027 Comprehensive Plan Replacing the Adopted 2010 Comprehensive Plan in its Entirety; Providing for the Following Elements of the Comprehensive Plan: Introduction, Background, Land Use, Transportation and Mobility, Open Space, Housing, Infrastructure, Public Schools, and Neighborhoods; Providing for an Appendix; Providing for Severability; Providing for Repeal of all Ordinances in Conflict Herewith to the Extent of Such Conflict; and Providing an Effective Date

There was no action taken.

V. ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business to come before Council, the meeting was adjourned at 5:23 p.m.

ATTEST:

Mayor - City of Venice

City Clerk