**EXCERPT FROM THE APRIL 16, 2013 REGULAR MEETING OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION**

**4. Comprehensive Plan Amendment Petition No. 12-1CP - Create City of Venice Urban Service Area Boundary - Staff: Scott Pickett, AICP, Senior Planner**

*(3:24)* Chair Snyder read a memorandum dated April 16, 2013, stated no written communications have been received regarding this petition; and opened the public session.

Mr. Pickett reported staff is following direction from city council on the Energy Economic Zone (EEZ), explained the EEZ, that an urban service area has to be established for the EEZ, described the current county EEZ area, stated the county urban service area does not include the entire city, and explained council approved the entire city limits as an EEZ. He displayed the statutory definition of an urban service area, noted the establishment of an urban service area will have no impact on the city's current comprehensive planning program, and listed the number of objectives in the comprehensive plan that support the implementation of the EEZ.

Mr. Pickett gave the highlights of the EEZ program including a brief background, reviewed the goals of the program, the eligibility to participate in the program, the program benefits and incentives, gave the definition of clean technology business and green business, and outlined the energy efficiency standards and the EEZ administration.

Responding to questions, Mark Loveridge, Sarasota County Planning Services, explained the statute is short and set forth criteria for boundaries, stated the city would use the existing county urban service area, displayed a map of the county urban service area that includes the city, confirmed the EEZ applies to commercial and industrial businesses, answered questions on mixed use areas and the city urban service areas in the City of North Port, touched on the service area for the City of Sarasota, and reported the Town of Longboat Key opted out.

Discussion followed on the City of Miami Beach participating in the EEZ, whether there are any success stories in Miami Beach, Sarasota not having any applications to date, the program starting in July 2012, fiscal impacts being small, the concern with no applications thus far in Sarasota, how the business community is notified of the program, the Economic Development Corporation (EDC) promoting the program, the reference in the comprehensive plan, the urban service area being a tool to contain urban growth, and whether the proposed amendment is consistent with the comprehensive plan.

Mr. Minor stated the properties in the JPA are characterized as urban, the text amendment does not contradict the JPA, and answered questions on whether The Bridges project would possibly be a solar farm.

Mr. McKeon left the dais at 3:53 and returned at 3:56 p.m.

Mr. Persson left the dais at 3:56 and returned at 4:07 p.m.

Discussion took place on potential unintended consequences, the state Objections Recommendations and Comments report deeming the city as promoting urban sprawl, the comprehensive plan being corrected, there being no negative consequences of doing the EEZ, designating more than certain pockets of the city in the EEZ, the February 2015 review date of the EEZ pilot program, staff time expended on this venture, and whether the county can extend the urban service area.

Mr. Loveridge responded stating the county did not designate any area in the City of Venice as being eligible for EEZ incentives, the determination of the urban service area was made in Tallahassee with the goal of starting the process in Venice, and noted the designation of the urban service area is specific to Venice in the comprehensive plan.

Mr. Minor confirmed the state has required the city to establish an urban service area to take advantage of the EEZ and answered questions on compatibility.

*(4:05)* Chair Snyder closed the public hearing.

Mr. Murphy moved based on the staff report and the presentation, the Planning Commission, sitting as the local planning agency, finds this request consistent with the Comprehensive Plan and, therefore, recommends to City Council approval of Comprehensive Plan Amendment Petition No. 12-1CP. Seconded by Mr. Shrauger.

Discussion followed on the possible drawbacks or benefits of the program.

ROLL CALL: Mr. Towery, YES; Mr. Graser, YES; Mr. Shrauger, YES; Mr. Williams, YES; Mr. Murphy, YES; Mr. Snyder, NO; Ms. Moore, YES. MOTION CARRIED.