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Agent: Jeffery Boone, Esq., Boone Law Firm
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## Background

- Between 1953 and 1980 existing improvements: two marine sales/service/repair buildings on the north side of the site, a water-front restaurant, a commercial/office/storage building, the dock master office/marine service building.
- November 6, 2013: Petition No. 13-03MI, City Council approved an existing 57 slip marina subject to 44 stipulations.
- September 2, 2014: Site and Development Plan Petition No. 14-03SP, approved an existing 2,600 square foot tiki hut with a maximum capacity of 72 restaurant seats.
- December 3, 2014: Site and Development Plan Amendment No. 14-03SP. 1 was administratively approved to include a $40^{\prime}$ x $40^{\prime}$ tract previously excluded from Site and Development Plan 14-03SP.
- January 6, 2015: Special Exception Petition No. 14-01SE approved 15 live-aboard slips at the marina subject to five stipulations.
- September 26, 2017: Comprehensive Plan Amendment Petition No. 17-02CP, approved a future land use map amendment to change the future land use map designation of the subject property from Northern Gateway Corridor (Planning Area F) and Waterway to Commercial.
- January 12, 2018: 2017-2027 City of Venice Comprehensive Plan became effective and the future land use map designation for the subject property became Mixed Use Corridor (MUC).


## Aerial Photograph



## Photographs of the Site



## Photographs of the Site



## Surrounding Property Information

| Direction | Existing Land Use(s) | Current Zoning District(s) | Future Land Use Map Designation(s) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| North | Mobile home subdivision and commercial buildings | Residential, Mobile Home (RMH) \& Commercial, Intensive (CI) | Mixed Use Corridor (MUC), Conservation, and Moderate Density Residential |
| West | Intracoastal waterway and mobile home subdivision | Marine Park (MP) \& RMH | Moderate Density Residential and Conservation |
| South | Intracoastal waterway and police substation and boat dock | Government Use (GU) and MP | Conservation and Mixed Use Downtown (MUD) |
| East | US 41 Business and mobile home subdivision | RMH | U.S. 41 Business and Moderate Density Residential |

## Future Land Use Map



## Existing Zoning Map



## ZONING MAP AMENDMENT PETITON NO. 17-11RZ

## Zoning Map Amendment Fisherman's Wharf

| PETITION NO.: | 17-11RZ |
| ---: | :--- |
| REQUEST: | Zoning map amendment to rezone the subject 7.18土 acre property from the <br> Commercial, Intensive (CI) district and Marine Park (MP) district to Commercial, <br> General (CG) district. |
| GENERAL DATA |  |
| Owner: | Venice Marine Park, LLC |
| Address: | 509 N. Tamiami Trail |
| Froperty Size: | $7.18 \pm$ acres |
| Neighborhoperty ID: 0407-06-0010 |  |
| Existing Zoning: | Commercial, Intensive (CI) and Marine Park (MP) |
| Proposed Zoning: | Commercial, General (CG) |

## Proposed Zoning Map



## Proposed Site Plan



# Planning Analysis Comparison of MP and CI to CG 

| Permitted Structures in the MP District | Structures Allowed by Special Exception in the MP |
| :--- | :--- |
| District |  |

## Planning Analysis



## Planning Analysis

| Zoning District | Existing CI District | Proposed CG District |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Special Exception Uses | Wholesale, warehouse and storage <br> Building trades contractors (with outside storage of materials <br> and equipment) <br> Outdoor display and sale of retail merchandise <br> Truck stops <br> Television or radio transmitter towers <br> Agricultural fairs and fairground activities, sports fields <br> and sports arenas, and similar uses offering events open <br> to the public and with temporary or permanent structures <br> Carnivals or circuses, archery ranges, miniature golf courses, <br> pony rides \& skating rinks, and indoor pistol or rifle ranges <br> Commercial tourist attractions <br> Welding and machine shops <br> Essential services <br> Multi-family dwellings <br> Adult entertainment establishments | Automotive service stations <br> Multi-family dwellings <br> Motorbus terminals <br> Essential services <br> Outdoor display \& sale of retail merchandise <br> Temporary lodging, including hotels <br> Outdoor recreation <br> Pain management clinic <br> Plant nurseries <br> Boat liveries <br> Drive-in restaurants <br> Brewpubs |

