

Additional Written Correspondence

From 3/20/17 to current date

JoAnne Brewer

From: Lori Stelzer
Sent: Monday, March 20, 2017 1:18 PM
To: JoAnne Brewer; Jeff Shrum
Subject: FW: Affordable Housing . the Test
Attachments: Letter to Herald Tribune.pdf

From: Carl De aloe <carldealoe@yahoo.com>
Sent: Friday, March 17, 2017 2:51:29 PM
To: earle.kimel@heraldtribune.com; John Holic; Richard Cautero; Robert Daniels; Jeanette Gates; Deborah Anderson; Kit McKeon; Fred Fraize; Jeff Shrum; Scott Pickett
Cc: Susan
Subject: Affordable Housing . the Test

Please find attached an open letter concerning the Affordable Housing Test Case for Venice. I feel all points are valid and should be read in the serious vein that this important issue deserves.

I thank you in advance for your attention in this matter of high regard to all citizens of Venice.

Susan Taylor

ontheporch4231@comcast.net

Need to Report an Issue? SeeClickFix Venice Connect is available as an app for Android and iPhone. Select SeeClickFix from your app store on your device and choose Venice, Florida. There is also a link to the program on the city's website, www.venicegov.com, or go directly to SeeClickFix at <http://www.seeclickfix.com/Venice>

PLEASE NOTE: This agency is a public entity and is subject to Chapter 119, Florida Statutes, concerning public records. Email communications are covered under such laws; therefore, email sent or received on this entity's computer system, including your email address, may be disclosed to the public and media upon request. If you do not want your email address released to a public records request, do not send electronic mail to this entity. Instead, contact this office by phone or in writing.

Need to Report an Issue? SeeClickFix Venice Connect is available as an app for Android and iPhone. Select SeeClickFix from your app store on your device and choose Venice, Florida. There is also a link to the program on the city's website, www.venicegov.com, or go directly to SeeClickFix at <http://www.seeclickfix.com/Venice>

PLEASE NOTE: This agency is a public entity and is subject to Chapter 119, Florida Statutes, concerning public records. Email communications are covered under such laws; therefore, email sent or received on this entity's computer system, including your email address, may be disclosed to the public and media upon request. If you do not want your email address released to a public records request, do not send electronic mail to this entity. Instead, contact this office by phone or in writing.

RECEIVED

MAR 20 2017

PLANNING & ZONING

From:

Sent: Friday, March 17, 2017 2:08 PM

To: earle.kimel@heraldtribunecom; jholic@venicegov.com; rcautero@venicegov.com; rdaniels@venicegov.com; jgates@venicegov.com; danderson@venicegov.com; kmckeon@venicegov.com; ffraize@venicegov.com; jshrum@venicegov.com; spickett@venicegov.com

Subject: Affordable Housing- The Test

Importance: High

Mr. Kimel, I thought your article in the Herald today was very detailed and interesting on the proposed affordable housing **test case** in Venice. But I also thought it should be Part 1 of several articles showing all sides to this "**test case**" in our backyard. Mr. Pinto started his message at the meeting by showing us "dots" of housing and the % of housing in metro areas. Well, I am also a dot and I chose not to live in a metro area. Please read this rather long point by point message showing concerns of so many. ***I also addressed this to our council and mayor. Debates are healthy and perhaps each side can learn from the other when done with an open mind.*** Some of the glaring comments made at the meeting by the visionary for this project Mr. Pinto (who also stated he has never done a project like this) has left many thoughts to ponder and questions to be answered:

