

**From:** [Edwin Martin](#)  
**To:** [Planning Commission](#); [City Council](#)  
**Subject:** Easy solution to making affordable housing available to City employees, others.  
**Date:** Thursday, April 21, 2022 2:31:14 PM

---

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

“As Sarasota rents continue to cost an arm and a leg, the city is going to look into a zoning practice that could boost the number of affordable housing units in the city limits.

The practice is known as inclusionary zoning, and it’s used in cities from Cambridge, Massachusetts, to Miami.

If inclusionary zoning were implemented in the city of Sarasota, developers would be required to set aside some units in a building or complex as affordable units when they build in a certain area or areas of the city. The developer would be given incentives for providing these units.” SHT.

I have suggested this approach to Venice, so far no response. Example, Venice allowed approved a 300 unit condo project on Laurel Road, near the Middle School, to increase to 400 rental units. I suggested reserving 10 percent as affordable, not in separate building. There is no “Taking “ here the 400 units were never approved or contemplated. This could have been a voluntary change as an incentive for increase.

It would require an ordinance to make this a formal policy as many jurisdictions, large and small have done. Take Santa Clara, all new developments, single or multiple have a percentage set aside as “affordable.” If Sarasota City, County, Venice, other local municipalities did this, workers and others could afford to live here.

Ed Martin

## Please provide what specific area or comments regarding Land Development Regulations Update

1. What is your first and last name?

Gary Scott

**2. Where can we e-mail a response?**

marygaryscott@gmail.com

3. What is your phone number?

(307) 630-3624

**\*4. General or specific comments:**

The stated intent of 2.2.4.4 regarding planned districts open spaces is to assure adequate management measures will be provided in residential developments to perpetually maintain all common open space. 2.2.4.4A. The intention is good, but all meaningful management measures that existed in the first draft of the LDR have been redlined out. The open spaces within a residential PUD are now absolutely unprotected. The only thing that now remains in this section is the stated intention. There are no substantive provisions in the second draft. Please take a look at this. Apparently the management measures that were in the first draft were not acceptable to someone, but they have to be replaced with something for this section to mean anything at all.

**From:** [Gary Scott](#)  
**To:** [Planning Commission](#)  
**Subject:** Venice Planning Commission  
**Date:** Thursday, April 7, 2022 7:56:43 AM

---

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

First, thank you for all of your hard work in regard to updating the LDR. I have comments to make in regard to two of the sections of the second draft. At the meeting on April 5 there was no discussion about the substantial red lining of the first draft of section 2.2.4.4 relating to open spaces in planned districts. The stated intent of that section is to assure adequate management measures will be provided in residential developments to perpetually maintain all common open space. The intention is good, but all management measures that existed in the first draft of the LDR were redlined out. The open spaces within a residential PUD are now totally unprotected. The management provisions that were in the first draft if they were found to be objectionable need to be replaced with something. As the second draft now exists it is only a statement of intention, nothing more. There is no meat on the bones.

My second comment relates to the PUD section. Please consider giving greater protection for the homeowners within a residential PUD against the traffic and noise that would come with a commercial development within the PUD. Consider limiting the size of any one retail building within a PUD to something less than the 40,000 square feet that currently exists in the zoning use table. The question was asked at the meeting whether anyone had a problem with limiting a building to that size, but there was not a question as to whether anyone believed there should be more of a limitation. A 40,000 square foot building is very large, is designed to serve regionally, and does not belong in the middle of a residential neighborhood. A commercial building of that size belongs in an area zoned commercial. The purpose of commercial zone is to place some distance between where people live and where significant commercial activity takes place. We should honor that ideal. Thank you for your consideration. Gary Scott

**From:** [naomi voit](#)  
**To:** [City Council](#); [Planning Commission](#)  
**Subject:** Development has destroyed our paradise  
**Date:** Thursday, April 14, 2022 7:59:50 PM

---

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

I refer to a letter to the editor in the April 14 Herald Tribune (Sarasota) from Michael Fradkin, Sarasota.

Mr Fradkin and his wife moved to Sarasota 20 years ago when a common greeting was "just another beautiful day in paradise." Mr. Fradkin's paradise has disappeared and it is no secret why - "what with the traffic, noise, and overdevelopment extant in (our) community."

Those of us who moved to Venice for our days in paradise pray that living in Venice will remain paradise. I hope that the high rise buildings under construction at Fisherman's Wharf do not portend what the future of Venice will look like.

