

From: gwats1956@aol.com
To: [City Council](#)
Cc: [Board and Council Messages](#)
Subject: 240 Base Avenue East Variance appeal
Date: Monday, September 8, 2025 6:59:22 PM

You don't often get email from gwats1956@aol.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

Caution: This email originated from an external source. **Be Suspicious of Attachments, Links and Requests for Login Information**

[Sent from the all new AOL app for iOS](#)

Begin forwarded message:

On Monday, September 8, 2025, 4:31 PM, MAILER-DAEMON@aol.com <MAILER-DAEMON@aol.com> wrote:

Sorry, we were unable to deliver your message to the following address.

<Citycouncil@venice.gov>:

No mx record found for domain=venice.gov

----- Forwarded message -----

I am writing this to express our concerns relative to the variance considered at 240 Base Ave East. We have lived in Beach Manor Villas South, which is adjacent to subject address for 25 years.

As it was described to us, the proposed structure does not appear to be compatible with the existing residential neighborhood. We are also concerned that this structure, if approved, will adversely affect our property values.

It will also increase the commercial traffic, which is not acceptable for this area.

We ask that the City Council refuse to approve the requested variance

Gail W. Ellwinger
Eugene Ellwinger. Unit #16. Beach Manor Villas South

[Sent from the all new AOL app for iOS](#)

From: [Kay Fraser](#)
To: [City Council](#)
Cc: [Board and Council Messages](#)
Subject: Fwd:
Date: Monday, September 8, 2025 10:06:29 PM

You don't often get email from kmf1320@gmail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

Caution: This email originated from an external source. **Be Suspicious of Attachments, Links and Requests for Login Information**

Karen Fraser--Kay
260-402-6624

----- Forwarded message -----

From: Kay Fraser <kmf1320@gmail.com>
Date: Mon, Sep 8, 2025 at 8:46 PM
Subject: Fwd:
To: kmichaels@venicefl.gov <kmichaels@venicefl.gov>
CC: <kdando1@ptd.net>, <pezdesign246@gmail.com>, <ccretors@cretors.com>, <dashugars@gmail.com>

On Sat, Sep 6, 2025 at 10:31 AM Kay Fraser <kmf1320@gmail.com> wrote:

Just about a year ago, I arrived, along with hurricane Milton, at my new home in Beach Manor villas south. I moved from South Venice to a location which I loved because of its charm, its unspoiled quality, its neighborly feel.

Yes some building has occurred—the expansion of Village on the Isle for example— but that is respectful and necessary.

The proposed new building on Base avenue, about a block from my villa, is neither necessary nor respectful. The large metal structure is unsightly for sure, with no reason for being so, nor any attempts that I can see from the developer to try to fit in with the surroundings or meet with the neighbors for a compromise solution. As far as I can tell, that has not happened. Additionally I don't understand how such a commercial looking building could be allowed in that location anyway. It Certainly seems in violation of the zoning code And the intention of the appropriate growth around the airport.

Too fast, too ugly, too pre-emptive. At the very least, the developers should hold off until they understand the local objections from their hoped-for new neighbors and work with the city planners of Venice for an appropriate design (and use) solution. Until that happens, the City Council should repeal the builders' requested variance. Thank you for considering this request and for helping to preserve a precious area of Venice.

Karen Fraser--Kay

| 260-402-6624

From: [Ingrid Blokzijl](#)
To: [Kelly Michaels](#); [City Council](#)
Cc: [Peter Zeh](#); [Board and Council Messages](#)
Subject: RE: Appeal Hearing (petition 25-22VZ0) being held on September 9, 2025.
Date: Monday, September 8, 2025 1:35:05 PM

You don't often get email from ingblok@yahoo.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

Caution: This email originated from an external source. **Be Suspicious of Attachments, Links and Requests for Login Information**

City Council, City of Venice, Florida:

This letter is submitted in response to the zoning variance granted for 204 Base Avenue. As a resident living one block from this property, I am concerned about the approval of this variance. Our community has welcomed and supported zoning changes aimed at enhancing the attractiveness of our neighborhood for residential development through improved architectural standards.

The allowance of a large metal commercial structure appears inconsistent with the vision set forth for our Island neighborhood. The intention behind the zoning updates was to promote positive development in the area. Permitting a metal building characterized by sizable garage bay doors and chain-link fencing seems to undermine these objectives.

It is unclear why the City would alter zoning and architectural requirements only to disregard them with what I believe to be the first subsequent development. While the building is described as multipurpose with a focus on children and civic organizations, it would be appropriate for its design and layout to align with existing architectural regulations to maintain and improve neighborhood aesthetics. If the stated purpose is accurate, there should be no obstacle to creating an appealing structure in accordance with established guidelines. Architectural design should remain a priority.

