

From: [ronald courtney](#)
To: [City Council](#)
Subject: Rejection of resolution
Date: Saturday, June 22, 2019 3:34:09 PM

Mayor and Council Members;

As a full time resident of the city of Venice I urge you to reject the Conditional Use Request for a Planned United Development allowing for a Gated Community (CC 19-09CU) thus creating a north south road that denies public use.. This proposal is in direct conflict with the recently revised Comprehensive Plan Transpiration Under our plan it is necessary to coordinate with developers to minimize the negative impact to existing roadways with in the city. It is essential that through good growth transportation management there are multiple routes for public transportation to reduce congestion. By making a decision that is opposed to both our comprehensive plan and good management practices we will increase congestion causing additional expense for fuel consumption, increase carbon emissions violating our strategic plan for a eco friendly community, increase the potential for accidents with personal injury or loss of life while potentially delaying the arrival of safety and emergency personnel.. Under the Federal EPA for transportation there is language that smart and sustainable street design will enhance the quality of life for residents, protect human health and the environment. Therefore it is essential the there be the appropriate connecting roads for Border and Laurel that is open to the public.

Respectfully

Ronald Courtney
435 Otter Creek Drive
941 484 2063

From: [John Pinckney](#)
To: [City Council](#)
Subject: Connector
Date: Sunday, June 23, 2019 7:52:57 AM

Dear Members of the City Council,

Just some quick input on the connector. If you don't make the connector between Laura and Border a must, then the only road will be Jacaranda to access Laura and points north. The traffic on Jacaranda to Laura is already very heavy and going to be very dangerous if the connector is not approved. Please, we need to think long term and not just for the needs of the developers!

Thanks,
John Pinckney

Sent from my iPhone

From: [Paul Connolly](#)
To: [John Holic](#)
Cc: [City Council](#)
Subject: (formerly) The Bridges or Villa Paradiso
Date: Sunday, June 23, 2019 12:58:17 PM

Dear Honorable Mayor Holic and City Council Members:

Soon, you will be voting on requiring or not requiring public access on the proposed “connector road” between Laurel and Border Roads through the proposed Neal development formerly known as “The Bridges”. I urge you to give strong and due consideration to making said connector a “public” roadway. Not doing so will guarantee that all traffic moving between Laurel and Border east of I-75 will have to use Jacaranda Blvd. Requiring the public connector road will (at the very least) take some of the pressure off Jacaranda and will absolutely create an alternative means of travel between Laurel and Border when Life/Safety emergency response is needed.

With eyes wide open, we can reasonably expect some increased traffic on Jacaranda due to development of sites such as “Aria”, “Cielo”, and “Vicenza”. With the connector road, there will be an alternative in the event that Jacaranda is blocked off (closed or compromised). Without the connector, there will be no other alternative except for the distant Pinebrook Road and its associated additional travel length, traffic, and traffic signals.

In advance, thank you for your consideration of this input and your service to the City of Venice.

Paul J. Connolly
228 Casalino Drive
Nokomis, FL 34275

Paul J. Connolly, P.E., P.L.S.
Civilworks New England/Haight Engineering, PLLC
P.O. Box 1166
181 Watson Road
Dover, New Hampshire 03821
O: 603.750.4266
F: 603.749.7348
pconnolly@civilworksne.com
www.civilworksne.com

From: [Charlene Turczyn](#)
To: [City Council](#); holic@venicegov.com
Subject: Road situation
Date: Sunday, June 23, 2019 2:42:24 PM

Dear Honorable Mayor Holic and City Council Members:

Soon, you will be voting on requiring or not requiring public access on the proposed "connector road" between Laurel and Border Roads through the proposed Neal development formerly known as "The Bridges". I urge you to give strong and due consideration to making said connector a "public" roadway. Not doing so will guarantee that all traffic moving between Laurel and Border east of I-75 will have to use Jacaranda Blvd. Requiring the public connector road will (at the very least) take some of the pressure off Jacaranda and will absolutely create an alternative means of travel between Laurel and Border when Life/Safety emergency response is needed.

With eyes wide open, we can reasonably expect some increased traffic on Jacaranda due to development of sites such as "Aria", "Cielo", and "Vicenza". With the connector road, there will be an alternative in the event that Jacaranda is blocked off (closed or compromised). Without the connector, there will be no other alternative except for the distant Pinebrook Road and its associated additional travel length, traffic, and traffic signals.

In advance, thank you for your consideration of this input and your service to the City of Venice.

Charlene Turczyn
Sr. Principal
www.cmwassoc.com

CMW and Associates Corporation; SDB, WOSB, EDWOSB
PO Box 1886 Nokomis, FL 34274 (p) 941 488 7492
GSA Schedules: TAPS GS07F063N, MOBIS GS10F0199U
Seaport-e 8(a) STARS II

Offices in Washington DC, Springfield, IL and Venice FL

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: This e-mail and any attachments contain information from CMW & Associates Corporation, and are intended solely for the use of the named recipient or recipients. Any dissemination of this e-mail by anyone other than an intended recipient is strictly prohibited. If you are not a named recipient, you are prohibited from any further viewing of the e-mail or any attachments or from making any use of the e-mail or attachments. If you believe you have received this e-mail in error, notify the sender immediately and permanently delete the e-mail, any attachments, and all copies thereof from any drives or storage media and destroy any printouts of the e-mail or attachments.

From: [Paul Turczyn](#)
To: [City Council](#)
Subject: (formerly) The Bridges or Villa Paradiso
Date: Sunday, June 23, 2019 4:04:29 PM

Dear Honorable Mayor Holic and City Council Members:

Soon, you will be voting on requiring or not requiring public access on the proposed "connector road" between Laurel and Border Roads through the proposed Neal development formerly known as "The Bridges". I urge you to give strong and due consideration to making said connector a "public" roadway. Not doing so will guarantee that all traffic moving between Laurel and Border east of I-75 will have to use Jacaranda Blvd. Requiring the public connector road (at the very least) will take some of the pressure off Jacaranda and absolutely create an alternative means of travel between Laurel and Border when Life/Safety emergency response is needed.

With eyes wide open, we can reasonably expect some increased traffic on Jacaranda due to development of sites such as "Aria", "Cielo", and "Vicenza". With the connector road, there will be an alternative in the event that Jacaranda is blocked off (closed or compromised). Without the connector, there will be no other alternative except for the distant Pinebrook Road and its associated additional travel length, traffic, and traffic signals.

In advance, thank you for your consideration of this input and your service to the City of Venice.

Paul J. Turczyn
265 Benedetto Ct
North Venice, FL 34275

From: [Evan Michaels](#)
To: [City Council](#); [John Holic](#)
Subject: Issue
Date: Sunday, June 23, 2019 6:31:15 PM

Dear Honorable Mayor Holic and City Council Members:

Soon, you will be voting on requiring or not requiring public access on the proposed “connector road” between Laurel and Border Roads through the proposed Neal development formerly known as “The Bridges”. I urge you to give strong and due consideration to making said connector a “public” roadway. Not doing so will guarantee that all traffic moving between Laurel and Border east of I-75 will have to use Jacaranda Blvd. Requiring the public connector road will (at the very least) take some of the pressure off Jacaranda and will absolutely create an alternative means of travel between Laurel and Border when Life/Safety emergency response is needed.