- Although it was stated that this is not government subsidized *it is* employer subsidized. So, if you are fired what happens to your "break in the rent"? Would this be a tool for the employer to hold over the employee? Make your employees beholding to the company?
- If this "**test case**" doesn't work and employers pull out of the deal, what happens to the apartments?
- Isn't lowering the impact fees a government subsidy just under another name?
- The statements that workers have to take a bus or drive round trip 21 miles to get to work is a hollow argument as we all worked hard, commuted to work without the need of our company to put are homes in their backyard. Employees took jobs knowing they have a commute.
- I would love to live on Lido Key or sit on my patio and look at the ocean, but I live where I can afford to live, in a neighborhood where I am comfortable with the lifestyle. A small life off the "island" but one which took many years to accomplish. And yes, I started with entry level positions.
- Due to the fact that workers get a break living in one of the apartments subsidized by their company, would it not discourage workers to find better, high paying jobs because they lose this "break"? Would they have to move to make room for a subsidized employee to have the apartment?
- At the meeting, Mr. Pinto's constant comparison to affordable motels and Northport's problems were a waste of time better spent on answering questions without becoming a heated argument. I stayed at affordable hotels that would never be in my future again. If I wanted to live in Northport, I would have moved to Northport. But I moved to North Venice which now seems like a smoke and mirror deal with no knowledge of the changing population that has been in the planning.
- With the discouragement of renters to own cars (stated many times), isn't it unfair for any working person who is not privileged to work at any of the surrounding Knight Trail companies that would live there (if any apartments would be left from Tervis and PGT) to own a car to get to work? What happens if you realize you need a car, your rate goes up?
- The use of Uber for workers to get "around town" and do errands was laughable.

- How do workers and families go to the library, beaches, restaurants downtown festivals and shopping? How does one say that they "discourage" people to have the right to a car by giving them a lower rate for rent or make them pay for parking (the same thing just phrased differently)? Seems a little "big brother" to make that kind of statement. Has anyone looked into the legality of this type of thinking?
- There was a double sided comment when Mr. Pinto kept speaking of all the restaurant workers, nurses and teachers in the area who can't afford housing yet stated that they were trying to generate enough support from PGT, Tervis, and Knights Trail companies that the housing would be filled with area workers on Knight Trails. So his broad scope just narrowed!
- What about the service people working on the "Island"? The entire gist of the meeting was service workers, nurses and teachers.... Perhaps affordable housing on the Island is a better test case. Workers would be closer to the beach (after a long week of work who doesn't love the beach?), close to their work (restaurants, city workers and hospital employees, and can walk to Publix and downtown festivals without the need for Uber or a bus to downtown. (ok you can all stop smiling at that one)
- **If this is a test case why not stay with the lower density and see if the test passes or fails?**
- Has anyone done a study on the impact it would have for home values in the area (not a pleasant subject but all the same a truthful one). How many of the people voting for this higher density rezoning live in the area? Or are the studies done for the benefit of the companies on Knights Trail without regard to the surrounding population?
- The figure of 35 children entering into the nearby schools was based on what? How do you know who is going to live there? Have plans already been made without the rezoning or is the rezoning already a done deal and just a public formality? The comment they could go to private schools (made by Mr. Pinto) was again laughable if were not so wrong. Building playgrounds on site means more children. With the discouragement of their parents owning cars, how do they get to after school practices? Birthday parties? Dentist and Doctor appointments? Libraries? Beaches? A quick run to the store for milk? Oh I forgot they can Uber! Or will this company compound offer a grocery as well?
- Really and honestly, Isn't this just the first step in changing zoning in North Venice? Isn't the meeting on March 22 in the town council concerning more "extremely" low income being granted zone changes? Is it just a piggyback onto this rezoning? Is the meeting for voting going to be scheduled when our population of snowbirds head home?
- Will you publish, in the paper and perhaps on television, the date of the vote so more citizens can voice their opinion? For and against! Isn't that why council is there? **To hear the concerns of the people they represent vs. the companies whose vested interest is making profits. By the way, where do the CEO's live?**
- *With the major impact to our area, I believe all sides should be heard. The weight of the taxes from companies into the city coffers should not over shadow the needs of the citizens living in "North" Venice and enjoying our area. It took a lot of years to get here to our beautiful town and the changes are concerning. I don't want to be on the losing side if this "test" case fails in my own backyard*
- Cc: D.R. Horton Homes, Neal Homes, Venetia Golf and River Club, Lennar Homes, WCI, Toscana Isles HOA,

RECEIVED

MAR 20 2017

PLANNING & ZONING

JoAnne Brewer

From: Lori Stelzer
Sent: Tuesday, March 21, 2017 9:24 AM
To: JoAnne Brewer; Jeff Shrum
Subject: FW: Low income housing on Knights Trail

