

City of Venice 401 West Venice Ave., Venice, FL 34285 941-486-2626

DEVELOPMENT SERVICES - PLANNING & ZONING

ZONING MAP AMENDMENT APPLICATION

Project Name:	City of Venice Airport Property Rezone
Parcel Identification No.:	0430-09-0007, 0430-09-0011 and 0428-13-0001
Address:	NE Corner of Airport Ave. E. & Ringling Dr. S. Intersection
Parcel Size:	12.36 +/- acres
FLUM designation:	CI/VUD and GU/VUD
Current Zoning:	CI/VUD and GU/VUD Proposed Zoning: CG/VUD
Property Owner's Name:	City of Venice
Telephone:	941-486-2626
Fax:	941-480-3031
E-mail:	Elavallee@venicegov.com
Mailing Address:	401 W. Venice Avenue
Project Manager:	Mark Cervasio, Airport Director
Telephone:	941-882-7249 Kathleen Weeden - Rezone
Mobile / Fax:	941-716-3612 941-882-7409
E-mail:	MCervasio@venicegov.com kweeden@venicegov.com
Mailing Address:	401 W. Venice Avenue, Venice, FL 34285
Project Engineer :	n/a
Telephone:	
Mobile / Fax:	
E-mail:	
Mailing Address:	
Project Architect:	n/a
Telephone:	
Mobile / Fax:	
E-mail:	
Mailing Address:	
Incomplete applicat	ions cannot be processed – Sperreverse side for checklist
Applicant Signature / Date:	Edwit Harlee 5/18/2018

Revised 12/10

X	Statement of Ownership & Control
X	Signed, Sealed and Dated Survey of Property
n/a	Agent Authorization Letter
	Narrative describing the petition 05/16/2018
X	Public Workshop Requirements. Date held
	Copy of newspaper ad. Copy of notice to property owners.

Required documentation (provide one copy of the following, unless otherwise noted):

When pertaining to the rezoning of land, the report and recommendations of the planning commission to the city council shall show that the planning commission has studied and considered the proposed change in relation to the following, where applicable:

Written summary of public workshop.

- a. Whether the proposed change is in conformity to the comprehensive plan.
- b. The existing land use pattern.

Copy of sign-in sheet.

- c. Possible creation of an isolated district unrelated to adjacent and nearby districts.
- d. The population density pattern and possible increase or overtaxing of the load on public facilities such as schools, utilities, streets, etc.
- e. Whether existing district boundaries are illogically drawn in relation to existing conditions on the property proposed for change.
- f. Whether changed or changing conditions make the passage of the proposed amendment necessary.
- g. Whether the proposed change will adversely influence living conditions in the neighborhood.
- h. Whether the proposed change will create or excessively increase traffic congestion or otherwise affect public safety.
- Whether the proposed change will create a drainage problem.
- j. Whether the proposed change will seriously reduce light and air to adjacent areas.
- k. Whether the proposed change will adversely affect property values in the adjacent area.
- Whether the proposed change will be a deterrent to the improvement or development of adjacent property in accord with existing regulations.
- m. Whether the proposed change will constitute a grant of special privilege to an individual owner as contrasted with the public welfare.
- n. Whether there are substantial reasons why the property cannot be used in accord with existing zoning.
- o. Whether the change suggested is out of scale with the needs of the neighborhood or the city.
- p. Whether it is impossible to find other adequate sites in the city for the proposed use in districts already permitting such use.

Fees

Application filing fee \$2,908.

Application filing fee for the following zoning districts \$4,732: CMU, PUD, CSC, PCD, PID, RMH. Public notice fee in excess of \$50 will be billed to applicant and is not included in application fee.

PROJECT NARRATIVE

The City is proposing to rezone City owned property at the Venice Municipal Airport located at the northeast corner of the Intersection of Airport Ave., E. and Ringling Dr., S. bordered on the east side by US 41 Business/S. Tamiami Trail, Venice FL, 34285, formerly known as the "Circus Property". This property currently consists of three parcels (Parcel ID's 0430090007, 0430090011 and 0428130001 based on the Sarasota County Property Appraiser. This application requests rezoning the larger property into one consistent zoning district of Commercial General/Venetian Overlay District (CG/VUD). Currently the property is zoned primarily Commercial Intensive/VUD District (CI/VUD) with a small portion of the property adjacent to Airport Ave. E designated as Government Use/VUD. The rezone does not propose any change to the overlay district.

Policy 8.2 Land Use Compatibility Review Procedures. Ensure that the character and design of infill and new development are compatible with existing neighborhoods.

