



City of Venice

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

Meeting Minutes Planning Commission

Tuesday, July 2, 2019

1:30 PM

Council Chambers

I. Call to Order

A Regular Meeting of the Planning Commission was held this date in Council Chambers at City Hall. Chair Barry Snyder called the meeting to order at 1:30 p.m.

II. Roll Call

Present: 7 - Chair Barry Snyder, Shaun Graser, Tom Murphy, Kit McKeon, Richard Hale, Scott Williams and Bill Willson

Also present

Liaison Council Member Helen Moore, City Attorney Kelly Fernandez, Development Services Director Jeff Shrum, Planning Manager Roger Clark, Planner Isaac Anderson, and Recording Secretary Mercedes Barcia.

III. Audience Participation

No one signed up to speak.

IV. Public Hearings

[19-11RZ](#)

Rezone Amendment - Cassata Place Phase II

Staff: Isaac Anderson, Planner

Agent: Jeffery Boone, Esq., Boone Law Firm

Mr Snyder announced this is a quasi-judicial hearing, read memorandum regarding advertisement and written communications, and opened the public hearing.

Ms. Fernandez queried board members on conflicts of interest and ex-parte communications. Mr. Wilson, Mr. Hale, and Mr. Graser disclosed site visits. There were no conflicts of interest.

Mr. Anderson, being duly sworn, provided a presentation and spoke on site characteristics, surrounding property comparison table, future land use and zoning map, zoning comparison table, comprehensive plan consistency, mitigation techniques, applicant's responses to Code Section 86-47(f)(1) rezone amendments, planning commission action, and responded to board

questions regarding county versus city zoning and difference in the maximum number of units allowed.

Annette Boone, representing applicant, being duly sworn, spoke to subject property, county zoning designation, pre-annexation agreement, applicant's zoning request, consistency with the comprehensive plan, and responded to board questions regarding maximum density.

Jeffery Boone, Boone Law Firm, being duly sworn, noted subject property is not a joint planning area (JPA) property.

Ms. Boone responded to board questions on the density and zoning of the adjoining property to the west and combining Cassata one and two in the future.

Mr. Shrum, being duly sworn, spoke to surrounding JPA properties to the east and south, the county's designation on maximum units per acre, and potential development.

Mr. Boone commented on the property developing in the city, JPA, and county versus city density.

Mr. Snyder closed the public hearing.

A motion was made by Mr. McKeon, seconded by Mr. Murphy, that based on review of the application materials, the staff report and testimony provided during the public hearing, the Planning Commission, sitting as the local planning agency, finds this petition consistent with the Comprehensive Plan, in compliance with the Land Development Code and with the affirmative Findings of Fact in the record, and recommends to city council approval of Zoning Amendment Petition No. 19-11RZ. The motion carried by the following vote:

Yes: 7 - Chair Snyder, Mr. Graser, Mr. Murphy, Mr. McKeon, Mr. Hale, Mr. Williams and Mr. Willson

19-17SP

Site & Development Plan Amendment - VOTI Mark Manor Renovation
Staff: Roger Clark, AICP, Planning Manager
Agent: Dean Paquet, P.E., Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc.

Mr. Snyder announced this is a quasi-judicial hearing, read memorandum regarding advertisement and written communications, and opened the public hearing.

Ms. Fernandez queried board members on conflicts of interest and ex-parte communications. Mr. Hale, Mr. Snyder, and Mr. Graser disclosed site visits. Mr. McKeon disclosed being on the Board of Directors and confirmed he can remain fair and impartial and base his decision on the evidence presented today.

Mr. Clark, being duly sworn, provided a presentation and spoke on site and development plan amendment, Village on the Isle (VOTI) land swap with the Lutheran Church, new construction, architectural, future land use and zoning map, conclusion and findings of fact, consistency with the comprehensive plan, and planning commission action.

Dean Paquet, representing VOTI, being duly sworn, spoke to building architecture, height, material and paint, site aerial, and requested allowing staff approval for similar architectural improvements to existing structures.

Greg Roberts, representing applicant, being duly sworn, spoke to time limit and expiration of the site and development plan.

Discussion followed regarding covered walkway to church, inner connectivity between buildings, consistency throughout the campus, and renovating cottages.

Mr. Clark commented on color sample board, motion to include allowing administrative approval of similar architectural upgrades to existing structures, one year extension of the site and development plan, and responded to board questions regarding administrative approvals to include having a process for architectural enhancements as part of the Land Development Regulations (LDR) update.

Mr. Snyder closed the public hearing.

A motion was made by Mr. Murphy, seconded by Mr. Wilson, that based on review of the application materials, the staff report and testimony provided during the public hearing, the Planning Commission, sitting as the local planning agency, finds this petition consistent with the Comprehensive Plan, in compliance with the Land Development Code and with the affirmative Findings of Fact in the record, and moves to approve Site and Development Plan Amendment Petition No. 19-17SP and allow administrative approval for similar architectural improvements to existing structures and a one year extension for expiration of the site and development plan. The motion carried by the following vote:

Yes: 7 - Chair Snyder, Mr. Graser, Mr. Murphy, Mr. McKeon, Mr. Hale, Mr. Williams and Mr. Willson

V. Comments by Planning Division

[19-4066](#)

Land Development Regulations Update

Staff: Jeff Shrum, AICP, Development Services Director

Mr. Shrum commented on the new senior planner, land development code (LDC) update, tree ordinance recommendation to city council, and LDR update.

Discussion followed regarding tree ordinance, banyan trees, incorporating

staff and public comments, best practices, and meeting state requirements.

VI. Comments by Planning Commission Members

There were none.

VII. Adjournment

There being no further business to come before this Commission, the meeting was adjourned at 2:23 p.m.

Chair

Recording Secretary