



City of Venice

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

Meeting Minutes Planning Commission

Tuesday, May 3, 2022

1:30 PM

Council Chambers

Continuation of April 19, 2022 Meeting

20-24AM

Land Development Regulations and City of Venice Zoning Map Update
Text Amendment (Legislative)

Staff: Roger Clark, AICP, Planning and Zoning Director

Chair Snyder announced this is a legislative hearing, read memorandum regarding advertisement and written communications, and stated this is a continuance of the April 19, 2022 hearing for Text Amendment Petition 20-24 AM, and opened the public hearing.

Chair Snyder announced that the audience would be allowed to participate at the beginning of the hearing.

Ruth Cordner, 246 Montelluna Drive, spoke on land development, Planned Unit Developments (PUDs), and requested the Planning Commission not recommend Land Development Regulations (LDRs) to City Council at this time.

Kenneth Baron, 209 Corelli Drive, spoke regarding meeting procedures, and recommended amending Chapter 87, Section 2.2.4.5.A.4 and provided detail which is included in written correspondence.

Marshall Happer III, 117 Martellago Dr, expressed concerns regarding the LDRs with respect to PUDs in section 86-130 and offered a proposed amendment which is included in written correspondence.

Curt Whittaker, 613 West Venice Avenue, spoke on protecting gopher tortoise, state law, and other species. He was in favor of the ability to form historic districts, and procedures addressing the Planning Commission.

Nancy DeForge, 332 Laurel Hollow Drive, Nokomis, spoke regarding Chapter 87-7 second draft and a title change. She recommended the ability to establish historic districts.

Scott Woodman, 229 Turin Street, restated concerns about clean energy production adjacent to residentially zoned property and recommended amendments which are included in written correspondence.

Gary Scott, 156 Pesaro Drive, spoke against the proposed draft of the LDRs, commercial development, the Comprehensive Plan and recommended limiting building size allowed in a residential PUD.

Jeff Boone, 1001 Avenida Del Circo, recommended not changing the regulations to downtown Venice building heights and gave examples of buildings that were allowed to request an exception.

Planning and Zoning Director Clark presented changes since the last meeting and hearing.

Section 1 Administration to include having a majority for appeal powers over the Zoning Administrator, Certified Local Government (CLG) requirement of appointing new board members, removed vested rights and variances from being required to have a neighborhood workshop, completeness review changed from 15 to 10 business days, change sufficiency to compliance review process, revised language regarding incomplete applications, language revisions regarding annexations, deletion of unnecessary information from application requirements, revised language regarding rezoning in an annexation, language revision from petition to application, clarification of comprehensive plan amendments, map amendments, and text amendments. Also covered were language revision regarding adjacent zoning district expansion, language on maximum development potential regarding availability of public facilities in Planned Development Zoning Amendments, language and revision for architectural elevations.

Planning and Zoning Director Clark presented Section 2 Zoning changes to include revision regarding compatibility buffer in PUDs, definition of "Neighborhood in Scope", PUDs with non-residential and commercial zoning.

Discussion took place regarding commercial use classification table and retail sales and service sizing, downtown edge height exception language revision, blank walls and transparency language revision, Mixed Use and Commercial Use Classification table, drive-through allowances, no changes were recommended to clean energy production and restrictions near residential.

Recess was taken from 3:57 p.m. until 4:06 p.m.

Planning and Zoning Director Clark discussed the recommendation from an architect and recommendation for height by district table, current and proposed maximum heights.

Discussion took place regarding height limitations and options.

There was agreement with staff proposed height restrictions Residential Multi-Family (RMF) 1-4.

Discussion took place regarding Industrial Light Warehouse (ILW) by 45 feet by right, recommend 68 feet maximum.

There was agreement for the staff recommended height maximums for Office, Professional, and Institutional (OPI), Commercial General (CG), Commercial Intensive (CI), ILW, and Government.

Discussion took place regarding non-conforming properties.

There was agreement with Planned Unit Development (PUD), Planned Industrial Development (PID), and Planned Commercial Development (PCD) height recommendations.

There was agreement with downtown building height 35 feet +10 feet conditional use, which is the same as code today.

There was agreement for the Mixed Use Districts height recommendations.

Planning and Zoning Director Clark commented on the airport area, height restrictions, and potential height exceptions.

Discussion took place on cupola definition, added diagram to Section 3.1.1, electric vehicles, multi-family housing with 50 or more parking spaces, commercial or non-residential, regulations, and state guidelines.

Assistant City Manager Clinch commented on electric vehicle charging stations, interest from multi-family housing, and noted it does not make sense for some businesses.

Discussion took place regarding section 4, setbacks, measured from property lines, staff recommended against including the roadway in the setback, and agreement to delete the sentence in 4.2 regarding setbacks including roadway.

It was noted that section 6 had formatting changes only.

Planning and Zoning Director Clark presented comments on section 7 from the state CLG coordinator, national register nominations, survey, and inventory of historic properties.

Discussion took place regarding a Certificate of Demolition, required delay for CLG certification, added captions to ARB, historic districts, reiterated

the 100% property owner approval if creation of historic districts is required, encourage individual homeowners to go on local register, Chapter 89 Environmental, and five acre size for environmental assessment, gopher tortoises protected by state law.

Mr. Boone stated he had 25 client applications on the active petition schedule, expressed concern on the ability of any person to apply for a comprehensive plan amendment, and commented on building heights, setbacks, non-conforming uses, and compatibility.

Tommye Whittaker, 613 West Venice Avenue, expressed concerns about building heights.

Arlene Dooley, 1315 Pinebrook Way Court, expressed concerns about compatibility, and height restrictions in PUDs.

Discussion took place about financial impact to applicant, hardships with variance, animals on properties, who can file an amendment, non conforming structures language revision, and no changes to compatibility section.

Chair Snyder closed the public hearing.

A motion was made by Mr. Willson, seconded by Mr. McKeon, 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 and in compliance with Florida Statutes Chapter 163, Part II, and therefore, recommends to City Council approval of Petition No. 20-24AM, with the corrections and modifications discussed at the meeting today. The motion carried by the following vote:

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