## Planning Analysis

## MP Standards

- Maximum Residential Density - None
- Maximum Lot Coverage by all Buildings - None
- Minimum Yard Requirements (Setbacks) - None
- Maximum Height of Structures - 35 feet (the district has no conditional use provision for structures in excess of 35 feet)

| Development Standard | Existing CI District | Proposed CG District |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Max. Residential Density | 18 units per acre | 18 units per acre |
| Max. Lot Coverage | Unrestricted, except 30\% for multiplefamily dwellings | Unrestricted, except 30\% for multiplefamily dwellings |
| Max. Building Height | 35 feet | 35 feet and an additional 10 feet for one story devoted primarily to parking within the structure |
| Conditional Use (Height) | No conditional use | Structures in excess of 35 feet but no more than 85 feet in height |
| Min. Yards (Setbacks)* | Front yards: 20 feet <br> Side yards: 0-15 feet <br> 20 feet when abutting a residential district <br> Buildings above 35 feet shall provide an additional side yard at a ratio of one foot for each three feet of building, and a front yard of 25 feet or $1 / 2$ of the building height, whichever is greater | Front yards: 20 feet <br> Side yards: 0-15 feet <br> 20 feet when abutting a residential district <br> Buildings above 35 feet shall provide an additional side yard at a ratio of one foot for each three feet of building, and a front yard of 25 feet or $1 / 2$ of the building height, whichever is greater |
| Landscaping | Landscape buffer required in minimum 20 -foot wide side yards that abut residentially zoned property | Landscape buffer required in minimum 20 -foot wide side yards that abut residentially zoned property |

## Zoning map Amendment Comprehensive Plan Consistency

- East Venice Avenue Neighborhood
- LU-1.2.9 Mixed Use Category: Identifies the CG zoning district as an implementing district for the Mixed Use Corridor future land use designation.
- LU-4.1.1 Transitional Language: Policy 8.2 Land Use Compatibility
- Land use density and intensity
- Building heights and setbacks
- Character or type of use proposed
- Site and architectural mitigation design techniques
- Considerations to determine compatibility
- Protection of single-family neighborhoods from the intrusion of incompatible uses.
- Prevention of the location of commercial or industrial uses in areas where such uses are incompatible with existing uses.
- The degree to which the development phases out non-conforming uses in order to resolve incompatibilities resulting from development inconsistent with the current Comprehensive Plan.
- Densities and intensities of proposed uses as compared to the densities and intensities of existing uses.


## Zoning map Amendment Comprehensive Plan Consistency

## Mitigation techniques of Policy 8.2:

- Providing open space, perimeter buffers, landscaping and berms
- Screening of sources of light, noise, mechanical equipment, refuse areas, delivery and storage areas
- Locating road access to minimize adverse impacts
- Adjusting building setbacks to transition between different uses
- Applying step-down or tiered building heights to transition between different uses
- Lowering density or intensity of land uses to transition between different uses.


## Zoning Map Amendment Land Development Code Consistency

Applicable Rezone Considerations Provided in Code Section 86-47(f):

The applicant addressed each consideration in their submittal and a staff comment was provided for each consideration when appropriate in the staff report.

| Requirement |  | Nes |  |  |
| :---: | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 1. | Whether the proposed change is in conformity to the Comprehensive Plan | $\checkmark$ |  |  |
| 2. | The existing land use pattern | $\checkmark$ |  |  |
| 3. | Possible creation of an isolated district unrelated to adjacent and nearby districts | $\checkmark$ |  |  |
| 4. | The population density pattern and possible increase or overtaxing of the loan on public <br> facilities such as schools, utilities, streets, etc. | $\checkmark$ |  |  |
| 5. | Whether the existing district boundaries are illogically drawn in relation to the existing <br> conditions on the property proposed for change. | $\checkmark$ |  |  |
| 6. | Whether changed or changing conditions make the passage of the proposed amendment <br> necessary. | $\checkmark$ |  |  |
| 7. | Whether the proposed change will adversely influence living conditions in the <br> neighborhood. | $\checkmark$ |  |  |
| 8. | Whether the proposed change will create or excessively increase traffic congestion or <br> otherwise affect public safety. | $\checkmark$ |  |  |
| 9. | Whether the proposed change will create a drainage problem. | $\checkmark$ |  |  |
| 10. | Whether the proposed change will seriously reduced light and air to the adjacent area. | $\checkmark$ |  |  |
| 11. | Whether the proposed change will adversely affect property values in the adjacent area. | $\checkmark$ |  |  |
| $\mathbf{1 2 .}$ | Whether the proposed change will be a deterrent to the improvement or development of <br> adjacent property in accord with existing regulations. | $\checkmark$ |  |  |
| $\mathbf{1 3 .}$ | Whether the proposed change will constitute a grant of special privilege to an individual <br> owner as contrasted with the public welfare. | $\checkmark$ |  |  |
| $\mathbf{1 4 .}$ | Whether there is substantial reasons why the property cannot be used in accord with existing <br> zoning. | $\checkmark$ |  |  |
| $\mathbf{1 5 .}$ | Whether the change suggested is out of scale with the needs of the neighborhood or city. | $\checkmark$ |  |  |
| $\mathbf{1 6 .}$ | Whether it is impossible to find other adequate sites in the city for the proposed use in <br> districts already permitted such use. | $\checkmark$ |  |  |

