



PUD ZONING MAP AMENDMENT APPLICATION

Submit a complete application package to the Planning and Zoning Division. All information must be legible and will become a permanent part of the public record. Incomplete applications will not be reviewed and will be returned to the applicant/agent. Refer to the City of Venice Code of Ordinances Section 86-130 for Planned Unit Development district submittal requirements. After this application package is deemed complete, any new development will be scheduled for a Pre-Hearing Conference at the Planning Commission (Section 86-130(t)(4)).

Project Name: GCCF PUD	
Brief Project Description: Rezoning of currently approved Bridges (CMU) and Villa Paradiso (PUD) into a single PUD.	
Address/Location: Border Road and Laurel Road	
Parcel Identification No.(s): 0389-00-2005, 0389-00-2006, 0389-00-1010, 0390-00-3040, 0389-00-2031, 0389-00-2030, 0390-00-3041, 0390-00-3030, 0390-00-3010	
Proposed Numbers/Types of Dwelling Units: 1,300	
Parcel Size: 300 +/- acres	
Current Zoning Designation(s): CMU & PUD	FLUM Designation(s): Mixed Use Residential
Fee: The Zoning Administrator determines if a project is a minor or major amendment. A 35% reduction will be applied to concurrently filed land use petitions that qualify. Some projects may be assessed an extended technical review fee of \$1400: <input type="checkbox"/> New \$4732 <input type="checkbox"/> Major Amendment to PUD \$2300 <input type="checkbox"/> Minor Amendment to PUD \$533	
Additional fees: Per Code Section 86-586, legal advertising and public notice fees in excess of \$50 will be billed after all public hearings, regardless of approval status. Other fees may include review of transportation/environmental reports and studies by the City's consultant, verification by a consultant of the accuracy of the legal description provided by the applicant/agent and City Attorney fees. These fees are billed separately and must be paid before the Planning Commission public hearing. If these fees are not paid, approvals and further City of Venice permits are subject to delay.	
BILL TO: <input type="checkbox"/> APPLICANT <input type="checkbox"/> AGENT (SELECT ONE)	
Applicant/Property Owner Name: BORDER ROAD INVESTMENTS LLC, MYARRA PROPERTY JOINT VENTURES LLC, WOOLRIDGE INVESTMENT-FLORIDA LLC, and FC LAUREL LLC	
Address: 5800 LAKEWOOD RANCH BLVD, SARASOTA , FL, 34240	
Email:	Phone:
Design Professional or Attorney: Melanie Smith, P.E. Stantec	
Address: 6900 Professional Parkway East, Sarasota, FL 34240	
Email: melanie.smith@stantec.com	Phone: (941) 907-6900
Authorized Agent (1 person to be the point of contact): Jeffery A. Boone, Esq.	
Address: 1001 Avenida Del Circo, Venice, FL 34285	
Email: jboone@boone-law.com	Phone: (941) 488-6716

Staff Use Only

Petition No.

Fee:

Application packages are reviewed by Planning Staff for completeness within 3 business days, as outlined in the Technical Review Committee (TRC) Calendar. Packages must be submitted via hard & electronic copies, and additional copies may be requested. Large plans should be collated and folded to allow the bottom right corner visible. Concurrently filed applications must be packaged separately. Please indicate N/A if the document is not being submitted.

☒ **Application:** (15 copies)

☒ **Project Narrative:** Provide A statement describing in detail the character and intended use of the development, in addition to the short description on page one of the application. All modifications to PUD standards must be listed with each applicable Section of Code (15 copies).

☒ **CD with Electronic Files:** Provide PDF's of ALL documents, appropriately identified by name on one CD. *The legal description for each parcel must be submitted in text format and will be verified by a consultant.*

☒ **Agent Authorization Letter:** A signed letter from the property owner, authorizing one individual to submit an application and represent the owner throughout the application process. This individual will be the single point of contact for staff (1 copy).

☒ **Statement of Ownership and Control:** Documentation of ownership and control of the subject property (deed). Sarasota County Property Appraiser or Tax Collector records will not suffice. Corporations or similar entities must provide documents recognizing a person authorized to act on behalf of the entity (1 copy).

☒ **Survey of the Property:** Signed and sealed survey that accurately reflects the current state of the property. Each parcel must have its own legal description listed separately on the survey, correctly labeled by parcel id. (1 copy) **Date of Survey:**

☒ **Concurrency Application and Worksheet:** (15 copies). *If a traffic study is required, contact Planning staff to schedule a methodology meeting. After the methodology meeting, two copies of the traffic study (signed, sealed, and dated), and electronic files (SYN, HCS files etc.) will be required.