With eyes wide open, we can reasonably expect some increased traffic on Jacaranda due to development of sites such as “Aria”, “Cielo”, and “Vicenza”. With the connector road, there will be an alternative in the event that Jacaranda is blocked off (closed or compromised). Without the connector, there will be no other alternative except for the distant Pinebrook Road and its associated additional travel length, traffic, and traffic signals.

In advance, thank you for your consideration of this input and your service to the City of Venice.

From: [Ralph Mastronicola](#)
To: [City Council](#)
Subject: Traffic
Date: Monday, June 24, 2019 6:58:24 AM

Neal would once again like to NOT put in a road that was recommended by the Venice Comprehensive Planning Committee.

I urge everyone living in Milano to write the mayor and city council.

citycouncil@venicegov.com.

Mayor Holic

jholic@venicegov.com

- 1) it is a safety issue - if Jacaranda is blocked there is no easy access to Laurel Avenue
- 2) Traffic is already heavy on Jacaranda - this will funnel more traffic to Jacaranda.
- 3) We as taxpayers will be responsible for new roads including the Jackson extension
- 4) The developers should be responsible for safe traffic, as their developments are adding to the traffic congestion.

Here is a suggested letter.

Dear Honorable Mayor Holic and City Council Members:

Soon, you will be voting on requiring or not requiring public access on the proposed "connector road" between Laurel and Border Roads through the proposed Neal development formerly known as "The Bridges". I urge you to give strong and due consideration to making said connector a "public" roadway. Not doing so will guarantee that all traffic moving between Laurel and Border east of I-75 will have to use Jacaranda Blvd. Requiring the public connector road will (at the very least) take some of the pressure off Jacaranda and will absolutely create an alternative means of travel between Laurel and Border when Life/Safety emergency response is needed.

With eyes wide open, we can reasonably expect some increased traffic on Jacaranda due to development of sites such as "Aria", "Cielo", and "Vicenza". With the connector road, there will be an alternative in the event that Jacaranda is blocked off (closed or compromised). Without the connector, there will be no other alternative except for the distant Pinebrook Road and its associated additional travel length, traffic, and traffic signals.

In advance, thank you for your consideration of this input and your service to the City of Venice.
Sent from my iPhone

From: lfamiano2208@gmail.com
To: [City Council](#)
Subject: Road
Date: Monday, June 24, 2019 7:09:48 AM

Neal would once again like to NOT put in a road that was recommended by the Venice Comprehensive Planning Committee.

I urge everyone living in Milano to write the mayor and city council.

citycouncil@venicegov.com.

Mayor Holic

jholic@venicegov.com

- 1) it is a safety issue - if Jacaranda is blocked there is no easy access to Laurel Avenue
- 2) Traffic is already heavy on Jacaranda - this will funnel more traffic to Jacaranda.
- 3) We as taxpayers will be responsible for new roads including the Jackson extension
- 4) The developers should be responsible for safe traffic, as their developments are adding to the traffic congestion.

Here is a suggested letter.

Dear Honorable Mayor Holic and City Council Members:

Soon, you will be voting on requiring or not requiring public access on the proposed "connector road" between Laurel and Border Roads through the proposed Neal development formerly known as "The Bridges". I urge you to give strong and due consideration to making said connector a "public" roadway. Not doing so will guarantee that all traffic moving between Laurel and Border east of I-75 will have to use Jacaranda Blvd. Requiring the public connector road will (at the very least) take some of the pressure off Jacaranda and will absolutely create an alternative means of travel between Laurel and Border when Life/Safety emergency response is needed.

With eyes wide open, we can reasonably expect some increased traffic on Jacaranda due to development of sites such as "Aria", "Cielo", and "Vicenza". With the connector road, there will be an alternative in the event that Jacaranda is blocked off (closed or compromised). Without the connector, there will be no other alternative except for the distant Pinebrook Road and its associated additional travel length, traffic, and traffic signals.

In advance, thank you for your consideration of this input and your service to the City of Venice.

Sent from my iPhone

Life's a beach

From: [Mike Rafferty](#)
To: [Charles Newsom](#)
Cc: [City Council](#); [John Holic](#); [Lori Stelzer](#); [earle.kimel@heraldtribune.com](#); [ggiles@venicegondolier.com](#); [Bob Mudge](#)
Subject: Fwd: Rezone 18-10 - The Bridges Workforce Housing
Date: Sunday, June 23, 2019 11:03:18 AM
Attachments: [Narrative.pdf](#)
[alert 2desantis vetos workforce housing.pdf](#)

Good Morning Chuck,

Just read your note to Ed.....I hope this means you will vote on the Bridges rezone to deny the proposal and retain the current CMU zoning and 1,100 unit work force housing project.

Thank you,
Mike Rafferty

Affordable Housing Documents as discussed at EDC Board meeting this morning
Charles Newsom <CNewsom@Venicegov.com>

Yesterday, 5:57 PM

Edward Lavallee <ELavallee@Venicegov.com>;

Judy Gamel <JGamel@Venicegov.com>

[Blueprint for Sarasota Workforce
Housing.pdf](#)
[3 MB](#)

[COUNTY AHAC- Recommendations with
attachments.pdf](#)
[372 KB](#)

2 attachments (4 MB) Download all

Phish Alert

Good evening Mr Lavallee

Attached please find interesting information on Affordable housing from the EDC meeting.

Best Regards,
Chuck Newsom

Council to consider trading 1,100 units of workforce housing for 1,300 more residential units.

Recent Council talk to encourage development of workforce gets a reality check on June 25. A public hearing to rezone the Gulf Coast Community Foundation (GCCF) project, The Bridges, from its current status to allow construction of 1,100 units of workforce housing to a Planned Unit Development (PUD) with 1,300 roof tops takes place on that date.

Council's talk on workforce housing is well documented (see below) and this parcel with easy access to I-75 and close proximity to the new Sarasota Memorial hospital would seem as ideal to put their words into action.

Now developers in North Venice want to take these 300 +/- acres of land recently purchased from the GCCF and develop it with 1,300 homes, a 10 acre parcel with cell towers, and 25 acres of nonresidential use to include assisted living facilities, church, and medical. Justification, much less density than the 1,100 workforce units and 600 roof tops as approved.

As far as I know, this is the only remaining parcel in Venice approved for workforce housing as the 510 unit John Nolen Gardens off Knights Trail Road was abandoned in 2017.

If this Council is sincere in its desire to provide workforce housing opportunities, this rezone must be denied.

<https://www.heraldtribune.com/news/20160304/in-venice-bridges-may-lead-to-affordable-housing>

In Venice, 'Bridges' may lead to affordable housing



By Earle Kimmel

Posted Mar 4, 2016 at 2:47 PM Updated Mar 4, 2016 at 2:47 PM

Mayor lobbies for a plan before land's owner supports it.

