

From: Carl De aloe [mailto:carldealoe@yahoo.com]

Sent: Tuesday, June 20, 2017 6:57 PM

To: City Council <CityCouncil@Venicegov.com>

Cc: Istelzer@venicegov.com

Subject: Re: Affordable Housing

I have just received noticed that there are some upcoming meetings next week regarding the comprehensive plan including "affordable housing" proposals. My fiancé' and myself will be out of town and not able to attend the meetings but I am attaching a letter I previously sent to Ms. Stelzer. Again, we are very disturbed at the prospect of the sheer amount of Low Income dwellings proposed for our immediate area. North Venice will be the dumping ground for people who "cannot afford to live in Venice". May I suggest that younger people who cannot afford to live in certain areas should not be artificially placed in those areas. Instead the incentive to work hard, further one's training and education should be the motivation to eventually raise oneself up. Then and only then can they move into the area of their choice. By Subsidizing and offering incentives to the builders of these types of dwellings, the mayor and city council are placing the burden on the taxpayers of Venice to fund Impact Fees and waive building restrictions. We vehemently oppose any such actions.

Sincerely,

Carl De Aloe

> On Mar 21, 2017, at 12:22 PM, Carl De aloe <carldealoe@yahoo.com> wrote:

>

> 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 fiancé 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

From: lesvilcone@aol.com <lesvilcone@aol.com>

Sent: Tuesday, June 20, 2017 4:34:07 PM

To: City Council

Subject: 10 year plan update

Please do your home work and ask questions why these changes, do they really benefit Venice or the developers???

Dear Venice City Manager and City Council,

June 20, 2017

The city's proposed Comprehensive 10 Year Updated Plan could destroy what is left of the small town feel of Venice which many residents moved here for and could possibly lower homeowner's property values. This draft of **the update would entirely repeal (remove) Policy 13.1** which requires that density at the lower end of the range be applied when new land use is adjacent to lower densities. This Policy should be kept in the new plan.

In addition, **the update would entirely repeal (remove) Policy 10.2** which has five specific standards (safe-guards) for site planning that address compatibility with surrounding buildings, such as structures and land uses, and issues such as roof lines (how high the new structures roofs are in relation to existing neighbors) and which now requires specific locations of green spaces.

Why it's important to question this draft of newly proposed changes?

- **It could cost homeowner's money regarding property values, How?**
A three-story apartment building could be allowed to be built next to your low density residential property, but not now in the existing plan.
- Removing the restrictions Policy 13.01 and Policy 10.2 would allow additional commercial development where it is not allowed now and could quadruple (increase to 400%) the high-density land use acreage and dwelling units through-out the city. Don't let this happen!
- The above proposed changes are not mandated by the state of Florida, so why are these dramatic changes being introduced to the Plan, who benefits?

With Respect,
Leslie Robert Vilcone
111 Auburn Woods Circle
Venice Florida, 34292

From: Fred MacNamara <macnamara.fred@gmail.com>

Sent: Tuesday, June 20, 2017 7:32:00 PM

To: City Council

Subject: Venice Comprehensive Plan

Dear Council members,

Upon reviewing the Comprehensive Plan I would urge you to keep policy number 13.01 and 10.2. We need these safeguards to prevent overcrowding and over development and to provide adequate green space. I am a permanent resident of Venice.

Thank you,

Fred MacNamara

Venetia Community

Sent from my iPad

From: ANGELINA <anuzzo125@comcast.net>
Sent: Tuesday, June 20, 2017 8:39:50 PM
To: City Council
Cc: lstelzer@venicegov.com
Subject: Comprehensive Plan - Meeting of June 23, 2017

To Mayor Holic and the Members of the City Council:

We are very much against how the plan for "affordable housing" has been presented for the last three times. Even the title has changed - affordable housing, low income housing, work force housing, what does it all mean. How about "Section 8", will this be another facet of this project?

Firstly, there was a meeting at PGT a few months ago where Mr. Pinto presented his plan for the project. He minimized the amount of housing units sought, advised the audience of how parking was to be minimal since the tenants could walk/bike to work, and if transportation was needed, they could call "Uber". This statement had so many holes in it - are tenants to travel up to Publix and put groceries in their bike baskets? How about getting to houses of worship, medical appointments, school, libraries, public transportation, etc.? Where is the concern for the proposed tenants?

At a subsequent meeting before the City Council, it was proposed to increase the housing capacity and add more parking facilities. Once the foot was in the door, plans were changed and the project just keeps increasing in size and terms.

There is concern for the workers in the North Port area travelling 25 miles to work at PGT and Tervis. Why not concern for other areas outside Venice, i.e. Bradenton, etc. What commitment can the Sheriff's Department make to have their employees as proposed tenants?

Were the residents at Toscana even aware that this project is intended in "their backyards"? At a recent meeting, a resident spoke up and said he would not have bought a Toscana home if he knew of the pending project. Wool is being pulled over many eyes with the less than truthful way it is being handled.

Much development is underway in this area and "affordable housing" is not a desirable addition. The location is in close proximity to the waste management facility, concrete/mining/crushing firms, and other commercial businesses. Does housing belong in that area? A change of zoning is not the way to fix the problem. This housing project should be situated in another area and not North Venice.

Thank you for the opportunity to voice our opinion. We hope that our concerns will be addressed by the City Council.

Angelina and Joseph Procopio
Venetian Golf and River Club Residents

From: susan <ontheporch4231@comcast.net>

Sent: Tuesday, June 20, 2017 7:04:21 PM

To: City Council; lstelzer@venicegov.com

Subject: affordable housing

With the unavailability to attend the upcoming meetings, I have drafted the following for you to review with open minds and thoughts:

I am enclosing a letter I drafted sharing my feelings about the glut of housing that is proposed to be put in North Venice.... Not near the Island of course. Please take a serious read as it is important to all of us out of the way of the city folk on the North part of town...out of sight next to workforce housing at PGT, the every growing cement crushing plant and continued traffic onto Knights Trail.

I express the unfairness to give any builder a "break" to make Mr. Holic's dream come true... this all may sound rather strained but it is out of concern that I voice my opinion... ask any realtor what will happen to our values in North Venice and how, when the sell of many of homes hit the market, the impact of loss revenue as we flee to Sarasota... I see where there is already money needed from tax funds to complete the senior housing project just a shame that there are so many blinders with the only view being that of North Venice. The number of homes proposed at the meeting was unreal and the comment that only approx. 500 homes are needed added up to ... no logic at all

be kind to all you meet... you never know the burden they carry.... Susan

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,

From: Larry Rebbecchi <rebbecchi208@comcast.net>

Sent: Tuesday, June 20, 2017 6:50:55 PM

To: City Council

Cc: Lori Stelzer

Subject: affordable housing

My husband and I attended the very first meeting at the PGT facility. At that time, answers to questions from the group that attended this meeting sounded a little vague. First and foremost there were no direct answers to questions such as, how many cars will be parking in the front of these apartments? The answer given was “there will be no parking spots because the people living in these homes will not have cars! they will be using public transportation or “they could call Uber”. This didn’t make any sense to me. This is 2017 and most people have cars!

I must say that we have not physically been able to attend the meetings because of other obligations, but have been following the newspapers and keeping up with what is going on. Basically it seems to us things are changing very quickly. First the amount of homes was to be approximately 300 homes and now the number has almost doubled. We feel that when housing is restricted to a certain income group, that housing will never gain in value. The only direction for low income housing and the neighborhood around it is down. Therefore, we are opposed to this project.

Mr. & Mrs. Larry Rebbecchi
Venetian Golf & River Club