Please don't let Venice become what Sarasota has turned into.

Naomi Voit

Hi. My name is Scott Woodman and I have signed the Speakers Card.

I am here as a resident to participate in today's Public Hearing and propose some minor amendments to the draft Chapter 87 Section 2 Zoning Code and referenced Chapter 87- Section 3 Development Standards that are presented by City Staff.

My residence is located to the south and adjacent to the Venice Community Center and Cultural Campus along Turin Street. It is currently zoned as "Mixed Use" and will be rezoned as "GOV" or "Government" in the new zoning district.

My primary amendments are related to the Government zoning district permitted uses and conditional uses when adjacent to residential zoned districts, like my specific situation will be.

In 2016, my neighbors and I participated in several contentious public hearings with the City and FPL before the City Council following the ongoing installation of solar arrays as shade canopies in the south parking lot of the Community Center and adjacent to our residentially zoned single family neighborhood. The outcome of these hearings was that the City Council agreed that such solar arrays were incompatible with the community and voted to remove them.

After reviewing the draft Section 2 Zoning Code and referenced Section 3 Development Standards, there are several "permitted uses" and "conditional uses" in the Government zoning district that would or could reintroduce similar "Clean Energy Production" use conflicts (such as solar arrays or other visually objectionable like accessory structures) that would not be consistent with the determinations made by the City Council and residents back in 2016 that such solar arrays were incompatible with the community and voted to remove them.

In keeping with this precedence, please consider the following proposed amendments to the draft Chapter 87 Section 2 Zoning Code and referenced

Chapter 87- Section 3 Development Standards. The proposed amendments include:

1. For Chapter 87 Section 2 Zoning Code Sub-Section 2.2.3.E.3 (page 17) for Accessory Uses in Government Use (GOV) – requesting that solar arrays and clean energy production (see Sub-Section 2.4.8.G) be a prohibited use when adjacent to residential zoning districts.
2. For Chapter 87 Section 2 Zoning Code Sub-Section 2.2.7 (page 47) for the Traditional District Use Table where “Clean Energy Production” in Government Use (GOV) is listed as a “Conditional Use” – requesting that footnote can be added to the table to prohibit Clean Energy Production when adjacent to residential zoned districts.
3. For Chapter 87 Section 2 Zoning Code Sub-Section 2.4.8.G.4 for Clean Energy Production (pages 143 – 144) Exclusions – requesting that an additional exclusion to prohibit Clean Energy Production uses in Government Use zoned districts when adjacent to residential zoned districts.
4. For Chapter 87 Section 3 Development Standards Code Sub-Sections 3.1.9.A and 3.1.9.B.7 (page 15) – requesting that solar arrays and clean energy production (as defined in Sub-Section 2.4.8.G) be a prohibited use when adjacent to residential zoning districts.

I believe these minor amendments to the draft Zoning Code and Development Standards Code will provide consistency with previous actions taken by the City Council in 2016 to help protect the residential community from uses at the Community Center and Cultural Campus that were not compatible.

Thank you for this opportunity to come here today and provide important input to these proposed code changes and for your consideration for these proposed minor amendments.

**From:** [Tom McMurray V](#)  
**To:** [Lisa Olson](#)  
**Subject:** Fwd: LDR Update Public Hearing (20-24AM)  
**Date:** Tuesday, April 19, 2022 12:10:51 PM

---

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

Dear Ms. Olson,

I apologize for the spelling error in your email address!

All the best,  
Tom McMurray

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

**From:** Tom McMurray V <[tjmacthe5th@gmail.com](mailto:tjmacthe5th@gmail.com)>  
**Date:** Tue, Apr 19, 2022 at 8:57 AM  
**Subject:** LDR Update Public Hearing (20-24AM)  
**To:** <[lolsen@venicefl.gov](mailto:lolsen@venicefl.gov)>  
**Cc:** <[kmichaels@venicefl.gov](mailto:kmichaels@venicefl.gov)>

Dear Ms. Olson:

We appreciate the intent of the draft LDR and the time and resources dedicated to the process.

Both written correspondence and workshop communication refer to expanded possibilities and wider range of uses for Seaboard property owners but questions and concerns about potential restrictions on permitted uses as a result of the zoning changes remain.

Thank you.

Best regards,

Tom McMurray