VENICE — For nearly a decade, the 146-acre project known as "The Bridges" has led nowhere.

Now, Venice Mayor John Holie is lobbying for it as a path to affordable housing. And he is doing it by taking the unusual step of promoting plans for land the city does not control and without yet receiving support from the owner, the Gulf Coast Community Foundation.

The Gulf Coast Community Foundation purchased the land in 2005 for \$16.1 million with an eye toward building a mixed-use, mixed-income neighborhood for working families that would include workforce housing. But the foundation put those plans on the shelf after the collapse of the real estate market during the Great Recession.

(For remainder follow above link)

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 12, 2019

FLA. NEWS SERVICE 7

A conversation on workforce housing

Mayor has an idea to fix impediment that limits workforce housing units to 750 sq. ft. within county.

By GREG GILES
News Editor

Mayor John Holie of Venice wants the Sarasota County Commission to rezone the workforce housing project on "The Bridges" property, a 146-acre site currently owned by the Gulf Coast Community Foundation.

Mayor Holie
A solution: Don't grant more impact fees on the site. Co-locate the workforce housing units with the 1,100 units already on the site.

Rich Cautero
A solution: Don't grant more impact fees on the site. Co-locate the workforce housing units with the 1,100 units already on the site.

Bob Daniels
A solution: Get out of the city. The city is not the place for this type of housing.

Helen Moore
A solution: Pressure the state legislature to pass a law that allows for more workforce housing units.

Joanne Gates
A solution: Agree with the state legislature to pass a law that allows for more workforce housing units.

Mitzie Fiedler
A solution: Agree with the state legislature to pass a law that allows for more workforce housing units.

New Community



Herald-Tribune

Wednesday, June 12, 2019

Affordable housing sought

Venice City Council members hesitant to trim impact fees

By Earle Kimmel

earle.kimmel@heraldtribune.com

VENICE — An impromptu brainstorming session Tuesday by the Venice City Council on the best way to promote affordable housing in the city started with the query of whether to ask Sarasota County to modify its ordinance capping impact fees on workforce housing to include places larger than 750 square feet.

It ended with a call to join with other local governments and their lobbyists to push the state legislature to stop taxing trust funds meant to pay for affordable housing.

Mayor John Holie brought the topic up, after conversations with developers who wanted to see if the county ordinance that caps impact fees in half could be modified to include a development where the average size of units are 750 square feet. In that way, it would be possible to build larger two-bedroom units and smaller efficiencies, as well as the county-targeted 750-square-foot, one-bedroom units. "There are a lot of families that need workforce housing that need more than one bedroom," Holie said.

(see Herald Tribune edition of June 12, 2019 for remainder of article)

Copyright © 2019 Herald Tribune - All rights reserved. Restricted use only 6/12/2019



ALERT: Workforce Housing in Trouble

Venice City Council considers converting 1,100 units of workforce housing to 1,300 conventional roof tops at their June 25, 2019 Meeting. Will they follow the same path as our Governor and ignore these needs?

Send an e-mail to Council and tell them NO on Rezone 18-10.....let them know you will be voting this November.....

citycouncil@venicegov.com , elavallee@venicegov.com , LStelzer@Venicegov.com

Herald-Tribune



Two-time Pulitzer winner
2011, 2016

 Saturday, June 22, 2019

heraldtribune.com |  @heraldtribune |  [Facebook.com/heraldtribune](https://www.facebook.com/heraldtribune) | \$2



Gov. Ron DeSantis discusses the state budget during a press conference Friday in Tallahassee. DeSantis signed the \$91 billion state spending plan while issuing \$131.3 million in budget vetoes. (STAFF PHOTO / JOHN KENNEDY)

With cuts, DeSantis signs state budget

By John Kennedy
jkennedy@gatehousemedia.com

TALLAHASSEE — Gov. Ron DeSantis signed an almost \$91 billion state budget Friday and made good on his pledge to pare back a modest level of spending — vetoing

A look at what DeSantis vetoed

Gov. DeSantis signed an almost \$91 billion state budget after vetoing \$131.3 million.

Among the bigger projects axed:

\$8 million: Jacksonville Urban Core Workforce Housing

From: [Mike Rafferty](#)
To: [John Holic](#)
Cc: [City Council](#); [Lori Stelzer](#)
Subject: Fwd: 18-10RZ Council Public Hearing June 25, 2019
Date: Sunday, June 23, 2019 12:14:28 PM

Good Morning John,

I realize this is a quasi judicial matter. Once the Hearing is opened please encourage Council to get answers from our Planning Director on those items outlined in the e-mail below.

Also, please include this e-mail in the record of correspondence for 18-10RZ.

Thanks,

Mike Rafferty

-----Original Message-----

From: Mike Rafferty <mer112693@aol.com>
To: jshrum <jshrum@venicegov.com>; AJimenez <AJimenez@venicegov.com>
Cc: LStelzer <LStelzer@Venicegov.com>
Sent: Sun, Jun 23, 2019 12:05 pm
Subject: 18-10RZ Council Public Hearing June 25, 2019

Good Morning Jeff,

As part of your presentation to Council on June 25, 2019 please include comments on the following:

- COV code for a PUD limit nonresidential use to 5% [86-130,(i), (2)].....5% of 300 ac+/- = 15 ac....25 proposed in application. This exceeds code and must be reduced and/or left zoned CMU (see next issue).
- Nonresidential required by code to be within project, not on streets fronting existing public ways [86-130, (r)]....proposed 25 ac nonresidential fronts on Laurelleave this part zoned CMU....deduct 100 roof tops
- City is searching for park property in N Venice.....PUD code provides for up to 8% of gross are project to be set aside as COV park and/or other public use [86-130-j,(2)]....24 acres....deduct 100 roof tops
- Cell towers prohibited from PUD....deduct 10 ac parcel from PUD and leave zoned as CMU.....deduct 50 roof tops....(parcel 038 900 2031)
- Net.....1,150 roof tops

Thank you.

Mike Rafferty

From: [W Olen Thomas](#)
To: [John Holic](#); [City Council](#)
Subject: GCCF Planned Unit Development (PUD)
Date: Monday, June 24, 2019 11:43:37 AM

At the City Council meeting on Tuesday, June 25, 2019 you will have the opportunity to review the conditional use petition and zoning map amendment for the 300 acre GCCF Planned Unit Development (PUD) located east of I-75 between Laurel Road and Border Road. This project has been previously reviewed by the Planning Commission and approved by them with one of the following staff stipulation/conditions:

“The main north/south corridor through the development from Border Road to Laurel Road shall not be gated and shall be accessible for use by the public at all times.”

If you decide to approve this project, I think it is vital that you include this stipulation as a condition of your approval.

Jacaranda Boulevard is currently the only north/south traffic corridor east of I-75. Traffic on this road increases on a daily basis, and as the only north/south corridor in this section of the city, congestion will only get worse. This situation will be exacerbated by the following:

1. Milano is nearing completion and is adding 464 homes in total.
2. Aria is under development and will have 180 homes.
3. Cielo in under development and will add 126 homes at build out.