## Concurrency/Mobility

At the point of rezoning, staff conducts a preliminary review for concurrency. The following review agencies have reviewed the following public facilities: water, sewer, solid waste, stormwater/drainage and transportation.

No issues have been identified regarding facilities capacity regarding the proposed petition. A concurrency/mobility certificate will be issued at the point of site and development plan.

## Findings of Fact

## Based on analysis in the staff report:

Conclusions / Findings of Fact (Consistency with the Comprehensive Plan):
The subject petition may be found consistent with the Land Use Element strategies applicable to the Mixed Use Corridor (MUC) future land use designation and Policy 8.2 regarding compatibility. In summary, the subject petition may be found consistent with the Comprehensive Plan.

## Conclusions / Findings of Fact (Compliance with the Land Development Code):

The subject petition complies with all applicable Land Development Code standards and there is sufficient information to reach a finding for each of the rezoning considerations contained in Section 86-47(f) of the Land Development Code.

## Conclusions / Findings of Fact (Concurrency/Mobility):

Based on the preliminary concurrency analysis, no issues have been identified regarding current adequate public facilities capacity to accommodate the expected development of the subject property. Further concurrency review, including the issuance of a certificate of concurrency, will be required in conjunction with site and development plan amendment.

## City Council Action:

Upon review of the petition and associated documents, comprehensive plan, land development code, staff report and analysis, and testimony provided during the public hearing, along with Planning Commission's recommendation of approval, there is sufficient information on the record for the City Council to take action on Zoning Map Amendment Petition No. 17-11RZ.

## CONDITIONAL USE PETITION NO. 17-02CU

## Conditional Use

| PETITION NO:: | 17-02CU |
| ---: | :--- |
| REQUEST: | Conditional use petition to allow four multi-family residential buildings to exceed the <br> maximum building height of 35 feet in the proposed Commercial, General (CG) zoning <br> district by 20 feet. |
| GENERAL DATA |  |
| Owner: | Venice Marine Park, LLC Agent: Jeffery Boone, Esq., Boone Law Firm |
| Address: | 509 N. Tamiami Trail |
| Property Size: | $7.18 \pm$ acres |
| Neighborhood: | Gateway Neighborhood ID: 0407-06-0010 |
| Existing Zoning: | Commercial, Intensive (CI) and Marine Park (MP) |
| Proposed Zoning: | Commercial, General (CG) |
|  |  |

## Conditional Use

- Request for additional building height of 20.3 feet in excess of the code requirement for 4 multi-family residential buildings.
- CG district provides a maximum building height of 35 feet over 10 feet devoted primarily to parking.
- Conditional use up to 50 feet may be approved by City Council.


Conditional Use Up to 50
Feet by City Council

Maximum Height of 35 Feet

Up to 10 Feet of Parking


MEASUREMENT
10 feet not included (garage slab of 5.8+10) 15.8 Start of building height measurement 35 foot height permitted in the CG district 50.8 Max height per the CG district (15.8+35) added
20.3 conditional use request $\quad$ 71.1 Roof height $(50.8+20.3)$


## Photographs of the Site



## Proposed Site Plan



## Conditional Use Comprehensive Plan Consistency

Strategy LU 1.3.7 - Promotes infill development that relates to the context of the neighborhood regarding building placement, height and design.
Strategy LU GW 1.1.1 - Supports redevelopment in the Gateway Neighborhood.

## Transitional Strategies

- Policy 8.2 - require compatibility evaluation based on the following:
- Land use density and intensity
- Building heights and setbacks
- Character or type of use proposed
- Site and architectural mitigation design techniques
- Protection of single-family neighborhoods from the intrusion of incompatible uses.
- Prevention of the location of commercial or industrial uses in areas where such uses are incompatible with existing uses.
- The degree to which the development phases out nonconforming uses in order to resolve incompatibilities resulting from development inconsistent with the current Comprehensive Plan.
- Densities and intensities of proposed uses as compared to the densities and intensities of existing uses.