-----Original Message-----

*From: Paul [mailto:paulpharrington13@gmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, March 21, 2017 8:46 AM
To: Lori Stelzer <LStelzer@Venicegov.com>
Subject: Low income housing on Knights Trail*

*Hi Lori , regarding low income housing, I think maybe 10% of what they want to build is fair. Let's spread low income housing all over the city and not in one area!!! I am a resident of Venetian Golf and River Club for the past 11 years, this is ridiculous,thank you.
Paul Harrington*

Need to Report an Issue? SeeClickFix Venice Connect is available as an app for Android and iPhone. Select SeeClickFix from your app store on your device and choose Venice, Florida. There is also a link to the program on the city's website, www.venicegov.com, or go directly to SeeClickFix at <http://www.seeclickfix.com/Venice>

PLEASE NOTE: This agency is a public entity and is subject to Chapter 119, Florida Statutes, concerning public records. Email communications are covered under such laws; therefore, email sent or received on this entity's computer system, including your email address, may be disclosed to the public and media upon request. If you do not want your email address released to a public records request, do not send electronic mail to this entity. Instead, contact this office by phone or in writing.

JoAnne Brewer

From: Lori Stelzer
Sent: Tuesday, March 21, 2017 11:02 AM
To: JoAnne Brewer; Jeff Shrum
Subject: FW: Affordable Housing Issue

From: johnbudahas@comcast.net [<mailto:johnbudahas@comcast.net>]
Sent: Tuesday, March 21, 2017 10:43 AM
To: Lori Stelzer <LStelzer@Venicegov.com>
Cc: johnbudahas <johnbudahas@comcast.net>
Subject: Affordable Housing Issue

The amount of units planned (up to 5000 Plus) is excessive for the North Venice area at Knights Trail and would be disproportionate to the quality of homes in the surrounding area. Either downsize the number of affordable housing units planned or look to other areas. To have such a large input of affordable housing units would detract from the area in many ways and resale values.

Need to Report an Issue? SeeClickFix Venice Connect is available as an app for Android and iPhone. Select SeeClickFix from your app store on your device and choose Venice, Florida. There is also a link to the program on the city's website, www.venicegov.com, or go directly to SeeClickFix at <http://www.seeclickfix.com/Venice>

PLEASE NOTE: This agency is a public entity and is subject to Chapter 119, Florida Statutes, concerning public records. Email communications are covered under such laws; therefore, email sent or received on this entity's computer system, including your email address, may be disclosed to the public and media upon request. If you do not want your email address released to a public records request, do not send electronic mail to this entity. Instead, contact this office by phone or in writing.

RECEIVED

MAR 21 2017

PLANNING & ZONING

JoAnne Brewer

From: Lori Stelzer
Sent: Tuesday, March 21, 2017 11:48 AM
To: JoAnne Brewer; Jeff Shrum; Heather Taylor
Subject: FW: Affordable Housing Knights Trail/Laurel Rd

From: Pete BarenBregge [<mailto:pete.barenbregge@gmail.com>]
Sent: Tuesday, March 21, 2017 11:45 AM
To: Lori Stelzer <LStelzer@Venicegov.com>
Subject: Affordable Housing Knights Trail/Laurel Rd

To: Planning Commission
Re: Affordable Housing Knights Trail Rd/Laurel Rd
From: Peter Barenbregge
475 Padova Way
N Venice, FL 34275

I am not able to attend the meeting but want to convey my serious concern for this proposal.

I believe this proposal is excessive in every way. This area must not become the affordable housing capital of Venice. I realize this issue relates to the "not in my backyard" opinion and if that is the case, so be it.

I suspect the companies that are backing this proposal are not committing large sums of investment capital to support this for the long term. As is often the case, a few companies deem such a proposal to look good for them on the surface but they are not making the significant financial investment to support it. Ultimately, the costs will trickle down to the taxpayers, simple as that.

So, I am opposed to this proposal for two main reasons:

- 1) I don't want affordable housing in that location. It could only be a negative for our housing values, potential crime increase, and additional traffic.
- 2) It would increase property taxes in the near future. Taxes are high enough!