Permitting a commercial structure that lacks architectural merit is in conflict with the Vision and Intent of the City's Comprehensive Plan. It appears that the proposed development does not adhere to Venice Historical Precedent architectural design standards. No aspect of this proposal seems to meet compliance. This all-or-nothing request gives the impression that we are being presented with narratives rather than substantive facts.

I have yet to encounter a compelling reason or demonstrated hardship supporting the variance. The applicant has not addressed nor met any of the City's compatibility or hardship criteria required for such approval. A preference for constructing a metal warehouse does not constitute sufficient grounds for a variance. A large metal building such as is being proposed would adversely affect the visual appeal of our neighborhood and belongs in an industrial area such as Knights Trail or the Sarasota County Interstate Business Center.

I can understand a minor variance, but this seems to be a total exemption! Granting

this variance will set a precedent, continuing an industrial character that is contrary to the City's goals and current zoning.

I therefore request that the City Council repeal the variance and require the owner to collaborate with City Planners to produce a design that reflects and enhances the character of the Venice Island community, consistent with the City's Comprehensive Plan.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Respectfully,

Ingrid Blokzijl
1022 Beach Manor Center
Venice, FL 34285
941-786-5406

From: tfaser@sbcglobal.net
To: [City Council](#)
Cc: [Board and Council Messages](#)
Subject: Variance Appeal Hearing 9-09-2025 - Area Resident comments - 240 Base Ave E
Date: Monday, September 8, 2025 3:38:36 PM
Importance: High

Caution: This email originated from an external source. **Be Suspicious of Attachments, Links and Requests for Login Information**

To : **Venice City Council**

Subject: **Variance request for parcel: 240 Base Ave E**

When: **Regular City Council Meeting on 09/09/2025**

From: **Thomas and Mary Faser**

- *Allowing this type of commercial building (and its absence of architecture) would violate the core Vision and Intent of our City's Comprehensive Plan.*
- *The proposed building is an eyesore and is (way) out of place in our neighborhood. It may fit in an industrial or light commercial-zoned district (Laurel, Knights Trail), but it does NOT fit with the aesthetics and character of our (majority RESIDENTIAL) Island community.*
- *Has the owner spent any effort on complying with the Venice Historical Precedent architectural design standards? Has the owner even attempted to come up with an appropriate design?*
- *Why is the owner requesting an "ALL or NOTHING" variance? Are there options other than granting a variance from a "STRICT" adherence to the VHP Architectural requirement?*
- *This proposal represents the (lack of) architectural design that the Comprehensive Land Use and Development Plan was seeking to prevent in our City's neighborhoods. It is a detriment to the City.*
- *[We support the City's design Strategies and moving our Airport Avenue neighborhoods forward, to a more "charming, beautiful aesthetic", not sending us backward.](#)*
- *Why are the large loading bays facing the street? Code requires that these be located on the back side, out of site from the street. A redesign should include moving any loading bays to the rear of the building.*
- *Not only is the building a detriment to the aesthetics of our*

neighborhood, but the chain link security fencing, security gates and lack of landscaping are out of character with our Venice Island community.

- The Code for the Airport Avenue Mixed Use Corridor expressly calls for pedestrian friendly development. The proposal's absence of landscape architectural design is alarming.*
- We urge the Council to require adherence to the VHP Architectural design requirement and the Land Use Codes to address not only the building, but the fencing, sidewalks, and landscaping.*
- What's next? Where does it end? Granting a variance for this parcel sets a negative tone and precedent for future development. The number of metal buildings will continue to grow, as will the number of heavier, commercial type vehicles traveling throughout the neighborhood.*
- The owner has NOT shown a single compelling reason why he cannot comply with the VHP architectural requirement.*
- The owner has not demonstrated any legitimate hardship that qualifies the building for a variance.*
- The owner's alleged hardship that compliance is "not economically feasible" has neither been based on any fact, nor is legitimate, proper legal grounds for granting a variance.*
- The owner, in his variance application, has not attempted to address, nor has he met:*

1) ANY of the City's compatibility criteria standards, nor

2) ANY of the City's hardship criteria, to qualify for the variance!

- The owner's "preference" to build a metal warehouse/storage building DOES NOT justify granting a variance. The owner's claim that the proposed building, as is, is the "only solution that benefits" the neighborhood is also NOT A LEGITIMATE reason to grant a variance.*

- We feel strongly that the owner should work on a revised proposal that enhances "the beauty and charm of the City, enhancing the attractiveness of the area...and improving property values and generally improving the overall quality of life..." (LUC Chapter 87, Sect.7.1)*

-

Sincerely,

Thomas and Mary Faser

1026 Beach Manor Circle – Unit 44

Venice, FL 34285

From: [Mike Baird](#)
To: [City Council](#)
Cc: [Peter Zeh](#); [Dan Shugars](#); [Board and Council Messages](#)
Subject: Variance appeal of 240 Base Ave
Date: Monday, September 8, 2025 4:13:04 PM

You don't often get email from bairdm171@gmail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

Caution: This email originated from an external source. **Be Suspicious of Attachments, Links and Requests for Login Information**

City Council Members

As a registered voter and resident at 1114 Cockrill St., I strongly oppose the architecture variance that was given for the property at 240 Base Ave.

