


# 23-13RZ– Sawgrass Zoning Map Amendment Staff Report



## GENERAL INFORMATION


<b>Address:</b>	Generally the west side of N. Auburn Rd. between E. Venice Ave. and Edmonson/Border Rd.
<b>Request:</b>	To rezone the Sawgrass community from Sarasota County Residential Single Family (RSF-2) with a Planned Unit Development (PUD) Overlay to City of Venice PUD
<b>Owners:</b>	Multiple
<b>Applicant:</b>	City of Venice
<b>Parcel IDs:</b>	Multiple
<b>Parcel Size:</b>	316± acres
<b>Future Land Use:</b>	Mixed Use Residential (MUR)
<b>Zoning:</b>	Existing: Residential Single Family (RSF-2), PUD Overlay Proposed: Planned Unit Development (PUD)
<b>Comprehensive Plan Neighborhood:</b>	Pinebrook
<b>Application Date:</b>	March 21, 2023

## I. PROJECT DESCRIPTION

When the Sawgrass community was annexed into the City of Venice years ago, it was never officially rezoned. Thus, it currently carries a Sarasota County zoning designation of Residential Single Family (RSF-2), with a Planned Unit Development (PUD) overlay. The City of Venice is initiating a Zoning Map Amendment to bring the zoning into compliance with the City's Comprehensive Plan.

The proposed Zoning Map Amendment for the Sawgrass community would change the designation of the subject 316+ acre development from Sarasota County RSF-2/PUD to City of Venice Planned Unit Development (PUD). This will be accomplished through adoption of a Binding Master Plan. It is important to note that no changes are being proposed as a result of this rezoning and the proposed Binding Master Plan will memorialize setbacks, open space and other standards that currently exist in the community.

### Aerial Photo





**Site Photographs**



Edmonson Rd. entrance



Main entrance, looking south on N. Auburn Rd.



Main entrance along N. Auburn Rd.




Southernmost N. Auburn Rd. entrance


## Future Land Use and Zoning

The Future Land Use designation for the subject property is Mixed Use Residential (MUR). The Zoning district is Sarasota County Single Family Residential (RSF-2/PUD), as shown on the maps below. The proposal is to rezone to the City of Venice district of Planned Unit Development (PUD).

### Future Land Use




### Zoning





## Zoning, Proposed



## Surrounding Land Uses

Direction	Existing Land Uses(s)	Current Zoning District(s)	Future Land Use Map Designation(s)
North	Waterford	PUD	MUR
South	Fountain View; Auburn Lakes	Residential Multifamily (RMF-2); RMF-3	Medium Density Residential
East	Residential, vacant; Single family detached; Radio/television utility; Courtside Tennis Club; Jewish Community Center of Venice; Church; Drainage reservoir; Fox Lea Farm; Agricultural grazing land	<u>County:</u> Open Use Estate (OUE-1); Open Use Rural (OUR); Residential, Estate (RE) <u>City:</u> Office, Professional, and Institutional (OPI); Commercial (CM); Open Use Estate (OUE-1) (within City limits but retains County zoning)	<u>County:</u> Moderate Density Residential; Low Density Residential <u>City:</u> Institutional-Professional; Commercial; Low Density Residential; Medium Density Residential
West	Capri Isles	PUD	MUR

# Binding Master Plan



## II. PLANNING ANALYSIS

In this section of the report, analysis of the subject zoning map amendment petition evaluates 1) consistency with the Comprehensive Plan, 2) compliance with the City's Land Development Code (LDC), and 3) compliance with requirements for Concurrency/Mobility.

### 1) Consistency with the Comprehensive Plan

#### Land Use Element

**Strategy LU 1.2.16.6(a) – Mixed Use Residential (MUR).** The subject property has an existing Comprehensive Plan Future Land Use designation of MUR, which allows a maximum of 5% nonresidential uses throughout the PUD. There are no existing commercial uses and they will be prohibited through this petition.

#### Open Space Element

The Code requires designated open space in a PUD to be restricted “by appropriate legal instrument satisfactory to the city attorney as open space perpetually, or for a period of not less than 99 years” (Ch. 87, Sec. 2.2.4.4.D.). No changes are proposed to the existing open space through this rezoning. A stipulation is included consistent with the above code requirement.

**Strategy OS 1.11.1 – Mixed Use Residential District Requirements.** As previously described, the proposal is compliant with the requirement for a minimum of 50% open space, although it provides a total of 60%. Of that total percentage 16.3%± is Functional Open Space and 43.1%± is Conservation Open Space. This satisfies the Comprehensive Plan requirement for a minimum of 10% functional and 20% conservation.

#### Pinebrook Neighborhood

**Strategy LU-PB 1.1.1 Neighborhood Open Space Protection.** The City shall require that functional and conservation open spaces within existing residential developments including those zoned Planned Unit Development (PUD) be protected from redevelopment and infill development which may negatively affect their use. Reduction and or elimination of open spaces developed consistent with the underlying PUD zoning shall not be supported by the City. No redevelopment or infill development is proposed through this rezoning.

No other elements or strategies in the Pinebrook Neighborhood were identified as specifically relevant to the subject proposal.

#### ***Conclusions/Findings of Fact (Consistency with the Comprehensive Plan):***

Analysis has been provided to determine consistency with the Land Use Element strategies applicable to the Mixed Use Residential land use designation, strategies found in the Pinebrook Neighborhood, and other plan elements. This analysis should be taken into consideration upon determining Comprehensive Plan consistency.