☒ **School Concurrency:** School Impact Analysis Receipt from Sarasota County dated within 10 days of petition submittal (1 copy).

☒ **Public Workshop Requirements:** (Section 86-41) ☐ Newspaper advertisement ☐ Notice to property owners ☐ Sign-in sheet ☐ Written summary of public workshop (1 copy)

☒ **Common Facility Statements:** if common facilities, such as recreation areas or structures, private streets, common open space, parking areas, access drives, etc., are to be provided for the development, statements as to how such common facilities are to be provided and permanently maintained (1 copy).

☒ **Planning Commission Considerations/Findings:** Per Code Section 86-47(f)(1), prepare a statement for each of the following considerations/findings(15 copies):

a. Whether the proposed change is in conformity to the comprehensive plan; b. The existing land use pattern; 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; i. 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; l. 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; and p. Whether it is impossible to find other adequate sites in the city for the proposed use in districts already permitting such use.

☒ **Master Plan** containing the following (15 copies): 1. The title of the project and the names of the professional project planner and the developer; 2. Scale, date, north arrow and general location map; 3. Boundaries of the property involved, and all existing streets, buildings, watercourses, easements, section lines and other existing important physical features in and adjoining the project.; 4. Master plan locations of the different uses proposed, by dwelling types, open space designations, recreational facilities, commercial uses, other permitted uses, and off-street parking and off-street loading locations; 5. Master plan showing access and traffic flow and how vehicular traffic will be separated from pedestrian and other types of traffic; 6. Tabulations of total gross acreage in the development and the percentages thereof proposed to be devoted to the several dwelling types, other permitted uses, recreational facilities, streets, parks and other reservations; 7. Tabulations demonstrating the relationship of the development to proposed land use intensity and proposed numbers and types of dwelling units; 8. Where required by the planning commission, an ecological survey in accordance with the standards of the state department of environmental protection and the water and navigation control act of the county, as they may from time to time be amended.

If the PUD zoning map amendment is approved, after all public hearings a final Binding Master Plan with any revisions will be required.

Technical compliance must be confirmed 30 days before a public hearing will be scheduled. The applicant or agent MUST be present at the public hearing and will be contacted by staff regarding availability. By submitting this application the owner(s) of the subject property does hereby grant his/her consent to the Zoning Official and his/her designee, to enter upon the subject property for the purposes of making any examinations, surveys, measurements, and inspections deemed necessary to evaluate the subject property for the duration of the petition.


Authorized Agent Name & Date:

JEFFREY A. POORE
2/26/19

Applicant Name & Date:

Authorized Agent Signature:

Applicant Signature:

A handwritten signature in blue ink is located in the left column of the signature box. A blue arrow originates from the signature and points towards the right column, which is labeled 'Applicant Signature'.

GCCF PUD

PROJECT NARRATIVE

The proposed GCCF PUD is 300 +/- acre property located south of Laurel Road, north of Border Road, east of I-75 and the City's wastewater treatment plant, and west of the Milano PUD. The property is located within the Northeast Neighborhood of the City's Comprehensive Plan and is designated Mixed Use Residential on the Future Land Use Map. The property consists of the previously approved The Bridges CMU (Ordinance No. 2008-24) and the previously approved Villa Paradiso PUD (Ordinance No. 2006-10). Together the two currently approved binding development plans for the property authorize up to 1,794 residential dwelling units with a mix of residential housing types, and up to 160,00 square feet on non-residential uses.

The applicant proposes a rezoning to Planned Unit Development (PUD) which would combine The Bridges CMU and the Villa Paradiso PUD into a single PUD (GCCF) for the development of a residential community consisting of detached single- family homes, paired villas, multi-family homes, assisted living facilities, amenity centers, and open space. A 25 +/- acre portion of the property will also allow for House of Worship as permitted use, and Medical Office as a Special Exception Use, as an alternative to residential. The proposed density is up to 1,300 residential units (approximately 4.3 dwelling units per acre), a 27 % reduction in the currently approved density for the site. The proposed GCCF PUD will also reduce building heights, increase perimeter setbacks, and increase open space as compared to the currently approved zoning.

Access to the site will be via Laurel Road and Border Road. Consistent with Comprehensive Plan Strategy TR-NE 1.1.4 a north/south roadway connection between Laurel Road and Border Road will be provided through the GCCF PUD. In addition, where common ownership with the Milano PUD to the east exists, one or more optional interconnections between the properties shall be permitted. The circulation plan for the GCCF PUD will provide opportunities for multi-modal connectivity, and will include a linked sidewalk system for pedestrian connectivity from each of the development pods throughout the PUD. Further, sidewalk linkages along Laurel Road and Border Road will be provided to the project limit.