This is not an acceptable plan and I voice my opinion in to say I do NOT support this proposal.

Thank you.
Peter Barenbregge
475 Padova Way
N Venice, FL 34275

--

Pete BarenBregge
Cell: 301 706-8142
pete.barenbregge@gmail.com
www.petebarenbregge.com

Need to Report an Issue? SeeClickFix Venice Connect is available as an app for Android and iPhone. Select SeeClickFix from your app store on your device and choose Venice, Florida. There is also a link to the program on the city's website, www.venicegov.com, or go directly to SeeClickFix at <http://www.seeclickfix.com/Venice>

PLEASE NOTE: This agency is a public entity and is subject to Chapter 119, Florida Statutes, concerning public records. Email communications are covered under such laws; therefore, email sent or received on this entity's computer system, including your email address, may be disclosed to the public and media upon request. If you do not want your email address released to a public records request, do not send electronic mail to this entity. Instead, contact this office by phone or in writing.

RECEIVED

MAR 21 2017

PLANNING & ZONING

JoAnne Brewer

From: Lori Stelzer
Sent: Tuesday, March 21, 2017 12:25 PM
To: JoAnne Brewer; Jeff Shrum; Heather Taylor
Subject: FW: Affordable Housing

-----Original Message-----

*From: Carl De aloe [mailto:carldealoe@yahoo.com]
Sent: Tuesday, March 21, 2017 12:23 PM
To: Lori Stelzer <LStelzer@Venicegov.com>
Subject: Affordable Housing*

Dear Ms. Stelzer;

We here at Venetian Golf and River Club are very disturbed by any plans to build affordable low income housing in our North Venice area. Whether it be called work force housing or low income housing a rose by any other name is still a rose. Today's Herald Tribune posted a letter I wrote to the editor suggesting that the housing be built on Venice Island where low income service people and other low income earners can take full advantage of the beaches, stores, restaurants and parks.

Please realize that after working very hard for many years I and my fiance thought we had found a place we we could live comfortably with our peers during our retirement. By inundating us with high density low income housing in our immediate area we foresee the quality of our lifestyle deteriorating. The value of our homes will go down as well as the quality of life. We do not want to see North Venice as the Low Income area of Venice to avoid and thus I have written to the editor suggesting that affordable housing be placed on the Island itself if it's such a grandiose idea. The mayor and his board can then boast that they themselves do not ascribe to the NIMBY philosophy (not in my back yard).

*Sincerely,
Carl De Aloe*

Need to Report an Issue? SeeClickFix Venice Connect is available as an app for Android and iPhone. Select SeeClickFix from your app store on your device and choose Venice, Florida. There is also a link to the program on the city's website, www.venicegov.com, or go directly to SeeClickFix at <http://www.seeclickfix.com/Venice>

PLEASE NOTE: This agency is a public entity and is subject to Chapter 119, Florida Statutes, concerning public records. Email communications are covered under such laws; therefore, email sent or received on this entity's computer system, including your email address, may be disclosed to the public and media upon request. If you do not want your email address released to a public records request, do not send electronic mail to this entity. Instead, contact this office by phone or in writing.

RECEIVED

MAR 21 2017

PLANNING & ZONING

JoAnne Brewer

From: Lori Stelzer
Sent: Tuesday, March 21, 2017 2:32 PM
To: Jeff Shrum; JoAnne Brewer; Heather Taylor
Subject: FW: Affordable Housing

-----Original Message-----

*From: Karen Walters [mailto:kaig@aol.com]
Sent: Tuesday, March 21, 2017 2:01 PM
To: Lori Stelzer <LStelzer@Venicegov.com>
Subject: Affordable Housing*

*Please understand that I am very much in favor of affordable housing in my area.
BUT adding 5000 + units is way beyond excessive.
It stands the chance of creating a "ghetto" environment that benefits no one.
The goal should be integrated housing. Variety AND diversity should be the standard.
The Rev Karen G Walters
Venetian Golf and River Club*

Sent from my iPad

Need to Report an Issue? SeeClickFix Venice Connect is available as an app for Android and iPhone. Select SeeClickFix from your app store on your device and choose Venice, Florida. There is also a link to the program on the city's website, www.venicegov.com, or go directly to SeeClickFix at <http://www.seeclickfix.com/Venice>

PLEASE NOTE: This agency is a public entity and is subject to Chapter 119, Florida Statutes, concerning public records. Email communications are covered under such laws; therefore, email sent or received on this entity's computer system, including your email address, may be disclosed to the public and media upon request. If you do not want your email address released to a public records request, do not send electronic mail to this entity. Instead, contact this office by phone or in writing.

