



City of Venice

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

Meeting Minutes Planning Commission

Tuesday, September 17, 2013

1:30 PM

Council Chambers

I. Call To Order

A Regular Meeting of the Planning Commission was held this date in Council Chambers at City Hall. Chair Barry Snyder called the meeting to order at 1:30 p.m.

II. Roll Call

Mr. Snyder read the resignation letter from Mr. Shrauger and noted his valued contribution to the board. There was a consensus of the board to excuse Mr. Williams' absence at this meeting.

Present: 5 - Chair Barry Snyder, Helen Moore, Jerry Towery, Shaun Graser and Tom Murphy

Excused: 1 - John Williams

Also Present

Ex-Officio Councilmember Kit McKeon, City Attorney Dave Persson, Senior Planner Scott Pickett, Planner Roger Clark and Recording Secretary Susan Schult.

III. Approval of Minutes

13-0146 August 6, 2013 Minutes

A motion was made by Ms. Moore, seconded by Mr. Towery, that the Minutes of August 6, 2013 be approved as amended to strike "noise abatement" from the motion on page three. The motion carried by voice vote unanimously.

IV. Workshop Item

13-5AM Sign Code Update

Mr. Pickett thanked board members for their participation, Wade-Trim for their assistance and the public for submitting their input. He reviewed the sign code update goal to be business friendly and maintain the visual quality of the city. He suggested the commission keep these goals in mind, noted the number of revisions to make the code more user friendly, the new code is less restrictive, touched on issues related to temporary signage, and reviewed the thought process of not modifying a portion of the code that is currently working.

Mr. Pickett explained the revision objectives including simplifying the sign regulations, not creating new non conforming signs, providing administrative flexibility, relaxing existing sign regulations whenever practical, and gave examples for each objective. He reviewed workshops held to date, the process to complete the revisions, and approval of the ordinance change.

Amanda Warner, Wade-Trim, stated signage should be regulated for public safety and it is a legislative policy decision, and reviewed the regulatory parameters. She talked about how the city currently regulates signage, the goals to consolidate regulations, correct inconsistencies, address technological changes, and accommodate flexibility. She reviewed stakeholder and the policy task force involvement, displayed the schedule of meetings held, expounded on the feedback from the stakeholder input including consolidation of the code, changeable copy signs, art as signage, obsolete and nonconforming signs, and calculation of sign entitlements.

Ms. Warner read the revised intent statement, gave an overview of the consolidated user friendly changes including combining all sections into section 86-400 and removing all signage code language from section 122, simplified and increased entitlements, displayed types of signs referenced in the code, the sign face and sign structure drawing, and gave an example of calculated sign entitlement for monument and building signs that will be included in the code. She reported the design standards were consolidated, and summarized changes to setbacks, allowance of changeable copy, exempt and new temporary signs, increase of window signage, and administrative relief. She talked about the addition of an appeal process and corresponding criteria, monument sign design, alternative designs allowed if architecturally consistent with building and surrounding area, size and height standards, new sign replacement or alteration of conforming sign, and announced another commission workshop will be held on October 1.

Audience Participation

Richard Dorsett, Dorsett Signs, commented on building sizes, building sign percentage allowances for frontage and front facade, talked about signage in the Venetian Gateway (VG) district, the mandatory hedge in front of signage blocking signage, and signage pertaining to lot size.

Mike Lamberto, Venice Olive Oil, asked whether tube dudes are considered signage.

Ms. Warner stated they added a definition of artwork as signs, explained art is considered signage if it has a commercial message, or if it is representative of the product or service of the business it is considered signage. Mr. Pickett interjected the code should be more clear on art that is deemed to be a sign.

Mr. Lamberto talked about the correlation of card tables and clothes racks along the south side of W. Venice Avenue and the tube dude in front of his store.

Jean Trammell, Venice MainStreet Design Committee chair touched on the positive elements of the update process, stated the process was well done, and commended the consultant on the preservation of the historic downtown area.

Mr. Snyder reviewed the task force discussions on when a sign permit is needed, noted there are 22 different types of signage that does not require a permit, pole signs remain non conforming and new pole signs will not be allowed, pointed to the different types of signage included in the code, the changeable message addition, the provision for administrative relief, and explained how non conforming pole signage was addressed.

Mr. Graser commented on his thought process concerning what the city should look like, referenced the signage in Jupiter, FL, encouraged consistency in city signage, and noted the importance of balancing the economic interest and preservation of the city architectural character.

Discussion followed on adding a new message to a pole sign, the trigger being the

change of the face of the sign, the criteria for pole sign relief, the sign height being tied to the speed limit, not being allowed to artificially elevate the grade to have a higher sign, enforcement of the code, the temporary developer signage along Border Road, location of a business' sidewalk as it pertains to portable signage, changes in allowance of portable and temporary signs, tube dudes, and commercial vehicles with signage parked on the street after business hours.

Mr. Pickett explained the task force discussion and thought process on commercial vehicle signage.

Discussion continued on holiday decorations, the interpretation of recognized holidays, the sign code only applying to holiday decorations when it is a commercial message, the definition being limited, and human powered signs.

Mr. Persson noted the difference between first amendment signage and commercial free speech, answered questions on the signage being twirled or held by a person in the right of way, and stated he has not reviewed the ordinance.

Discussion ensued on whether people can replace tube dudes and hold signage, size of canopy signs, the placement of canopy signs being eight feet from the ground, the size of the canopy signs, not limiting where the canopy is placed, setting a height standard for canopy signs, whether the words "grand opening" should be added to section 86-400(i)(2)a, the special events provision, the distinction between a business grand opening and sales, the current practice with churches who have temporary signage for more than seven days, 1.5 square feet calculation of frontage versus 10% calculation of the front facade, and hedges in front of signage in the VG district.

Mr. Clark explained the goal is that the landscaping does not conflict with the signage, noted issues in the past with trees blocking signage, and that the developer should be aware of landscaping requirements when signage is proposed.

Discussion continued on possibly exempting the area right in front of the signage, code enforcement of overgrown vegetation, and whether another workshop is needed before approving the revisions. There was a consensus of the board not to hold another workshop on this item.

Mr. Pickett broached the subject of non conforming monument signs and queried the board on how to encourage compliance.

Discussion followed on monument signs that are too high, signs without a base or cap, bringing non conforming monument signs into compliance over time, current non conforming signs being grandfathered in until a change in face is made, the need to be consistent with all signage, and murals containing commercial signage.

V. Project and Petition Update

Mr. Pickett reviewed the upcoming petitions and agenda items for October 1 commission meeting.

VI. Audience Participation

Camelle Liakakos, representing Bay Indies, talked about the problem they are having with signage on the promotion of open houses and for sale signs, noted the zoning along Ridgewood Avenue, referenced the section pertaining to private drives off public roads, and confirmed the internal roads in Bay Indies are private.

Mr. Pickett stated the applicable code section would be under real estate and

developers advertising the sale or lease of property.

Ms. Liakakos answered questions regarding code enforcement on signage originating from the Bay Indies Homeowners Association (HOA) and questioned advertising along Ridgewood Avenue.

Mr. Persson noted the code applies to private property, and when the code is in conflict with an HOA document, the city prevails.

VII. Adjournment

There being no further business to come before this Commission, the meeting was adjourned at 3:15 p.m.

Recording Secretary

Chair