All internal roadways will be privately owned and maintained. The on-site stormwater management system will be privately owned and maintained. Water and wastewater facilities will be dedicated to the City of Venice.

Policy 8.2 Analysis

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:

- A. Land use density and intensity.
The proposed density and intensity is a reduction from the currently approved density and intensity for the property.
- B. Building heights and setbacks.
The proposed building heights and setback are a reduction from the currently approved development plans for the property.
- C. Character or type of use proposed.
The proposed uses are compatible with the neighborhood and will not result in a change in the character or type of uses currently permitted in the area.
- D. Site and architectural mitigation design techniques.
The proposed plan will result in a less intense form of development as compared to the currently approved development plans.

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

- E. Protection of single-family neighborhoods from the intrusion of incompatible uses.
Not applicable.
- F. Prevention of the location of commercial or industrial uses in areas where such uses are incompatible with existing uses.
Not applicable.
- 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.
Not applicable.
- H. Densities and intensities of proposed uses as compared to the densities and intensities of existing uses.
The proposed plan will result in a less intense form of development as compared to the currently approved development plans.

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

No incompatibility exists, nevertheless, the applicant offers the following responses.

- I. Providing open space, perimeter buffers, landscaping and berms.
The proposed plan is consistent with all City of Venice open space, buffers and landscaping requirements.
- J. Screening of sources of light, noise, mechanical equipment, refuse areas, delivery and storage areas.
The proposed plan will result in a less intense form of development as compared to the currently approved development plans.
- K. Locating road access to minimize adverse impacts.
Road access has been located to minimize any adverse impacts.
- L. Adjusting building setbacks to transition between different uses.
The proposed plan will result in a less intense form of development as compared to the currently approved development plans.

- M. Applying step-down or tiered building heights to transition between different uses.
The proposed plan will result in a less intense form of development as compared to the currently approved development plans.
- N. Lowering density or intensity of land uses to transition between different uses.
The proposed plan will result in a less intense form of development as compared to the currently approved development plans.

Sec. 86-47. (f) (1)

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.
The proposed change is in conformity with the Mixed Use Residential Comprehensive Plan designation for the property.
- B. The existing land use pattern.
The proposed residential PUD is consistent with the land use pattern in the area which largely consists of residential uses.
- C. Possible creation of an isolated district unrelated to adjacent and nearby districts.
The proposed residential PUD will not create an unrelated isolated district as it is adjacent to nearby districts with similar uses.
- D. The population density pattern and possible increase or overtaxing of the load on public facilities such as schools, utilities, streets, etc.
The proposed residential PUD will not overtax the load on public facilities such as schools, utilities and streets, and reduce impacts on public facilities as compared to the current zoning.
- E. Whether existing district boundaries are illogically drawn in relation to existing conditions on the property proposed for change.
The current split CMU and PUD zoning on the project is illogical and the proposed rezoning will allow for unified development of the properties.
- F. Whether changed or changing conditions make the passage of the proposed amendment necessary.
The split CMU and PUD zoning on the property makes the passage of the proposed zoning amendment necessary for a unified development plan.
- G. Whether the proposed change will adversely influence living conditions in the neighborhood.
The proposed change will not adversely affect living conditions in the neighborhood as appropriate buffering is proposed from adjacent properties and a reduction in the currently approved density/intensity of development is proposed.
- H. Whether the proposed change will create or excessively increase traffic congestion or otherwise affect public safety.
The proposed change will not excessively increase traffic congestion or otherwise affect public safety.
- I. Whether the proposed change will create a drainage problem.
The proposed change will not create a drainage problem and will be required to meet all City of Venice standards related to drainage.
- J. Whether the proposed change will seriously reduce light and air to adjacent areas.
The proposed development includes substantial setbacks and open space so as to ensure preservation of light and air to adjacent areas.
- K. Whether the proposed change will adversely affect property values in the adjacent area.
The proposed change will not adversely affect property values in the area.
- L. Whether the proposed change will be a deterrent to the improvement or development of adjacent property in accord with existing regulations.
The proposed change will not be a deterrent to the improvement or development of adjacent property.

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

The proposed change will not constitute a grant of special privilege.

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

The split CMU and PUD zoning of the properties requires this PUD rezoning in order to unify the development plan for the properties.

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

The change is not 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.

There are limited adequate areas within the City which are currently zoned for the proposed use.