It should be noted that Jacaranda Boulevard provides the only ingress and egress for these three developments.

The following new developments along Border Road will provide even more demand for north/south traffic movement:

1. Vicenza - Phase 1 is under development and will add 311 homes. Phase 2 will include more.
2. Venice Woodlands is under development and will add 263 homes.

In addition, the Murphy Oaks development is still under consideration and as late as last week developers are now attempting to rezone the 80 acre parcel across the street from the GCCF PUD and Aria that will add 203 homes if approved.

To the north, along Laurel Road across from the GCCF PUD, Treviso Grand is adding 272 rental residences and it is still unclear what impact the Mirasol mixed-use development will have on traffic.

The Comprehensive Plan specifies the need for additional north/south corridors. The Planning Committee approval of the GCCG PUD required that the north/south corridor must be accessible by the public at all times. Based on the information included above and other surrounding development not mentioned, the need seems well justified. And, this is the last

remaining opportunity to provide such a corridor east of I-75. I can tell you from experience as a resident of Milano, traffic is only getting worse.

I would also like to comment on a statement provided on page 26 of the Zoning Amendment staff report. The report states that the GCCF PUD provides for a development pattern consistent with the PUDs recently approved by the city. The Milano PUD, at a density of 1.46 units/acre is specifically cited for comparison. The GCCF PUD is planned for 4.3 units/acre - three times the density of Milano. That hardly seems comparable.

Thank you for your consideration. I look forward to tomorrow's meeting.

Regards,

W. Olen Thomas
248 Acerno Drive
Venice, FL 34275

From: [Bob Shorette](#)
To: [City Council](#)
Subject: Access Road
Date: Monday, June 24, 2019 4:28:05 PM

Dear Honorable Mayor Holic and City Council Members:

Soon, you will be voting on requiring or not requiring public access on the proposed “connector road” between Laurel and Border Roads through the proposed Neal development formerly known as “The Bridges”. I urge you to give strong and due consideration to making said connector a “public” roadway. Not doing so will guarantee that all traffic moving between Laurel and Border east of I-75 will have to use Jacaranda Blvd. Requiring the public connector road will (at the very least) take some of the pressure off Jacaranda and will absolutely create an alternative means of travel between Laurel and Border when Life/Safety emergency response is needed.

With eyes wide open, we can reasonably expect some increased traffic on Jacaranda due to development of sites such as “Aria”, “Cielo”, and “Vicenza”. With the connector road, there will be an alternative in the event that Jacaranda is blocked off (closed or compromised). Without the connector, there will be no other alternative except for the distant Pinebrook Road and its associated additional travel length, traffic, and traffic signals.

In advance, thank you for your consideration of this input and your service to the City of Venice.

Regards Robert Shorette

From: [Mike Rafferty](#)
To: [John Holic](#)
Cc: [City Council](#); [Jeff Shrum](#)
Subject: GCCF Workforce Housing
Date: Wednesday, June 26, 2019 9:32:29 AM
Attachments: [excerpt from Ord 2008-24.pdf](#)
[e mail mayor to jeff shrum jun 26.pdf](#)

Good Morning John,

I sincerely applaud today's e-mail to Jeff Shrum regarding the GCCF matter.

Your statement.....

When asked to rezone, I think it is important to try to understand what the council that was seated at the time of the original zoning may have had in mind. Those councils are the ones that drafted the stipulations and requirements currently in force and those stipulations and requirements would be lost to a rezone.

deserves reinforcement.

Attached is an excerpt from the original rezone Ord 2008-24 for the Bridges hi-lighting the provision for workforce housing.....

9. A workforce housing strategy shall be provided for new residential development and included in subdivision platting.....

Eleven years ago, your predecessors acknowledged the need for workforce housing and made provisions to accommodate same in the future. This Council recently reiterated the dire need for workforce housing.

Their intent is clear back in 2008, please make sure their foresight back then is not lost in the current frenzy to build, build, build.

Retain the CMU designation and workforce housing stipulation.

Thanks for all your efforts.

Regards,

Mike Rafferty

Caution: This email originated from an external source. **Be Suspicious of Attachments, Links and Requests for Login Information**

Prepared by: City Clerk

ORDINANCE NO. 2008-24

AN ORDINANCE AMENDING THE OFFICIAL ZONING ATLAS OF THE CITY OF VENICE, FLORIDA RELATING TO THE BRIDGES, REZONING PETITION NO. 07-3RZ FOR THE REZONING OF THE FOLLOWING DESCRIBED PROPERTY FROM SARASOTA COUNTY "OPEN USE RURAL (OUR)" ZONING DISTRICT TO CITY OF VENICE "COMMERCIAL, MIXED USE (CMU)" ZONING DISTRICT; AND PROVIDING AN EFFECTIVE DATE.

BE IT ORDAINED BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF VENICE, FLORIDA:

SECTION 1. The City Council finds as follows:

A. The Council has received and considered the report of the Planning Commission recommending approval, with additional conditions or stipulations governing permitted uses within the "Commercial, Mixed Use (CMU)" zoning district, of Zoning Map Amendment Petition No. 07-3RZ requesting rezoning of the property described herein.

B. The Council has held a public hearing on the petition and has considered the information received at said public hearing.

C. The proposed rezoning of the property described herein is in accordance with and meets the requirements of the City of Venice Comprehensive Plan and the Joint Planning Agreement/Interlocal Service Boundary Agreement and any amendments thereto.

SECTION 2. The Official Zoning Atlas is hereby amended by changing the zoning classification for the following described property located in the City of Venice from Sarasota County "Open Use Rural (OUR)" zoning district to City of Venice "Commercial, Mixed Use (CMU)" zoning district.

9. A workforce housing strategy shall be provided for new residential development and included in subdivision platting and site development plan applications and shall be evaluated by the Planning Commission.

SECTION 4. This ordinance shall take effect immediately upon its approval and adoption, as provided by law contingent on the approval of city vacation of the necessary portion of the 50 foot ingress and egress, public utilities and drainage easement (exact portion to be vacated to be determined by the city).

PASSED BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF VENICE, FLORIDA, THIS 9TH DAY OF DECEMBER 2008.

First Reading: November 25, 2008

Final Reading: December 9, 2008

Adoption: December 9, 2008


Ed Martin, Mayor

Attest:


Lori Stelzer, MMC, City Clerk

GCCF presentation on 6/25/19

JH

John Holic



Reply all

Wed 6/26/2019 4:31 AM

To:

Jeff Shrum <JShrum@Venicegov.com>

Cc:

Edward Lavalley <ELavalley@Venicegov.com>;

Kelly Fernandez - Persson & Cohen <kfernandez@swflgovlaw.com>;

Lori Stelzer <LStelzer@Venicegov.com>;

Judy Gamel <JGamel@Venicegov.com>

Label: Board and Council Public MB Permanent Delete Tag (1 month and 1 day) Expires: 7/27/2019 4:31 AM

Phish Alert

Jeff,

First, thank you for the information you and your team provided for the GCCF rezone yesterday; this portion of Northeast Venice proved to be completely different from other properties in the area as both properties were already zoned properly with City of Venice zoning and the new owner is requesting different zoning. In the majority of other properties we have worked on in Northeast Venice we granted original city zoning, per pre-annexation agreements, from county zoning to city zoning. When asked to rezone, I think it is important to try to understand what the council that was seated at the time of the original zoning may have had in mind. Those councils are the ones that drafted the stipulations and requirements currently in force and those stipulations and requirements would be lost to a rezone.