RECEIVED

MAR 21 2017

PLANNING & ZONING

STRIKETHRU & UNDERLINE

City of Venice Comprehensive Plan Update 2017-2027

Please share your comments with us

LAND USE ELEMENT:

STRATEGY LU 1.2.9 e RESIDENTIAL (MUR)

4th BULLET: A VARIETY OF RESIDENTIAL DENSITY RANGES ARE ENVISIONED PROVIDING THE OVERALL DENSITY DOES NOT EXCEED 5.0 DWELLING UNITS PER ~~GROSS ACRE~~ TOTAL GROSS ACREAGE OF THE SUBJECT PROJECT/PROPERTY.

5th BULLET: PREVIOUSLY APPROVED PUB DEVELOPMENTS, ~~EXCEEDING~~ INCLUDING THOSE THAT EXCEED THE STANDARDS OF THIS SECTION, SHALL BE PERMITTED! RETAIN THEIR CURRENTLY APPROVED DENSITY AND INTENSITY, OPEN SPACE PERCENTAGE

7th BULLET: INTENSITY/DENSITY:

- RESIDENTIAL DENSITY: 1.0 - 5.0 U/AC

- NON-RESIDENTIAL INTENSITY: 0.10

NON-RESIDENTIAL USES BASED ON THE GROSS

~~PROPERTY~~ OF THE ~~Pub~~ DESIGNATED NON-RESIDENTIAL PROPERTY.

Mail your comments to: Planning and Zoning, City of Venice, 401 W. Venice Ave. **RECEIVED**
Email your comments to: jbrewer@venicegov.com

MAR 21 2017

- OVER -

PLANNING & ZONING

IT IS UNDERSTOOD THAT OVERALL PUD DENSITY IS ESTABLISHED (IN THE DRAFT COMP PLAN) NOT TO EXCEED 5.0 U/LC SINCE THE LOW DENSITY RESIDENTIAL RANGE IS 1.0 - 5.0 U/LC.

HOWEVER, TO INFER THAT A PREVIOUSLY APPROVED PUD AT DENSITIES LOWER THAN 5.0 U/LC CANNOT MAINTAIN ITS CURRENTLY APPROVED DENSITY AND INTENSITY, OPEN SPACE % U/LC, IS ERRONIOUS LOGIC.

THERE WOULD NOT BE ESTABLISHED DENSITY RANGES IF ONLY THE HIGHEST DENSITY IN ANY RANGE CAN BE APPROVED OR MAINTAIN ITS PREVIOUS APPROVAL.

STRATEGY LU 3.3.7 INFILL DEVELOPMENT COMPATIBILITY

NEW BUILDINGS AND DEVELOPMENT SHALL CONFORM TO THE ZONE DISTRICT STANDARDS IN WHICH THEY RESIDE AND SHALL RELATE TO THE CONTEXT OF THE NEIGHBORHOOD AND COMMUNITY WITH REGARD TO BLDG. PLACEMENT, HEIGHT, AND DESIGN.

Linda Stargel
3/21/2017

JoAnne Brewer

From: Kathleen Economides <kathleendecono@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, March 22, 2017 9:51 AM
To: Jeff Shrum; Planning Commission; City Council
Subject: Proposed Changes in Comprehensive Plan

I am writing to express my concern with the change in land use designation in the proposed comprehensive plan for Pinebrook South from low density, medium density, and institutional/professional to mixed use residential. I believe this change does not benefit our community.

