



**CITY OF VENICE
DEVELOPMENT SERVICES DEPARTMENT**

MEMORANDUM

TO: Planning Commission Members

FROM: Jeff Shrum, Development Services Director

SUBJECT: Comprehensive Plan Update – Discussion Topics for Plan Revision Considerations.

DATE: March 8, 2017

Included in the packet for the meeting is all of the public correspondence received since January 2017 regarding comments on the draft plan. Although we have been providing this to you at each meeting, I feel it is important for you to see it all again for your consideration at the meeting of March 13 as well as the follow up meeting on March 22, 2017. Reading through these comments, some will seem familiar to comments we heard from initial input in 2015/2016 meetings and some we are just now hearing based on public input from 2017 meetings. A few of the familiar topics include comments that the Plan should: allow for no or much less growth, protect/preserve existing undeveloped lands. Other significant comment topics indicate: the need for more emphasis on the historic preservation aspect of the Plan, concern over the extent of development going on around/outside of the City, and concerns over the proposed mixed use aspects of the Plan for both residential and non-residential mixed use (this topic was brought up by written correspondence as well as through meetings with the Pinebrook South HOA). Again all of the comments received are included for your review.

The following topics are proposed as a starting point for discussion and consideration:

1. Historic Preservation (see Strategies LU 1.4.1 Historically Significant Structures, LU 1.4.2 Preserving the Nolen Plan Layout, LU-IS 1.1.1. Historic Preservation, LU-IS 1.1.2 Preserve Existing Structures, LU-IS 1.1.3 Historic Resources Inventory, LU-GW 1.1.1 Redevelopment, LU-EV 1.1.1 Redevelopment):
 - a. New Map (Proposed Historic District Map) – should an historic district map be developed to replace the previously discussed Map LU3 – which was to identify potential historic resources within the City by indicating properties with structures 50 years or older. See Strategy LU 1.4.1.
 - b. Should there be more clarity in the Plan to guide the subsequent Development Review procedures/criteria for development/redevelopment on any property within the “historic district”.
 - c. Delineation of historic district – consider potential impact the Seaboard Mixed Use Area.
 - d. The City “shall” pursue the Certified Local Government designation. See LU-IS 1.1.2 E.

- e. Further emphasis of tax incentive program. Are there other incentives? See Strategy LU 1.4.1 Historically Significant Structures.
 - f. Consider relocating language to the City wide for much of the historic preservation language to minimize confusion to the reader and provide a clear link to any associated strategies in the neighborhoods (location is confusing). See Intent and Strategies associated with Intent LU 1.4.
2. Carrying Capacity (spreadsheets): two spreadsheets have been provided by the consultant. One is a summary of the comparison of the maximum potential buildout between the current plan and the proposed plan, and the second table provides a much more detailed comparison for each future land use district for the current plan and the proposed plan by acreage, density, and intensity (square foot). Of note is the lack of clarity in the current plan for minimum and maximums for residential and non-residential (compare planning areas in the current plan to mixed use areas in the proposed plan). See Background, page 9.
3. Mixed Use:
- a. Mixed Use Residential:
 - i. Existing Older Planned Unit Developments (PUD)
 - 1. Aston Gardens and adjacent PUD properties: the approved zoning is higher than 5 units per acre.
 - 2. Capri Isle
 - 3. Bird Bay
 - 4. Village of Venice
 - 5. Pinebrook South
 - ii. Discuss the unique situation of the Sawgrass Subdivision.
 - iii. Non-Residential Component: does the proposed Plan allow non-residential where none exist today. (see Strategy LU 1.2.9.e Residential bullet #5)
 - iv. Need to ensure there is a cross reference for MUR Future Land Use and in the neighborhoods.
 - v. Existing PUD zoning – establishes development potential for the Mixed Use Residential. Consideration for revisions to the Plan for Mixed Use Residential to require a comprehensive plan amendment for changes to existing PUD developments (reference LU 1.2.12a Maximum Thresholds).
 - 1. Should we provide unique standards for specific existing PUD developments to require a comprehensive plan amendment for changes (mentioned at Pinebrook HOA meeting)?
 - b. Mixed Use Corridor (see Strategy LU 1.2.16 Mixed Use Development Transitions): Issue is external boundaries for the mixed use areas (compatibility standards – should the Plan provide further direction/detail for form based codes/regulations to address external boundaries to the Mixed Use areas to minimize concerns for compatibility).
4. Pinebrook Park (preserve): Map Change
- a. Change future land use for northern parcel of land to Conservation – input received at the February 21, 2017 meeting.
 - b. Ensure conservation language (to not create a use conflict) recognizes existing parking other infrastructure for the park in the southern portion of this parcel.
5. Transition (see Transition Section of Plan page 18):
- a. Provide better introduction to the transition section and how it will be utilized during the development of the land development code and the intent to update the Plan for these topics upon development of the land development code (comments included concern over the lack of commitment and direction for the land development code update).
 - b. Should other transition language from the existing plan be added? Comments such as: a fear there will be no or non-effective compatibility standards.

- c. Discuss language/need to update the Plan upon development of land development standards to ensure the Plan will continue to address compatibility.
- 6. Land Use:
 - a. Implementing zoning districts. Should the PUD zoning be allowed in other future land use districts (would it be counterproductive to the purpose and intent of Mixed Use Residential?) See Strategy LU 1.2.3 Residential, LU 1.2.4. Non-Residential, LU 1.2.9 Mixed Use.
 - b. Building Height: comment received that they believe that all protections for building height have been removed (see transition language). See Strategy LU 4.1.1.
- 7. Miscellaneous:
 - a. Ideas/suggestions for the cover of the Plan.
 - b. Acronym page and definitions must be added to the Plan.
 - c. Map amendment discussion: Laurel Road properties west of I-75 and north of Laurel Road. Should we consider reducing the mixed use area to provide mixed use land use in the front half and residential land use (moderate or other) on the rear half?
 - d. Governmental Uses: current draft restricts the location of governmental uses. Should it be a use allowed in other districts by right or require amendment? Schools, city office buildings, fire stations, police stations, etc.. These types of uses are not defined as essential services, which are allowed in all districts.
 - e. Discuss Strategy LU 1.2.20 Reserve Density and Intensity: concerns over implementation by the City Attorney.
 - f. Fix typos and maximize formatting and referencing for readability.
 - g. Discuss mixed use designation for “The Bridges” development or should it be mixed use residential with specific allowances recognizing their existing zoning approvals?
- 8. Other: Staff will continue to review for other issues.