

City of Venice

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

Meeting Minutes Planning Commission

Tuesday, April 4, 2017 1:30 PM Council Chambers

I. Call to Order

A Regular Meeting of the Planning Commission was held this date in Council Chambers at City Hall. Chair Barry Snyder called the meeting to order at 1:31 p.m.

II. Roll Call

There was consensus to excuse Mr. Murphy and Mr. Graser from the meeting.

Present: 4 - Chair Barry Snyder, Helen Moore, Jerry Towery and Charles Newsom

Excused: 3 - Shaun Graser, Tom Murphy and Janis Fawn

Also Present

Liaison Councilmember Kit McKeon, Assistant City Attorney Kelly Fernandez, Development Services Director Jeff Shrum and Assistant City Clerk Heather Taylor.

III. Approval of Minutes

<u>17-2607</u> Minutes of the March 21, 2017 Regular Meeting

A motion was made by Mr. Newsom, seconded by Ms. Moore, that the Minutes of the March 21, 2017 meeting be approved as written.

Discussion took place regarding Item Nos. 17-01AM and 17-2569 needing to be amended to reflect roll call vote.

The motion with the requested changes carried by voice vote unanimously.

IV. Public Hearings

V. 17-2606 COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE - DRAFT PLAN

Staff: Jeff Shrum, AICP, Development Services Director Public Comments Specific to Comprehensive Plan Update

Mr. Shrum commented on scheduling a public hearing for transmittal to city council and reviewed upcoming scheduled meetings and workshops.

Discussion took place regarding the joint meeting with city council to include feedback and comments received.

City of Venice Page 1 of 4

Mr. Shrum discussed revisions to include use of the John Nolen Plan historic district map as a starting point.

Discussion took place regarding inclusion of all properties 50 years and older, procedures for properties that are older than 50 years and outside of the historic district, including a provision that includes the review of properties outside of the historic district, updating the map to remove buildings impacted by construction in the Seaboard area, language to include additional inventory as they arise, language to review architecturally significant buildings not in the historic district, and defining the term "super-majority".

Discussion on Strategy LU 1.4.2 included the verbiage implication on city properties and the need to reference privately owned property.

Ms. Fernandez suggested adding verbiage that annotates what triggers economic viability.

Discussion continued regarding the city's authority to ensure it will evaluate economic viability.

Discussion on Strategy LU 1.4.3 included clarification of the use of "and or" and the desire of the board to use "or".

Mr. Shrum commented on input received from the historic preservation board.

Discussion on Strategy LU 1.2.8 took place on the compatibility review matrix to include the use of the term "incompatible" as a code.

Ms. Fernandez spoke to the use of the term "mitigation" and adjusting the codes to be more study based.

Mr. Shrum requested further discussion with the city attorney to determine more appropriate coding.

Discussion continued regarding different levels of intensity related to government properties.

Discussion on Strategy LU 1.2.18 took place regarding the desire of residents and city council to include a cap on potential density bonuses and length of density bonus validity.

Mr. Shrum spoke to including more clarification on the bonus table to include the bonus cap and responded to board questions regarding monitoring when caps have been met.

Discussion on Strategy LU 1.2.10 took place regarding guidance on areas other than mixed use residential.

Discussion on Strategy LU 1.2.9 took place regarding the use of the verbiage "shall not be denied."

Discussion on Strategy LU 1.2.17 included tracking and the annual review process.

Mr. Shrum provided clarification on the intent of the thresholds applied.

The board reviewed the acronyms and definitions to include placement of the list in the comprehensive plan, verbiage for arterial, collector road, expressway, use of acronyms in the definitions, JPA/ILSBA definition inclusion, references to the Florida Statute in definitions, and verbiage adjustments for "overlay".

Mr. Shrum clarified that the board is okay with use of acronyms in conjunction with more defined definitions.

VI. Audience Participation

James Economides, 1322 Whispering Lane, expressed concern with five units per acre permissible in the comprehensive plan, suggested the replacement of "if" with "soley because" in Strategy LU 1.2.9, noted an error regarding mixed use residential, and questioned whether the matrix governs MU-R's.

Mitze Fiedler, 285 Martellago, suggested including language to address perusing renewable energy in major renovation and new city buildings.

Kathleen Economides, 1322 Whispering Lane, thanked the board and staff for addressing concerns and stated that her concerns were addressed under Mr. Economides' comments.

Dorothy Moore, 1258 Lucaya Ave, spoke to concern with traffic on Pinebrook Road.

Mr. Snyder and staff discussed concerns noted during audience participation, the proposed future land use map, providing clarity on the form based codes to include the mixed use area and on the border, and the addition of mixed use on the matrix.

VII. Comments by Planning Division

Mr. Shrum reminded the board of the April 12, 2017 workshop, and discussed the transmittal public hearing on May 3, 2017 at 1:30 p.m.,

City of Venice Page 3 of 4

and responded to board questions regarding the number of city council workshops expected, review by the state, petitions for the April 18, 2017 meeting, and the end date for applications under the current comprehensive plan.

VIII. Comments by Planning Commission Members

Discussion took place regarding the comprehensive plan timeline after council review.

IX. Adjournment

There being no further business meeting was adjourned at 3:08 p.m.	to	come	before	this	Commission,	the
Chair						
Recording Secretary						

City of Venice Page 4 of 4