It is my understanding that the mixed use designation is used elsewhere in the country in urban areas with retail establishments on the first floor and apartments or condominiums on the second floor. It is used to encourage people to live in cities. I also understand that it is also used for startup planned developments to enable them to have as much as possible within the development. This is not the case with Pinebrook South. Pinebrook South only has two lots left for development and is not in need of the mixed use designation and the attendant issues raised in the proposed comprehensive plan .

I am specifically concerned with the following items in the comprehensive plan:

LU 1.2.11 states that transitions and/or buffering of uses shall not be required in the mixed use designation. I am concerned about the lack of transitions and/or buffering in the vacant lot on Pinebrook Road which has been proposed to have a seven building, two story, 43 unit apartment complex with 93 parking spaces. The lack of buffering would be intrusive to the six houses in Pinebrook South on Lucaya Avenue, Pinebrook Nursing Home, and residents on Sleepy Hollow Road. I am also concerned that in the event of a disaster, potential developers could use the mixed use designation in Pinebrook South to build multi-family units next to our single family homes.

LU 1.2.15 states that mixed use developments should generally provide non-residential and other uses within walking distance of each other and that all uses permitted within the mixed use designation shall be deemed to be compatible and not subject to internal transitions and/or buffering. I believe this is inappropriate for Pinebrook South. We absolutely need compatible development and buffering. We are a neighborhood looking to retain our current lifestyle.

LU 1.2.16 states that within the mixed use designation, all areas are deemed to be compatible with the adjacent land use designation. This sounds as if Pinebrook South could be subject to a lot being developed for uses incompatible with homes in our neighborhood. The attorney for the land owner of the vacant lot on Pinebrook Road has already stated that it is his belief that the proposed apartment complex is compatible with Pinebrook South housing. I do not agree. To say that all areas are deemed compatible is a problem.

LU1.2.17 states that a mixed use area's road network should connect directly into the neighborhood road network of the surrounding community, providing multiple paths for movement to and through the mixed use area so that trips made from the surrounding residential neighborhood to the mixed use area should be possible without requiring travel along a major street, where feasible. Pinebrook South does not need nor want more traffic through its major streets. We have elderly residents crossing the street to get to mailboxes, children playing and neighbors walking and biking. Additional traffic through the neighborhood is a hazard that is neither needed nor wanted. We already are dealing with additional traffic and congestion on Pinebrook

Road due to the opening of the Honore extension. To think there could be more traffic encouraged on the streets within our community is unbelievable.

It would be helpful if the comprehensive plan could be more specific to address these concerns. What is in writing is critical. As time goes on, it is what is in writing that governs what will happen. It would also be helpful to know what will happen if this mixed use designation conflicts with the Pinebrook South deed restrictions. Which will prevail?

Rather than designate Pinebrook South as a mixed use area, it would be preferable to retain our current designations. The area was developed to be a quiet, safe and peaceful area. Residents of Pinebrook South do not want to see multi family or rental apartments next to their homes. Having a designation of mixed use seems to set a precedent for multiple types of development to occur within the boundaries of Pinebrook South should there be a disaster or large buyout due to foreclosure, etc.

Pinebrook South is not an urban area. It is a residential neighborhood where people chose to live based on its quiet, peaceful, safe environment. My parents built their home in Pinebrook South in 1983 precisely for those reasons. We moved to Pinebrook seven and a half years ago because it is such a peaceful, quiet and pleasant place. Changing the land use designation to mixed use is not conducive to maintenance of our quality of life. It will only increase noise and traffic, reduce our property values, and make our community less liveable. Mixed use is inappropriate for our neighborhood. The designations should remain the same as they are now and our neighborhood should remain a quiet, safe residential area. Just because Pinebrook South is a PUD does not mean one size fits all. Mixed use may be a popular planning device, but its use should be limited to appropriate areas for this type of development.

In closing, I note that Pinebrook Nursing Home is proposed to be mixed use whereas Harbor Chase Nursing Facility and the Catholic Diocese of Venice maintain their institutional/professional designation. Why is the discrepancy? There is no consistency. I simply fail to understand.

Thank you for listening to my concerns. I appreciate the time and effort involved in making Venice the outstanding community that it is.

Sent from my iPad