



City of Venice

401 West Venice Avenue
Venice, FL 34285
www.venicegov.com

Meeting Minutes Architectural Review Board

Thursday, March 23, 2017

9:00 AM

Council Chambers

I. Call to Order

A Regular Meeting of the Architectural Review Board was held this date in Council Chambers. Chair Jon Steketee called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m.

II. Roll Call

Present 4 - Jeff Matthews, Jon Barrick, Mark Beebe and Chair Jon Steketee

Absent 3 - Fred Hind, Ruth Ann Dearybury and Greg Novack

Also Present

Liaison Council Member Fred Fraize, Assistant City Attorney David Jackson, Building Official Frank O'Neill, Development Services Director Jeff Shrum, City Clerk Lori Stelzer, and Recording Secretary Mercedes Barcia.

III. Approval of Minutes

[17-2576](#) Minutes of the February 9, 2017 Regular Meeting

A motion was made by Mr. Beebe, seconded by Mr. Barrick, that the Minutes of the February 9, 2017 meeting be approved as written. The motion carried unanimously by voice vote.

IV. Public Hearings

[ARB](#)
[17-0802](#) 512 W VENICE AVE - VENETIAN
Pool Cage Replacement & Pool Equipment Enclosure
Owner: Venice Avenue Condominiums Assn Inc
Staff: Frank O'Neill, Building Official

Mr. Steketee announced this is a quasi-judicial hearing, opened the public hearing, and read memorandum regarding advertisement and written communications.

Mr. Jackson questioned board members concerning ex-parte communications and conflicts of interest. Mr. Matthews spoke on working with the company that submitted the drawings and looking at

the project as a consultant. Mr. Matthews explained this occurred over a year and a half ago and he did not work or receive payment on the project. Mr. Beebe spoke regarding past site visit and project consultation, and noted he did not work on project. Mr. Jackson questioned Mr. Matthews and Mr. Beebe if they can be impartial at this hearing. Mr. Matthews and Mr. Beebe confirmed to be impartial and no conflicts of interest. There were no ex-parte communications since receipt of the application.

Mr. O'Neill, being duly sworn, stated the applicant is requesting approval to replace pool cage and pool equipment enclosure.

David and Robin Marquis, applicants, being duly sworn, spoke on their request to include age of pool and cage, pool area, aluminum cage, square footage of wall, landscaping, surface pavers and color, enclosure size, and aluminum contractor.

Discussion followed regarding cage color, original architect design and site plan, equipment area, pool cage wall, balance panels, landscaping, county grant, building fitting the community's character, street level quality and design, project style, covered area, roof structure, proposed structure around the equipment enclosure, design sketch, screen material, side walls, and roof location inside the screen.

No one signed up to speak.

Mr. Steketee closed the public hearing.

Mr. Barrick spoke regarding the current structure's design, function, and purpose, applicant's proposal, and variance. Discussion followed on equipment enclosure, pool screen, guidelines for screen enclosures, variance, and landscaping.

A motion was made by Mr. Matthews, seconded by Mr. Barrick, to approve ARB 17-0802 as a variance per guidelines with the condition that the proposed equipment structure be heavily landscaped to conceal the mass of it.

Mr. Jackson advised the hearing is not advertised as a variance and will need to be re-advertised and placed on the next meeting agenda.

Discussion followed regarding the motion, public input, applicant's request, and re-advertising hearing as a variance.

Ms. Stelzer provided clarification on notice requirement procedures and noted the application will have to be addressed two meetings from today.

A motion was made by Mr. Matthews, seconded by Mr. Barrick, to continue ARB 17-0802 until all legal notifications are in place. The motion carried unanimously by voice vote.

V. Board Discussion

[17-2577](#)

Review of Historic Preservation Board's Response to the Proposed Comp Plan

Mr. Barrick spoke on the Historic Preservation Board's review of the draft comprehensive plan and their request for revisions and changes in the language, obtaining certified local government, designating historic structures and cultural sites, historic ordinance and including additions to the comprehensive plan, protection of historic structures, presentation to the planning commission, and requesting ARB's support on proposed modifications.

Mr. Matthews spoke regarding fairness to property owners of historical homes, structures in the community meeting historic criteria and building codes, and concern with homeowner costs and affordability.

Discussion followed regarding economic incentives, tax benefits, modifications or renovations to historical homes, surveying properties designated as historic homes, educating the community, permit process, demolition permits, preserving historic homes, code compliance, definition of existing historic structures, John Nolen Plan, structure sizes and expansion of older homes, Department of Interior, having guidelines in the comprehensive plan, keeping historical nature in the community, and help versus demand.

Mr. Shrum noted the Historic Preservation Board's recommendations were submitted to the planning commission for review and comments, and spoke regarding regulatory language and the planning commission determining the historic district in Venice.

Discussion followed on identifying historic cultural areas and structures that are significant in Venice, Mr. Hagler providing a list of properties that are on the national register, John Nolen Plan, comprehensive plan, protecting historic areas and properties, historic districts, control district map, contributing properties to the John Nolen Plan, architectural control district, defining aspects to be protected, policy decisions, pocket parks, and the Seaboard area.

Mr. Beebe left the dais at 10:09 a.m. and did not return.

Discussion ensued on redevelopment of the Seaboard area, planning commission's joint meeting with city council on the comprehensive plan, and revised redline version of draft.

VI. Staff Comments

There were none.

VII. Audience Participation

No one signed up to speak.

VIII. Adjournment

There being no further business to come before this Board, the meeting was adjourned at 10:12 a.m.

Chair

Recording Secretary