



City of Venice

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

Meeting Minutes Planning Commission

Tuesday, January 16, 2018

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

Present: 7 - Chair Barry Snyder, Helen Moore, Jerry Towery, Shaun Graser, Tom Murphy, Janis Fawn and Kit McKeon

Also Present

Liaison Councilmember Charles Newsom, Assistant City Attorney Kelly Fernandez, Development Services Director Jeff Shrum, Senior Planner Scott Pickett, Planning Manager Roger Clark and Recording Secretary Shirley Gibson.

III. Approval of Minutes

[18-3074](#)

Minutes of the December 5, 2017 and December 19, 2017 Regular Meetings.

A motion was made by Mr. Towery, seconded by Ms. Moore, that the minutes of the December 5, 2017 and December 19, 2017 regular meetings be approved as written. Motion carried by voice vote unanimously.

IV. Public Hearings

[17-11SP](#)

925 S. Tamiami Trail Monument Sign Site & Development Plan Amendment

Staff: Scott Pickett, AICP, Senior Planner

Agent: Danielle Bobzien, FDL Property Management

Applicant: Leslie Evans Dunn, Dunn Haven Holdings, LLC

Mr. Snyder announced this was a quasi-judicial hearing, read a memorandum regarding advertisement and written communication, opened the public hearing, confirmed speaker cards completed by all those who will offer testimony or speak under audience participation.

Ms. Fernandez questioned commission members regarding exparte communications and conflicts of interest. Mr. Towery, Mr. McKeon and Mr.

Snyder had site visits with no communication and there were no conflicts of interest.

Mr. Pickett, being duly sworn, spoke regarding petition summary, proposed site plan, proposed monument sign, property history and location, future land use and existing zoning maps, consistency with the comprehensive plan, land development code compliance, required and proposed sign standards, concurrency review, summary findings and answered board questions regarding the two parcels, prior site and development plan, whether the site plan still applies and obtaining clarification on what the commission is modifying.

Mr. Pickett indicated they cannot redevelop property under old site and development plan.

Danielle Bobzien, FDL Property Management, being duly sworn, spoke regarding current plans, owners wanting to join the two parcels legally, timeline and answered board questions regarding current occupancy of property.

Mr. Shrum, being duly sworn, spoke regarding nonconforming uses, clean up the zoning to be consistent with the adjoining property, residential district, overall size of the sign, setbacks and answered board questions regarding the sign location, modification of existing site and development plan and processing it as an amendment.

Mr. Shrum further spoke regarding modifying sign, possibly adding stipulation tying the two parcels together, any changes would negate that, amendments, limitations, zoning aspect needs to be addressed and nonconforming use.

Discussion took place regarding prior history of the property and concerns on zoning history.

Mr. Shrum indicated this was in an overlay district where these uses are allowed.

A motion was made by Mr. Towery, seconded by Mr. McKeon, that based on review of the application materials, the staff report and testimony provided during the public hearing, the Planning Commission, sitting as the local planning agency and land development regulations commission, finds this petition consistent with the Comprehensive Plan, in compliance with the Land Development Code and with the affirmative Findings of Fact in the record, and moves to approve Site and Development Plan Petition No. 17-11SP with the stipulation that the existing pylon ground sign structure shall be removed prior to the issuance of any permit for the proposed monument sign.

V. New Business

[PHC](#)
[17-16RZ](#)

Murphy Oaks Planned Unit Development Pre-Hearing Conference

Staff: Roger Clark, Planning Manager

Agent: Clint Cuffle, P.E., WRA Engineering

Property Owner: SSD Land Holdings, LLC

Mr. Snyder indicated this was a pre-hearing conference and not a public hearing, read a memorandum regarding advertisement and written communications, confirmed speaker cards completed by all those who will offer testimony or speak under audience participation.

Mr. Clark spoke regarding the Preserves of Venice, history of the previous application, planned unit development, package given to commission members were the original documents from a previous request, materials provided had one review by planning staff and provided guidance to owners regarding the planned unit development.

Greg Singleton, Windham Development, spoke regarding prior approval for 118 lots, zoning application withdrawn at a 2017 city council meeting and made changes to project team.

Cliff Cuffle, WRA Engineering, spoke regarding his firm's resume, hired new project teams to assist in this project and did not change environmental or transportation consultant.

Mr. Singleton spoke further regarding specifics of project, Preserves of Venice, current Windham projects throughout Florida, prior rezoning, aerial maps of projects, submitted a PUD application, met with representatives from surrounding neighborhoods, met with planning staff and received feedback, lots were reduced from 118 to 105, buffers increased and modified, existing local vegetation, six foot PVC fence, wax myrtle hedge, elevations, new sidewalk, distance from pavement to right of way, fence location, northern property line increased, proposing bike lane extension, building left turn lane into site, widening of roadway, drainage ditches, entrance, several stipulations that were discussed and agreed upon by surrounding neighbors, Fox Lea Farm, notice of proximity, roofing construction, vehicle access, sound barriers, comparable surrounding communities, lot coverage, showed photos of proposed project and answered board questions regarding noise study, removal of stipulations, rear setbacks, reasoning for the reduction of units, outcome from neighborhood meeting, reducing depth of ponds, outflow, proposed left turn lane, traffic study, sidewalks, any commercial activities and needing a comprehensive plan amendment to make this a mixed use residential property.

Richard Longo, 295 Marsh Creek Road, Venice, spoke regarding home values, community meeting held with the builder, objecting to the proposal

presented, developer made some improvements, density, lot size and coverage, traffic study, amenities, setbacks, compatability, noise issues, safety, property values, esthetics and reducing number of homes to be built.

Jeffrey Boone, Boone Law Firm and representing Fox Lea Farm, spoke regarding affected party status, developer was supposed to file application prior to the comprehensive plan being adopted, did not have any input until now, will be involved in the process moving forward, concerns with noise and dust, plans of expansion and the comprehensive plan amendment.

Pam Schierberg, 1624 Lis court Drive, Venice, spoke regarding community comparisons, Waterford amenities and property values.

Mr. Clark answered board questions regarding any Windwood amenities, planned unit development, application filed under the 2010 comprehensive plan, rezoning, neighborhood workshop and the procedure for changing a petition.

Discussion took place regarding the next process, having another neighborhood meeting, conforming to the new comprehensive plan, Central Venice Coalition, previous application submitted by applicant, planned unit development, concern with PVC fences and Toscana Isles landscaping.

Mr. Singleton spoke in response to the commission's concerns regarding fencing.

Discussion continued regarding a list of items for planning to review which are the comprehensive plan revision, neighborhood meeting requirement, any concerns being sent back to applicant, is PVC the best choice, concerns with noise and applicant listing any disclosures.

Mr. Shrum spoke regarding neighborhood workshop requirement.

Discussion took place about removing the requirement for a neighborhood workshop and defining ground height for a building.

VI. Audience Participation

There was none.

VII. Comments by Planning Division

Mr. Shrum spoke regarding appeals to comprehensive plan that became effective January 12th, elections are coming up, Parks and Recreation Master Plan and agenda items for the next meeting.

VIII. Comments by Planning Commission Members

Ms. Fawn stated she attended the Parks and Recreation Advisory Board meeting earlier in the month and indicated that she would advise the board when the Planning Commission begins discussing the master plan.

IX. Adjournment

There being no further business to come before this Commission, the meeting was adjourned at 4:20 p.m.

Chair

Recording Secretary