

MINUTES OF A JOINT MEETING BETWEEN
VENICE CITY COUNCIL AND
PLANNING COMMISSION
VENICE, FLORIDA

MARCH 4, 2014

A Joint Meeting of the City Council and Planning Commission was held this date at the Venice Community Center. Mayor Holic called the meeting to order at 1:30 p.m.

I. ROLL CALL

The following elected officials and committee members were present: Mayor John Holic, Vice Mayor Bob Daniels and Councilmembers Jim Bennett, Jeanette Gates, Kit McKeon, and Dave Sherman; Planning Commission members Chair Barry Snyder, John Williams, Helen Moore, Tom Murphy, Charles Newsom, Shaun Graser, and Jerry Towery.

Also present: City Manager Edward Lavallee, City Clerk Lori Stelzer, City Attorney Dave Persson, Planning Director Jeff Shrum, Senior Planner Scott Pickett, and Planner Roger Clark.

II. DISCUSSION TOPICS

- 14-0443** Update to the Comprehensive Plan and Land Development Regulations
a. Discussion on the Status of These Two Major Planning Items

Council and planning commission members offered comments relative to updating the comprehensive plan and land development regulations, specifically the order of completion and receiving input from the community.

Discussion followed on status of updates, condensing the document into a more manageable size, interpretations of existing language, need for concepts in the comprehensive plan being included in the Land Development Regulations (LDRs), conflicting language in the comprehensive plan and LDRs, prioritization, staffing needs, revenue from various taxes, compliance sometimes can be in conflict with visions, adherence to existing laws, planning areas, and use of consultants.

Mr. Shrum stated the overall purpose of the comprehensive plan, and noted the plan should cover ten years, should be useable with clear interpretation and implementation, and the process allows for one year to complete once a letter is submitted stating the plan is being updated.

Discussion ensued on staff resources, planning commission's designation as local planning agency, related costs being submitted to council, decisions being based on legality, consistency with applicant selection, strategic direction, the John Nolen plan, the process for amending the comprehensive plan, and North Venice developmental needs regarding a town center, satellite services, and infrastructure, LDR implementation, staff recommendations regarding approval/disapproval of projects, the city's vision for the future of northern Venice, removal of

outdated and/or repetitive information in the comprehensive plan, reviewed zoning categories, applying mitigation factors to development, connectivity for biking and walking, and east/west connector roads.

Recess was taken from 3:15 p.m. until 3:26 p.m.

- 14-0444** Rezone Petition/Process/Regulations
- a. Challenges/Difficulties Presented in Review of the Various Planned Unit Development (PUD) and the Commercial Mixed Use (CMU) Zoning Districts

Mr. Snyder provided background information on the increase of planned development with regards to the requirement of a master plan, and spoke to the need for clarity on the level of detail required on master plans.

Discussion followed on flexibility for the applicant, staff flexibility, effect of economy, connectivity, and zoning, the need to look at each development independently, and transit and multi-modal options.

- 14-0445** Discussion on Expectations of the Planning Commission in Relation to the City's Strategic Plan

Mayor Holic stated there has been three meetings on strategic planning, there is a need for a more useable format, noted that council does not know the final results yet and may need to focus more on long term results, and suggested asking Rollins College for a report on their observations of Venice.

Discussion followed on the John Nolen Plan, resources that could be provided by the Florida League of Cities, the relationship between the strategic planning goals and the comprehensive plan, the need to use collective discussion as a benchmark for comprehensive plan updates, partnerships with Sarasota County and municipalities, the need for new urbanism, gated communities, integration with surrounding jurisdictions, and moratoriums.

Mr. Clark spoke to the amenities in Venice, community support, and stated focus should be on connectivity.

III. AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION

Jeff Boone, city resident, stated the idea of moratorium will discourage young people to return to Venice, pointed out the discussions should be of regular districts as well as planned districts, spoke to the 2050 development concept, opined new urbanism communities are fantastic, suggested drafting the comprehensive plan by taking what is required in the Florida Statutes for comprehensive plans and adding to it as needed, noted the joint planning agreement with the county, referenced previous controversy over the downtown parking lot, and referred to new residents and development and their impact on the city.

Pat Wayman, 3071 Border Road, stated the vision of the city is important, questioned regarding future population of the city, city owned land, overbuilding versus gridlock of a community, opined the city has not spent enough time on flooding in regards to development, legal does not mean desirable, stated zoning changes are not a guarantee, and expressed concern about public notification.

John Moeckel, 181 Treviso Court, stated he moved to Venice for the small town atmosphere, beach location, and the airport, he does not want the bigger communities in northeast Venice to turn into Naples, and he would like Venice to stay a small town with connectivity.

Mr. McKeon stated the city has no interest in a moratorium, there will be no significant change to the comprehensive plan without public input.

IV. ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business to come before the Council and Commission, the meeting was adjourned at 4:30 p.m.

ATTEST:

Mayor – City of Venice

City Clerk