I have copied Mr. Lavalley in this email as it will have a work request that he may have to approve. I have also copied Ms. Fernandez as I will be asking her if I need to disclose this email as ex-parte communication. I believe we are OK in asking staff for information and it is not considered ex-parte, but it doesn't hurt to make sure.

An important ingredient missing in the staff report was if we do nothing, what do we have, or stated another way, as currently zoned, what is the responsibility of a builder or developer? There are a number of stipulations listed in Section 3 of Ordinance 2006-10 for Villa Paradiso as well as a requirement for a north-south road. I think we need to know if the stipulations in Section 3 have been met and what type of road is required and at who's cost. Also, since the zoning went from county OUE to city PUD, has any type of binding master plan been submitted?

For the Bridges, Ordinance 2008-24, the original zoning went from county OUR to city CMU. The material in the agenda package has the ordinance with attached exhibits, two exhibit A's and exhibits 1-5; none of those shows the binding master plan, however, they do have other requirements. It would be helpful to know what the obligation is of the owner of the property under the current zoning, if all obligations have been met and what the binding master plan is for the property. Additionally, I believe a north-south connector road is required in Ordinance 2008-24.

I think if we had explanations of the current zoning requirements, including but not limited to what is binding and what can be easily changed, along with any associated drawings, we could better decide if rezoning had any advantages or disadvantages to the city.

The other topic is the road. I think we need a full explanation, along with drawings, of what a private road would look like and what a public road would look like. We need to have the requirements for a two lane public road per the comp plan and/or LDR's. I am sure Mr. Neal was being facetious when he mentioned a road with a 22 foot median, we need to know what's required by code. If we want to upgrade, that is a city council decision, not a requirement of a rezone.

Another area that needs greater explanation is the change in building height. I trust that change will be in the proper place by July 9 as per your memo. I will need to know more about the 55 foot maximum for the medical office, assisted living facility and house of worship. Also, I will need clarification on the 25 acre depiction versus 15 acre maximum for non-residential buildings.

Finally, for now at least, I think we need clarification on the amenity area. I thought I heard it was changed to single family/multi family instead of amenities for the development. Currently, all the subdivisions have some type of amenity area / park. As they are all gated communities, those park facilities take the burden of providing public parks off the city. If this rezone changes the way things have developed up until now, it could put pressure on the city to purchase park land and that is another expense that would have to be discussed at the council level as it is not currently a budgeted item, other than a placeholder in a future CIP year.

Sorry for so many questions, but I really think we need this information.

Thanks,

John

John Holic
Mayor, City of Venice
[401 W. Venice Ave.](#)
[Venice, FL 34285](#)
Office: 941-882-7402
Cell: 941-303-3357

From: [Mike Rafferty](#)
To: mer112693@aol.com
Cc: [City Council](#); kfernandez@swflgovlaw.com; [Lori Stelzer](#)
Subject: Fwd: GCCF - Quas-judic and ex-parte communication
Date: Wednesday, June 26, 2019 11:47:11 AM
Attachments: [gondo meeting with Neal and Newsom.pdf](#)

Good Morning Again,

Thanks to all for a prompt response.

Somewhat confused by the term "discouraged" rather than "prohibited" in Kelly's response.....your standard response on quasi judicial matters lean on the "prohibited" side.

Also, *shall not investigate facts in a matter independently*.....seems "prohibited".

As far as the Neal/Newsom meeting, I recall the same discussion that is documented in today's Gondo (article attached).

In any event, caution, would seem prudent.

Regards,

Mike Rafferty

-----Original Message-----

From: Kelly Fernandez - Persson, Cohen & Mooney <kfernandez@swflgovlaw.com>
To: 'John Holic' <JHolic@Venicegov.com>; Mike Rafferty <mer112693@aol.com>
Cc: City Council <CityCouncil@Venicegov.com>
Sent: Wed, Jun 26, 2019 11:07 am
Subject: RE: GCCF - Quas-judic and ex-parte communication

Mr. Rafferty,

I do not recall any discussion yesterday about Mr. Newsom meeting or having met with the applicant to discuss anything related to the pending GCCF petition.

In any case, communications between a Council member and an applicant or applicant representative that will involve a quasi-judicial proceeding are **strongly discouraged, but not strictly prohibited**. These types of communications (ex-parte) must be disclosed at the start of the hearing, which will allow any other party to question the discloser about the substance of the communication to ensure that everyone will be basing their decision on the same evidence and same record.

Kelly M. Fernandez, Esq.
Persson, Cohen & Mooney, P.A.
236 Pedro St.

Venice, FL 34285

Ph: (941) 306-4730 | Fax: (941) 306-4832

Board Certified by the Florida Bar in City, County and Local Government Law

A portion of the firm's practice includes the collection of debts. As such this electronic mail transmission may be an attempt to collect a debt, in which case any information which is obtained will be used for that purpose.

This email is intended solely for the use of the individual to whom it is addressed and may contain information that is privileged, confidential or otherwise exempt from disclosure under applicable law. If the reader of this email is not the intended recipient or the employee or agent responsible for delivering the message to the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution, or copying of this communication is strictly prohibited. If you have received this communication in error, please immediately notify us by telephone and return the original message to us at the listed email address. Thank You.

From: John Holic [mailto:JHolic@Venicegov.com]

Sent: Wednesday, June 26, 2019 10:49 AM

To: Mike Rafferty

Cc: City Council; Kelly Fernandez - Persson, Cohen & Mooney

Subject: Re: GCCF - Quas-judic and ex-parte communication

Dear Mr. Rafferty,

I see you have copied the City Attorney, I am certain she will take action as appropriate.

Sincerely,

John Holic

Mayor, City of Venice

401 W. Venice Ave.

Venice, FL 34285

Office: 941-882-7402

Cell: 941-303-3357

From: Mike Rafferty <mer112693@aol.com>

Sent: Wednesday, June 26, 2019 9:37 AM

To: John Holic

Cc: City Council; kfernandez@swflgovlaw.com

Subject: GCCF - Quasi-judicial and ex-parte communication

Good Morning John,

Regarding yesterday's hearing on the GCCF I respectfully encourage you to seek council regarding the following prohibition on.....

Quasi-judicial and ex-parte communication.....judicial body..... shall not investigate facts in a matter independently and shall consider only the evidence presented and any facts that may properly be judicially noticed.

The specifics regarding Mr Newcom is the testimony yesterday regarding Mr Newcom meeting with the developer independently to discuss details of the proposal.