From the elevation drawing, it is obviously a warehouse structure with no thought to the appearance and impact it will have on our residential neighborhood.

The property is surrounded by blocks of condos and single family homes, and a structure like that would be a step in the wrong direction for the future of Venice.

Please repeal the architecture variance at your 9/9 meeting.

Thank you,

Mike Baird

Treasurer- Board of Directors, Beach Manor Villas South
614-580-2525

From: [jack Humrichouser](#)
To: [City Council](#)
Cc: [Board and Council Messages](#)
Subject: 240 Base Ave East
Date: Tuesday, September 9, 2025 6:46:05 AM

[You don't often get email from jack.humrichouser@yahoo.com. Learn why this is important at <https://aka.ms/LearnAboutSenderIdentification>]

Caution: This email originated from an external source. Be Suspicious of Attachments, Links and Requests for Login Information

I would like to support the appeal on the decision to grant the zoning variance for the proposed development on this property. I am concerned due to the undefined purpose for this development. I would support developments that stay under the current zoning regulations.

Thank you,

Jack Humrichouser
Resident of BMVS

Sent from my iPad

From: [jeff.reynolds](#)
To: [City Council](#)
Cc: [Board and Council Messages](#)
Subject: 240 Base ave
Date: Tuesday, September 9, 2025 6:32:47 AM

Caution: This email originated from an external source. **Be Suspicious of Attachments, Links and Requests for Login Information**

To City council of Venice

Please do not allow the proposed plans for 240 Base Ave be approved as submitted. Listed are just some of the reasons that this would not be a good change for our island.

- ...Allowing this type of commercial building (and its absence of architecture) would violate the core Vision and Intent of our City's Comprehensive Plan
- ...the proposed building is an eyesore and is (way) out of place in our neighborhood. It may fit in an industrial or light commercial-zoned district (Laurel, Knights Trail), but it does NOT fit with the aesthetics and character of our (majority RESIDENTIAL) Island community
- Has the owner spent any effort on complying with the Venice Historical Precedent architectural design standards? Has the owner even attempted to come up with an appropriate design?
- Why is the owner requesting an "ALL or NOTHING" variance. Are there options other than granting a variance from a "STRICT" adherence to the VHP Architectural requirement?
- This proposal represents the (lack of) architectural design that the Comprehensive Land Use and Development Plan was seeking to prevent in our City's neighborhoods. It is a detriment to the City. • ...We support the City's design Strategies and moving our Airport Avenue neighborhoods forward, to a more "charming, beautiful aesthetic", not sending us backward
- Why are the large loading bays facing the street? Code requires that these be located on the back side, out of site from the street. A redesign should include moving any loading bays to the rear of the building
- Not only is the building a detriment to the aesthetics of our neighborhood, but the chain link security fencing, security gates and lack of landscaping are out of character with our Venice Island community.
- The Code for the Airport Avenue Mixed Use Corridor expressly calls for pedestrian friendly development. The proposal's absence of landscape architectural design is alarming• Urge the Council to require adherence to the VHP Architectural design requirement and the Land Use Codes to address not only the building, but the fencing, sidewalks, and landscaping also!
- ...What's next? Where does it end? Granting a variance for this parcel sets a negative tone and precedent for future development....The number of metal buildings will continue to grow.
- ...The owner has NOT shown a single compelling reason why he cannot comply with the VHP architectural requirement.
- **The owner has not demonstrated any legitimate hardship that qualifies the building

for a variance.

- The owner's alleged hardship that compliance is "not economically feasible" has neither been based on any fact, nor is legitimate, proper legal grounds for granting a variance.

- **The owner, in his variance application, has not attempted to address, nor has he met 1) ANY of the City's compatibility criteria standards, nor 2) ANY the City's hardship criteria, to qualify for the variance!

- **The owner's "preference" to build a metal warehouse/storage building DOES NOT justify granting a variance. The owner's claim that the proposed building, as is, is the "only solution that benefits" the neighborhood is also NOT A LEGITIMATE reason to grant a variance.

- **We feel strongly that the owner should work on a revised proposal that enhances "the beauty and charm of the City, enhancing the attractiveness of the area...and improving property values and generally improving the overall quality of life" (LUC Chapter 87, Sect.7.1)

Thank you for time.

sincerely Jeffrey Reynolds
Owner and resident of 1028 Beach Manor Circle