### 2) Compliance with the Land Development Code

The subject petition has been processed with the procedural requirements contained in Ch. 87, Sec. 1.7 of the Land Development Code (LDC). In addition, the petition has been reviewed by the City's Technical Review Committee and no issues regarding compliance with the LDC were identified.

#### **Decision Criteria (Section 1.7.4)**

1. Whether the amendment is compatible with the existing development pattern and the zoning of nearby properties.  
Applicant Response: As the amendment makes no visible changes to Sawgrass, it will be compatible with the existing development pattern and the zoning of nearby properties.

2. Changes in land use or conditions upon which the original zoning designation was based.  
Applicant Response: No changes in land use are proposed through this amendment.
3. Consistency with all applicable elements of the Comprehensive Plan.  
Applicant Response: Analysis of consistency with the Comprehensive Plan is provided in this report.
4. Conflicts with existing or planned public improvements.  
Applicant Response: The proposal does not conflict with existing or planned public improvements.
5. Availability of public facilities, analyzed for the proposed development (if any) or maximum development potential, and based upon a consideration of the following factors:
  - a. Impact on the traffic characteristics related to the site.  
Applicant Response: No impact on traffic will result from this change.
  - b. Impact on population density or development intensity such that the demand for schools, sewers, streets, recreational areas and facilities, and other public facilities and services are affected.  
Applicant Response: As the development is essentially built out, there will be no impact on population density or development intensity to alter demand for schools, sewers, streets, recreational areas and facilities, and other public facilities and services.
  - c. Impact on public facilities currently planned and funded to support any change in density or intensity pursuant to the requirements of the Comprehensive Plan and applicable law.  
Applicant Response: No change in density or intensity is proposed through this proposal.
6. Effect on health, safety and welfare of the neighborhood and City.  
Applicant Response: There is no discernable effect on the health, safety and welfare of the neighborhood or the City from this proposal.
7. Conformance with all applicable requirements of this LDR.  
Applicant Response: This proposal is in conformance with all applicable requirements of the LDR.
8. Potential expansion of adjacent zoning districts.  
Applicant Response: This proposal will not result in any potential expansion of adjacent zoning districts.
9. Findings of the Environmental Assessment Report, consistent with Chapter 89.  
Applicant Response: As this property is already developed and is simply going through a zoning map amendment, no environmental assessment report was necessary.
10. Any other applicable matters pursuant to this LDR, the Comprehensive Plan or applicable law.  
Applicant Response: There are no other applicable matters pursuant to this LDR, the Comprehensive Plan or applicable law.

**Summary Staff Comment:** This amendment is proposed to memorialize the existing standards in the Sawgrass community. No other changes are intended through this request and no development is anticipated.

### **Unified Control**

Due to the fact that the City is the applicant for the amendment and the property is already developed, the requirement of unified control is irrelevant. No rights are being taken away, and the community is being approved as it currently exists. In fact, this rezoning will provide additional protections for the property, especially the open space. This is merely the correction of a long-standing issue regarding County zoning designations on property within the City limits of Venice.

### **Binding Master Plan**

Consistent with Code requirements in Ch. 87, Sec. 1.7.3, a Binding Master Plan has been submitted. The proposed PUD zoning provides standards to maintain the subject property in its current state, as no changes are being proposed through this request.



***Conclusions/Findings of Fact (Compliance with the Land Development Code):***

Analysis has been provided by staff to determine compliance with the standards of the land development code. The subject petition complies with all applicable standards and there is sufficient information on the record to reach a finding for each of the rezoning considerations contained in Ch. 87, Sec. 1.7.4 of the Land Development Code.

**3) Public Facilities Concurrency**

The applicant is not requesting confirmation of concurrency as part of the proposed Zoning Map Amendment and no development is being proposed through this request. However, the request was reviewed by the City's Technical Review Committee (TRC) and no issues were identified regarding facilities capacity.

***Conclusion/Findings of Fact (Public Facilities Concurrency):***

As indicated, the applicant is not seeking confirmation of concurrency with the subject application. However, the proposed zoning map amendment was reviewed by the City's Technical Review Committee (TRC) and no issues were identified regarding facilities capacity.

**4) Transportation/Mobility**

No development is being proposed through this request. The Sawgrass community is essentially built-out. Thus no transportation changes are anticipated.

***Conclusion/Findings of Fact (Transportation/Mobility):***

No traffic analysis has been provided for this request as no development is being proposed.

**Staff Stipulation Recommendation:**

Consistent with Section 2.2.4.4.D. of the City Code of Ordinances, all land designated as open space in the Sawgrass PUD at the time of the approval of Petition 23-13RZ shall be restricted to open space perpetually, or for a period of not less than 99 years, within sixty (60) days of such approval through an executed legal instrument signed by all owners of land identified as open space. Such instrument shall be binding upon such owners, their successors and assigns and shall constitute a covenant running with the land, and be in recordable form.

**III. CONCLUSION**

Upon review of the petition and associated documents, Comprehensive Plan, Land Development Code, Staff Report and analysis, and testimony provided during the public hearing, there is sufficient information on the record to make a decision on Zoning Map Amendment Petition No. 23-13RZ.