In the event this may have already happened, or in the event it does happen, would it be necessary for Mr Newcom to abstain from any vote.

Thanks for all your efforts.

Regards,

Mike Rafferty

Caution: This email originated from an external source.**Be Suspicious of Attachments, Links and Requests for Login Information**

Decision on gated private road delayed

Neal Communities is OK with a public road — if the city pays for it

By BOB MUDGE
SENIOR WRITER

The Venice City Council spent hours Tuesday on a zoning amendment only to decide that it didn't have enough information to make a decision.

The amendment was a proposal to consolidate The Bridges Commercial, Mixed-Used District and the Villa Paradiso Planned Unit Development (PUD) in North Venice into a single PUD.

Neal Communities has plans for a 1,300-unit housing development on the combined 300 acres, with a mix of single-family and multi-family dwellings.

Neal sought some modifications to the city code it the proposed GCCF PUD but the major sticking point was in its application for a condition-use permit to put gates at the

Also at issue

A second potential hurdle to the approval of the GCCF PUD is the lack of a buffer along the I-75 side of the property. Council Member Chuck Newsom said he won't vote for it without an earthen and concrete barrier.

John Neal said that putting up a barrier would mean the removal of trees that are already providing a buffer. And, because the roadway is elevated, it's unlikely a wall that would withstand hurricane-force winds could be built.

Pat Neal offered to meet with Newsom to discuss other sound-reduction options.

The Council will also need to decide whether to require all development be in the city's Northern Italian Renaissance style; whether to allow modifications to height and setback requirements; and whether an existing cell tower counts against a 5 percent limit on nonresidential uses on the property.

access points to Border and Laurel roads for the major road through the property.

What Neal wanted: The company has developed a number of gated

communities in the area. The roads in this PUD would be private, so it wants to be able to allow access to residents only, by installing gates, with public access in

emergencies.

What city staff said: The city's comprehensive plan contemplates a north/south artery east and west of Jacaranda Boulevard. The GCCF property is the only one remaining that could connect Border and Laurel and provide one of the arteries.

Neal's response: The road can be public, as long as the city is willing to pay for it. Instead of gates off the boundary roads the developer would put gates at the side streets. But "if it's a private road, Neal Communities will gate it," attorney Jeff Boone said.

City Attorney Kelly Fernandez said that in her opinion the city would still have authority over the installation of gates.

What Council members said: Council Member Bob Daniels was most adamant about the road being public, saying he

wouldn't vote for a private road.

No other Council members took that firm a stand on the road. All were concerned about how much it would cost, especially after learning that all of the city's mobility fee money is committed to improving the Pinebrook Road/East Venice Avenue intersection.

Pat Neal put an estimate of \$7 million-\$9 million on it but called that the "developer's discount" — the amount it would cost his company, which already owns the land. As a government project, he said, it would probably total about \$15 million.

And that's for a private road as planned, with 10-foot travel lanes, bike lanes and sidewalks. The city might want wider lanes — requiring more right of way — lighting and landscaping beyond

what is planned, as well as a median, Neal said.

How they left it: Both the ordinance and the conditional-use application were postponed to the July 9 meeting. Neal will provide the Council with a cost to build the road and the city staff will look at funding options.

It will also allow time for consideration of a "modeling exercise" a consultant is working on to aid in traffic analysis.

Council Member Jeanette Gates said Neal's prices should be for what it would cost for the same road as private and as public, which would include right of way acquisition.

"I'm hearing horse trading," Neal said.

"If it's important to you to get this project going ... we're going to see how important to you it is," she replied.

From: [Mike Rafferty](#)
To: [John Holic](#)
Cc: [City Council](#); kfernandez@swflgovlaw.com; [Lori Stelzer](#)
Subject: Re: GCCF - Quas-judic and ex-parte communication
Date: Wednesday, June 26, 2019 1:42:11 PM

Dear Mayor Holic,

From what I saw on the live stream, Mr Newsom seemed eager to accept the offer.

Mr Rafferty

-----Original Message-----

From: John Holic <JHolic@Venicegov.com>
To: Mike Rafferty <mer112693@aol.com>
Cc: City Council <CityCouncil@Venicegov.com>; kfernandez@swflgovlaw.com
<kfernandez@swflgovlaw.com>; Lori Stelzer <LStelzer@Venicegov.com>
Sent: Wed, Jun 26, 2019 12:17 pm
Subject: Re: GCCF - Quas-judic and ex-parte communication

Dear Mr. Rafferty,

Thank you for the attached article. Please note, the article states Mr. Neal offered to meet Mr. Newsom to explain sound reduction alternatives. Mr. Newsom did not accept the invitation to the best of my recollection.

Thank you,

John Holic

Mayor, City of Venice

401 W. Venice Ave.

Venice, FL 34285

Office: 941-882-7402

Cell: 941-303-3357

From: Mike Rafferty <mer112693@aol.com>
Sent: Wednesday, June 26, 2019 11:47:02 AM
To: mer112693@aol.com
Cc: City Council; kfernandez@swflgovlaw.com; Lori Stelzer
Subject: Fwd: GCCF - Quas-judic and ex-parte communication

Good Morning Again,

Thanks to all for a prompt response.

Somewhat confused by the term "discouraged" rather than "prohibited" in Kelly's response.....your standard response on quasi judicial matters lean on the "prohibited" side.

Also, *shall not investigate facts in a matter independently*.....seems "prohibited".

As far as the Neal/Newsom meeting, I recall the same discussion that is documented in today's Gondo (article attached).

In any event, caution, would seem prudent.

Regards,

Mike Rafferty

-----Original Message-----

From: Kelly Fernandez - Persson, Cohen & Mooney <kfernandez@swflgovlaw.com>
To: 'John Holic' <JHolic@Venicegov.com>; Mike Rafferty <mer112693@aol.com>
Cc: City Council <CityCouncil@Venicegov.com>
Sent: Wed, Jun 26, 2019 11:07 am
Subject: RE: GCCF - Quas-judic and ex-parte communication

Mr. Rafferty,

I do not recall any discussion yesterday about Mr. Newsom meeting or having met with the applicant to discuss anything related to the pending GCCF petition.

In any case, communications between a Council member and an applicant or applicant representative that will involve a quasi-judicial proceeding are **strongly discouraged, but not strictly prohibited**. These types of communications (ex-parte) must be disclosed at the start of the hearing, which will allow any other party to question the discloser about the substance of the communication to ensure that everyone will be basing their decision on the same evidence and same record.

Kelly M. Fernandez, Esq.

Persson, Cohen & Mooney, P.A.

236 Pedro St.

Venice, FL 34285

Ph: (941) 306-4730 | Fax: (941) 306-4832

Board Certified by the Florida Bar in City, County and Local Government Law

A portion of the firm's practice includes the collection of debts. As such this electronic mail transmission may be an attempt to collect a debt, in which case any information which is obtained will be used for that purpose.