Compatibility review shall include the evaluation of the following items with regard to annexation, rezoning, conditional use, special exception, and site and development plan petitions:

- A. Land use density and intensity.
- B. Building heights and setbacks.
- C. Character or type of use proposed.
- D. Site and architectural mitigation design techniques.

Considerations for determining compatibility shall include, but are not limited to, the following:

 ${\it E. Protection of single-family neighborhoods from the intrusion of incompatible}$

uses. There are no single family residences adjacent.

F. Prevention of the location of commercial or industrial uses in areas where such uses are incompatible with existing uses. The uses that are there now will still be permitted.

G. The degree to which the development phases out nonconforming uses in order

to resolve incompatibilities resulting from development inconsistent with the current Comprehensive Plan.

The property is currently vacant with only lease for the Trapeze business use on month to month basis that will need to be eliminated if any development of the property is proposed.

H. Densities and intensities of proposed uses as compared to the densities and

intensities of existing uses. This zoning district is consistent with surrounding uses.

Potential incompatibility shall be mitigated through techniques including, but not limited to:

- I. Providing open space, perimeter buffers, landscaping and berms. To be determined under Site Plan review.
- J. Screening of sources of light, noise, mechanical equipment, refuse areas, delivery and storage areas. To be determined under Site Plan review.
- K. Locating road access to minimize adverse impacts. To be determined under Site Plan review.
- L. Adjusting building setbacks to transition between different uses. To be determined under Site Plan review.
- *M. Applying step-down or tiered building heights to transition between different uses.* **To be determined under Site Plan review.**
- *N. Lowering density or intensity of land uses to transition between different uses.* **To be determined under Site Plan review.**

Rezone Criteria – Airport Property Rezone

NE Corner of Airport Ave. E. & Ringling Dr. South Intersection

Rezoning amendments. When pertaining to the rezoning of land, the report and recommendations of the planning commission to the city council shall show that the planning commission has studied and considered the proposed change in relation to the following, where applicable:

a. Whether the proposed change is in conformity to the comprehensive plan.

Response: The adopted Comp Plan designates this property as Mixed Use Corridor and the Commercial General Zoning district is designated as an implementing district for the Mixed Use Corridor.

b. The existing land use pattern.

Response: The Comprehensive Plan identifies the majority of the property around the parcel and the existing land use pattern is commercial.

c. Possible creation of an isolated district unrelated to adjacent and nearby districts.

Response: As mentioned previously, the majority of the property around the parcel and the existing land use pattern is commercial, therefore it will not create an isolated district.

d. The population density pattern and possible increase or overtaxing of the load on public facilities such as schools, utilities, streets, etc.

Response: All appropriate approvals will be obtained through future development procedures and available capacity of public facilities will be confirmed.

e. Whether existing district boundaries are illogically drawn in relation to existing conditions on the property proposed for change.

Response: The district boundaries are consistent with the parcels identified as the subject property.

f. Whether changed or changing conditions make the passage of the proposed amendment necessary.

Response: The combination of two existing zoning districts into one provides for a unified designation for any future development of the property.

g. Whether the proposed change will adversely influence living conditions in the neighborhood.

Response: This is a de-intensification of the existing zoning designation of Commercial Intensive.

h. Whether the proposed change will create or excessively increase traffic congestion or otherwise affect public safety.

Response: All appropriate approvals will be obtained through future development procedures and available capacity of public facilities will be confirmed.

i. Whether the proposed change will create a drainage problem.

Response: All drainage issues will be addressed and resolved through the development process. The property is not currently in a Special Flood Hazard Area with the exception of the existing ponds.

 Whether the proposed change will seriously reduce light and air to adjacent areas.

Response: The project will comply with all standards required for development of the site.

k. Whether the proposed change will adversely affect property values in the adjacent area.

Response: A reduction in the intensity of the zoning district will be a benefit to the adjacent properties regarding capability.

I. Whether the proposed change will be a deterrent to the improvement or development of adjacent property in accord with existing regulations.

Response: The property will not negatively impact the development of the adjacent properties.

m. Whether the proposed change will constitute a grant of special privilege to an individual owner as contrasted with the public welfare.

Response: This rezone is consistent with the Future Land Use Designation as Mixed Use Corridor in the Comprehensive Plan.

n. Whether there are substantial reasons why the property cannot be used in accord with existing zoning.

Response: This property could be developed under the existing zoning district, however, as indicated previously, this is a de-intensification of the existing Commercial Intense Zoning District.

o. Whether the change suggested is out of scale with the needs of the neighborhood or the city.

Response: Once again, this is a de-intensification and is consistent with the future land use designation.

p. Whether it is impossible to find other adequate sites in the city for the proposed use in districts already permitting such use.

Response: This property is owned by the City and it has been determined that the Commercial General Zoning District is more appropriate.