## Conditional Use Comprehensive Plan Consistency

Height of Proposed Buildings on Subject Property

| Residential Multi-Family | 60 feet, 2 inches; 5 stories over 1 story of parking |
| :--- | :--- |
| Restaurant Expansion | 20 feet, one story |
| Marina Use Building | 15 feet; one story |
| Height of Existing Buildings on Adjacent and Area Properties |  |
| Bella Costa Multi-Family | 3 and 4 story buildings |
| Harbor Lights Manufactured Home Park | 1 story manufactured homes |
| 621 N. Tamiami Trail (commercial building) | 1 story commercial building |
| Costa Brava (2 towers) |  |
| Waterfront (3 towers) | 9 story buildings |
|  | 9 story buildings; 8 stories over 1 story of parking |

## Conditional Use Comprehensive Plan Consistency

## Mitigation techniques of Policy 8.2:

- Providing open space, perimeter buffers, landscaping and berms
- Screening of sources of light, noise, mechanical equipment, refuse areas, delivery and storage areas
- Locating road access to minimize adverse impacts
- Adjusting building setbacks to transition between different uses
- Applying step-down or tiered building heights to transition between different uses
- Lowering density or intensity of land uses to transition between different uses.


## Conclusions / Findings of Fact (Consistency with the Comprehensive Plan):

The subject petition may be found consistent with the Land Use Element strategies applicable to the Mixed Use Corridor (MUC) future land use designation and Policy 8.2 regarding compatibility. In summary, the subject petition may be found consistent with the Comprehensive Plan.

## Code Section 86-42(f) provides for the following "Conditions of Approval" for any request for conditional use that may be considered by the City:

(f) Conditions of approval. The city may impose conditions that are found necessary to ensure that the conditional use is compatible with other uses in the vicinity, and that the negative impact of the proposed use on the surrounding uses and public facilities is minimized. These conditions may include, but are not limited to, the following:
(1) Requiring site or architectural design features which substantially advance Venetian Mediterranean design standards or other appropriate architectural design compatible with the surrounding area;
(2) Requiring larger setback areas, lot area, and/or lot depth or width;
(3) Limiting the building structure height, size or lot coverage, and/or location on the site;
(4) Requiring landscaping, screening, drainage, water quality facilities, and/or improvement of parking and loading areas;
(5) Requiring berms, screening or landscaping and the establishment of standards for their installation and maintenance;
(6) Requiring and designating the size, height, location and/or materials for fences;
(7) Limiting or setting standards for the location, design, and/or intensity of outdoor lighting and signage;
(8) Designating the size, number, location and/or design of vehicle access points or parking areas;
(9) Requiring street right-of-way to be dedicated and streets, sidewalks, curbs, planting strips, pathways, or trails to be improved;
(10) Encouraging the protection and preservation of natural features including existing trees, soils, vegetation, watercourses, habitat areas, drainage areas, historic resources, cultural resources and/or sensitive lands; and
(11) Requiring the dedication of sufficient land to the public, and/or construction of pedestrian/bicycle facilities including, but not limited to, pathways, gazebos, public art displays and other such pedestrian amenities.

## Conditional Use Land Development Code Consistency

 Applicable Conditional Use Considerations Provided in Code Section 86-42(e):The applicant addressed each consideration in their submittal and a staff comment was provided for each consideration when appropriate in the staff report.

Conclusions / Findings of Fact (Compliance with the Land Development Code):
Required Findings for Conditional Use Approval: The following may be found regarding the conditional use petition

- Will not adversely affect the public interest,
- Any specific requirements governing the individual conditional use, if any, have been met by the petitioner,
- Satisfactory provision and arrangement have been made concerning the matters listed in Section 86-42(e).


## City Council Action

## Conditional Use

Upon review of the petition and associated documents, comprehensive plan, land development code, staff report and analysis, and testimony provided during the public hearing, along with Planning Commission's recommendation of approval, there is sufficient information on the record for the City Council to take action on Conditional Use Petition No. 17-02CU.

Stipulation: The Conditional Use will become effective upon approval of Zoning Map Amendment Petition No. 17-11RZ by City Council.

## Summary of Petitions:

- Zoning Map Amendment Petition No. 17-11RZ
- Conditional Use Petition No. 17-02CU
- Stipulation