This email is intended solely for the use of the individual to whom it is addressed and may contain information that is privileged, confidential or otherwise exempt from disclosure under applicable law. If the reader of this email is not the intended recipient or the employee or agent responsible for delivering the message to the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution, or copying of this communication is strictly prohibited. If you have received this communication in error, please immediately notify us by telephone and return the original message to us at the listed email address. Thank You.

From: John Holic [mailto:JHolic@Venicegov.com]

Sent: Wednesday, June 26, 2019 10:49 AM

To: Mike Rafferty

Cc: City Council; Kelly Fernandez - Persson, Cohen & Mooney

Subject: Re: GCCF - Quasi-judic and ex-parte communication

Dear Mr. Rafferty,

I see you have copied the City Attorney, I am certain she will take action as appropriate.

Sincerely,

John Holic

Mayor, City of Venice

401 W. Venice Ave.

Venice, FL 34285

Office: 941-882-7402

Cell: 941-303-3357

From: Mike Rafferty <mer112693@aol.com>

Sent: Wednesday, June 26, 2019 9:37 AM

To: John Holic

Cc: City Council; kfernandez@swflgovlaw.com

Subject: GCCF - Quasi-judicial and ex-parte communication

Good Morning John,

Regarding yesterday's hearing on the GCCF I respectfully encourage you to seek council regarding the following prohibition on.....

Quasi-judicial and ex-parte communication.....judicial body..... shall not investigate facts in a matter independently and shall consider only the evidence presented and any facts that may properly be judicially noticed.

The specifics regarding Mr Newcom is the testimony yesterday regarding Mr Newcom meeting with the developer independently to discuss details of the proposal.

In the event this may have already happened, or in the event it does happen, would it be necessary for Mr Newcom to abstain from any vote.

Thanks for all your efforts.

Regards,

Mike Rafferty

Caution: This email originated from an external source.**Be Suspicious of Attachments, Links and Requests for Login Information**

From: [John Holic](#)
To: [Robert Daniels](#)
Cc: [Lori Stelzer](#); [City Council](#)
Subject: Quasi-judicial Re: Border to Laurel road connector road
Date: Wednesday, June 26, 2019 7:25:21 PM

John Holic
Mayor, City of Venice
401 W. Venice Ave.
Venice, FL 34285
Office: 941-882-7402
Cell: 941-303-3357

From: Robert Daniels
Sent: Wednesday, June 26, 2019 6:34:45 PM
To: John Holic
Cc: Lori Stelzer
Subject: Fwd: Border to Laurel road connector road

For you to respond
Sincerely,

Council Member, Bob Daniels

From: Robert Daniels
Sent: Wednesday, June 26, 2019 6:34:11 PM
To: ndaniels1102@gmail.com
Subject: Fwd: Border to Laurel road connector road

Fyi
Sincerely,

Council Member, Bob Daniels

From: Paul Fox <pfox500@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, June 26, 2019 10:59:26 AM

To: Robert Daniels

Subject: Border to Laurel road connector road

Bob, I read in the Venice Gondolier today about your support for a public, not private, road to connect Border and Laurel Roads in Neal's proposed east of I-75 fronting development. I live in Milano and face Jacaranda Blvd. 0.2 mile away across a pond. There is already plenty of traffic on Jacaranda generating noise and there will be plenty more with all the houses already approved in the area. An alternate route is needed for some of the traffic between Border and Laurel. The new road should connect directly to Knight's Trail.

Neal already got away with a private gated road between Border and Laurel in the community approved east of Milano on Border Rd. They should have been made to extend Havana Road to Laurel and pay for it themselves. Please don't let them get away with it again!

The City of Venice should NOT pay for the connecting public road and require it to be built! Neal can add a few thousand dollars to the cost of each of the 1300 proposed houses to pay for it. If Neal threatens not to build the I-75 fronting community unless Venice pays for the road, let them walk away from the project. We've got enough houses approved already in North Venice. They will probably come back in a few years itching to build this community and pay for the road.

Paul Fox

243 Cassano Drive, Venice

Milano Community

Caution: This email originated from an external source. **Be Suspicious of Attachments, Links and Requests for Login Information**

From: [John Holic](#)
To: [Rona Elias](#); [City Council](#)
Subject: quasi-judicial RE: The need for the proposed road between Border and Laurel to be Public
Date: Thursday, June 27, 2019 1:54:54 PM

John Holic
Mayor, City of Venice
Office (941) 882-7402
Cell (941) 303-3357

From: Rona Elias [mailto:rkeliass17@gmail.com]
Sent: Thursday, June 27, 2019 1:43 PM
To: John Holic <JHolic@Venicegov.com>; Richard Cautero <RCautero@Venicegov.com>; Robert Daniels <RDaniels@Venicegov.com>; mfielder@venicegov.com; ggates@venicegov.com; Helen Moore <HMoore@Venicegov.com>; Charles Newsom <CNewsom@Venicegov.com>
Subject: The need for the proposed road between Border and Laurel to be Public

Dear Mayor Holic and Council People,

My husband and I live in the community of Milano between Border and Laurel and off Jacaranda Blvd. We have been visiting this area since the early nineties and when it came to retirement we initially wanted to move to Sarasota. A good friend of ours started telling about the advantages of living in Venice where you got more "bang for your buck". We looked at Grand Palm and Boca Royale and were immediately concerned about the traffic patterns. We also looked at other builders but chose Milano because of its location and proximity to exit 193 and 195 off of I75. I am aware that several of you live in the Venetian and Willow Chase and no doubt share my opinion. Having said that, making the new road public is imperative for safety reasons and to take the pressure off the Jacaranda corridor especially when the Knights Trail to Clark Rd has competed. We chose this area for a better quality of life and have come to love the Venice area.

I implore all of you to vote for the new road between Laurel and Border to be accessible to the public and not be gated!

Sincerely,
Rona and Scott Elias
264 Acerno Drive
N. Venice 34275

Caution: This email originated from an external source. **Be Suspicious of Attachments, Links and Requests for Login Information**

From: [Rona Elias](#)
To: [John Holic](#)
Cc: [City Council](#)
Subject: Re: quasi-judicial RE: The need for the proposed road between Border and Laurel to be Public
Date: Thursday, June 27, 2019 2:01:18 PM

Thank you for your response.

Sincerely,
Rona Elias
264 Acerno Drive
N. Venice, FL

On Thu, Jun 27, 2019 at 1:54 PM John Holic <JHolic@venicegov.com> wrote:

Thank you for your e-mail. The City Council sits as a quasi-judicial body in land use matters (such as rezonings and conditional uses) and must behave as judges in making such decisions. As in judicial matters, decisions must be based on factual information made part of the record during the public hearing. The due process rights of all participants include notice, the opportunity to be heard, and the right to be advised of all facts on which the decision makers rely.

For this reason, our Council Members are advised by the City Attorney's Office to not respond to letters, phone calls, e-mails, or requests for meetings with constituents outside the applicable public hearing.

Your correspondence is an important part of the public process and will be placed in the public record for all concerned to read. It is important that you know your correspondence will be read by every City Council Member prior to the public hearing and given its due consideration. You are encouraged to attend the public hearing on this matter and to testify as to any facts that you believe are important to the Council's determination.

John Holic
Mayor, City of Venice

[John Holic](#)

[Mayor, City of Venice](#)

[Office \(941\) 882-7402](#)

[Cell \(941\) 303-3357](#)

From: Rona Elias [mailto:kelias17@gmail.com]

Sent: Thursday, June 27, 2019 1:43 PM

To: John Holic <JHolic@Venicegov.com>; Richard Cautero <RCautero@Venicegov.com>; Robert

Daniels <RDaniels@Venicegov.com>; mfielder@venicegov.com; ggates@venicegov.com; Helen Moore <HMoore@Venicegov.com>; Charles Newsom <CNewsom@Venicegov.com>

Subject: The need for the proposed road between Border and Laurel to be Public

Dear Mayor Holic and Council People,

My husband and I live in the community of Milano between Border and Laurel and off Jacaranda Blvd. We have been visiting this area since the early nineties and when it came to retirement we initially wanted to move to Sarasota. A good friend of ours started telling about the advantages of living in Venice where you got more "bang for your buck". We looked at Grand Palm and Boca Royale and were immediately concerned about the traffic patterns. We also looked at other builders but chose Milano because of its location and proximity to exit 193 and 195 off of I75. I am aware that several of you live in the Venetian and Willow Chase and no doubt share my opinion. Having said that, making the new road public is imperative for safety reasons and to take the pressure off the Jacaranda corridor especially when the Knights Trail to Clark Rd has competed. We chose this area for a better quality of life and have come to love the Venice area.

I implore all of you to vote for the new road between Laurel and Border to be accessible to the public and not be gated!

Sincerely,

Rona and Scott Elias

264 Acerno Drive

N. Venice 34275

Caution: This email originated from an external source. **Be Suspicious of Attachments, Links and Requests for Login Information**

From: [John Holic](#)
To: [Rich Dallesandro](#)
Cc: [City Council](#)
Subject: quasi-judicial RE: Opposition to Hotel
Date: Thursday, June 27, 2019 2:03:32 PM

John Holic
Mayor, City of Venice
Office (941) 882-7402
Cell (941) 303-3357

From: Rich Dallesandro [mailto:sa22606@aol.com]
Sent: Thursday, June 27, 2019 10:43 AM
To: John Holic <JHolic@Venicegov.com>
Subject: Opposition to Hotel

To Hon. J.Holic, Mayor of the City of Venice. My hope is that you will be opposed to the construction of the Hotel that has been proposed to be built along East Venice Avenue. I am a condo owner located at Gondola Park Drive. This area is not zoned for a Hotel. I have owned my location since 2012. I purchased my property because of the location and the surrounding facilities in the area. A Hotel is not needed as there are more then enough nearby Interstate 75. Thank you in advance.

Respectfully,
Richard Dallesandro

Caution: This email originated from an external source. **Be Suspicious of Attachments, Links and Requests for Login Information**

From: [Lori Stelzer](#)
To: [Mercedes Barcia](#)
Subject: FW: GCCF presentation on 6/25/19
Date: Monday, July 1, 2019 5:12:52 PM

Mercedes,

Please add the mayor's email to the written correspondence. Thanks.

Lori Stelzer, MMC
City Clerk
City of Venice
401 W. Venice Avenue
Venice, FL 34285
941-882-7390
941-303-3486 (cell)
941-480-3031 (FAX)

From: John Holic <JHolic@Venicegov.com>
Sent: Wednesday, June 26, 2019 4:32 AM
To: Jeff Shrum <JShrum@Venicegov.com>
Cc: Edward Lavallee <ELavallee@Venicegov.com>; Kelly Fernandez - Persson & Cohen <kfernandez@swflgovlaw.com>; Lori Stelzer <LStelzer@Venicegov.com>; Judy Gamel <JGamel@Venicegov.com>
Subject: GCCF presentation on 6/25/19

Jeff,

First, thank you for the information you and your team provided for the GCCF rezone yesterday; this portion of Northeast Venice proved to be completely different from other properties in the area as both properties were already zoned properly with City of Venice zoning and the new owner is requesting different zoning. In the majority of other properties we have worked on in Northeast Venice we granted original city zoning, per pre-annexation agreements, from county zoning to city zoning. When asked to rezone, I think it is important to try to understand what the council that was seated at the time of the original zoning may have had in mind. Those councils are the ones that drafted the stipulations and requirements currently in force and those stipulations and requirements would be lost to a rezone.

I have copied Mr. Lavallee in this email as it will have a work request that he may have to approve. I have also copied Ms. Fernandez as I will be asking her if I need to disclose this email as ex-parte communication. I believe we are OK in asking staff for information and it is not considered ex-parte, but it doesn't hurt to make sure.

An important ingredient missing in the staff report was if we do nothing, what do we have, or stated another way, as currently zoned, what is the responsibility of a builder or developer? There are a number of stipulations listed in Section 3 of Ordinance 2006-10 for Villa Paradiso as well as a requirement for a north-south road. I think we need to know if the stipulations in Section 3 have been met and what type of road is required and at who's cost. Also, since the

zoning went from county OUE to city PUD, has any type of binding master plan been submitted?

For the Bridges, Ordinance 2008-24, the original zoning went from county OUR to city CMU. The material in the agenda package has the ordinance with attached exhibits, two exhibit A's and exhibits 1-5; none of those shows the binding master plan, however, they do have other requirements. It would be helpful to know what the obligation is of the owner of the property under the current zoning, if all obligations have been met and what the binding master plan is for the property. Additionally, I believe a north-south connector road is required in Ordinance 2008-24.

I think if we had explanations of the current zoning requirements, including but not limited to what is binding and what can be easily changed, along with any associated drawings, we could better decide if rezoning had any advantages or disadvantages to the city.

The other topic is the road. I think we need a full explanation, along with drawings, of what a private road would look like and what a public road would look like. We need to have the requirements for a two lane public road per the comp plan and/or LDR's. I am sure Mr. Neal was being facetious when he mentioned a road with a 22 foot median, we need to know what's required by code. If we want to upgrade, that is a city council decision, not a requirement of a rezone.

Another area that needs greater explanation is the change in building height. I trust that change will be in the proper place by July 9 as per your memo. I will need to know more about the 55 foot maximum for the medical office, assisted living facility and house of worship. Also, I will need clarification on the 25 acre depiction versus 15 acre maximum for non-residential buildings.

Finally, for now at least, I think we need clarification on the amenity area. I thought I heard it was changed to single family/multi family instead of amenities for the development. Currently, all the subdivisions have some type of amenity area / park. As they are all gated communities, those park facilities take the burden of providing public parks off the city. If this rezone changes the way things have developed up until now, it could put pressure on the city to purchase park land and that is another expense that would have to be discussed at the council level as it is not currently a budgeted item, other than a placeholder in a future CIP year.

Sorry for so many questions, but I really think we need this information.

Thanks,

John

John Holic
Mayor, City of Venice
401 W. Venice Ave.
Venice, FL 34285
Office: 941-882-7402

Cell: 941-303-3357