

**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: Ramsey Road Multi-Family (f/k/a Village at Venice)**Brief Project Description:** PUD Amendment for revised Development Plan.**Address/Location:** Ramsey Road**Parcel Identification No.(s):** 0412-11-0006, 0412-11-0005, 0412-14-0004**Proposed Numbers/Types of Dwelling Units:** 116 reduced from 120 currently permitted**Parcel Size:** 15.18**Current Zoning Designation(s):** 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:

☐ New \$4732 ☒ Major Amendment to PUD \$2300 ☐ 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: ☒ APPLICANT ☐ AGENT (SELECT ONE)

Applicant/Property Owner Name: The Gallina Companies (contract purchaser) Discovery Village at Venice, LLC and AG, Ventures, LLC (owners)

Address: 101 E. Main Street, Suite 500, Mt. Horeb, WI 53572 (contract purchaser)**Email:** **Phone:** 608-437-8300 (contract purchaser)**Design Professional or Attorney:** Michael E. Rissman, P.E., George F. Young, Inc.**Address:** 10540 Portal Crossing, Suite 105, Lakewood Ranch, FL 34211**Email:** mrisman@georgefyoung.com **Phone:** 941-747-2981**Authorized Agent (1 person to be the point of contact):** Jeffery A. Boone, Esq.**Address:** 1001 Avenida Del Circo**Email:** jboone@boone-law.com **Phone:** 941-488-6716**Petition No.** 19-04R2**Fee:**

Staff Use Only

RECEIVED

FEB 11 2019


PLANNING & ZONING

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). N/A
- ☒ **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). N/A
- ☒ **Planning Commission Considerations/Findings:** Per Code Section 86-47(f)(1), prepare a statement for each of the following considerations/findings(15 copies):
- Whether the proposed change is in conformity to the comprehensive plan;
 - The existing land use pattern;
 - Possible creation of an isolated district unrelated to adjacent and nearby districts;
 - The population density pattern and possible increase or overtaxing of the load on public facilities such as schools, utilities, streets, etc.;
 - Whether existing district boundaries are illogically drawn in relation to existing conditions on the property proposed for change;
 - Whether changed or changing conditions make the passage of the proposed amendment necessary;
 - Whether the proposed change will adversely influence living conditions in the neighborhood;
 - Whether the proposed change will create or excessively increase traffic congestion or otherwise affect public safety;
 - Whether the proposed change will create a drainage problem;
 - Whether the proposed change will seriously reduce light and air to adjacent areas;
 - Whether the proposed change will adversely affect property values in the adjacent area;
 - Whether the proposed change will be a deterrent to the improvement or development of adjacent property in accord with existing regulations;
 - Whether the proposed change will constitute a grant of special privilege to an individual owner as contrasted with the public welfare;
 - Whether there are substantial reasons why the property cannot be used in accord with existing zoning;
 - Whether the change suggested is out of scale with the needs of the neighborhood or the city; and
 - 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: Jeffery A. Boone, Esq.	Applicant Name & Date:
Authorized Agent Signature:  2/5/19	Applicant Signature:

Project Narrative- Ramsey Road Multi-Family PUD (f/k/a Village at Venice PUD)

The subject property is a 15.16 acre parcel generally located south of E. Venice Avenue, north of Hatchett Creek Boulevard, west of Ramsey Road and east of the Aston Garden Senior Living Facility. On June 9, 2009, the City Council adopted Ordinance No. 2009-04 approving the Village at Venice PUD zoning consisting of 120 multi-family dwelling units and a clubhouse with a binding development concept plan. The proposed PUD amendment seeks to amend the binding development concept plan to change the site layout, reduce building heights, modify architectural plans, and reduce the number of multi-family dwelling units to 116 units. A concurrent Site & Development Plan Amendment has been filed to reflect the proposed plan modifications.

In addition to the above, a modification to the requirements of Sec. 86-130 (q), concerning the requirement that no structure shall be located closer to any perimeter property line than two times the height of such structure, is requested. The proposed modification is to reduce the required setback from the perimeter property line to 25 feet for garage structures, and to 54 feet for residential buildings along the western boundary line. All other structures will meet or exceed the requirement of a perimeter setback of two times the building height of the structure. The perimeter setback reduction for garage structures is justified due to the significant amount of open space on site in excess of the 50% requirement and the significant amount of off-site open space adjacent to the garage structures. The residential building setback reduction is justified for the same reasons and additionally because the proposed modified perimeter setback of 54 feet exceeds the minimum perimeter setback requirement of 37.91 feet for the currently approved PUD.

The Ramsey Road Multi-family PUD will comply with the requirements of Section 86-130(m)1-7. Water and wastewater utilities will be public. Roads and stormwater management facilities will be private.

Any standard not stated or otherwise addressed in the binding master plan, including landscaping and buffering requirements, are subject to Chapter 86- Land Development Code.

The subject property has a Future Land Use Designation of Mixed Use Residential. The proposed PUD Amendment is consistent with all applicable elements of *Future Land Use Strategy LU 1.2.16-Mixed Use Residential* with the exception of Strategy LU 1.2.16.4 which limits density to 5.0 dwelling units per acre. However, *Strategy LU 1.2.21- Previously Approved Planned Developments* allows for previously approved PUD's to maintain their currently approved density, and the proposed PUD amendment for 116 dwelling units is less than the currently approved density of 120 dwelling units. Therefore, the proposed amendment is also consistent with the Comprehensive Plan with respect to density limitations. The proposed PUD Amendment is also consistent with Comprehensive Plan Transitional Policy 8.2 as evaluated below.

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

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

- A. *Land use density and intensity.*

The proposed PUD amendment is a reduction in density from the currently approved density.

- B. Building heights and setbacks.

The proposed PUD amendment will result in reduced building heights and greater setback than the currently approved PUD standards.

- C. Character or type of use proposed.

The proposed amendment does not change the character or type of use proposed

- D. Site and architectural mitigation design techniques.

Not applicable

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.

The proposed PUD amendment will further reduce any potential impacts to single-family neighborhoods as compared to the currently approved PUD standards.

- 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 PUD amendment is a reduction in density from the currently approved density.

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

- I. Providing open space, perimeter buffers, landscaping and berms.

The proposed PUD amendment provides sufficient open space and buffers to ensure no incompatibility exists.

- J. Screening of sources of light, noise, mechanical equipment, refuse areas, delivery and storage areas.

The proposed PUD amendment provides sufficient screening of sources of light, noise, mechanical equipment, refuse areas and delivery and storage areas.

- K. Locating road access to minimize adverse impacts.

Road access to the property been designed to minimize impacts.

- L. Adjusting building setbacks to transition between different uses.

The proposed PUD amendment reduces building heights from the currently approved PUD standards.

- M. Applying step-down or tiered building heights to transition between different uses.

Not applicable.

- N. Lowering density or intensity of land uses to transition between different uses.

The proposed PUD amendment is a reduction in density from the currently approved density.

Sec. 86-47. (f) Contents of planning commission report.

(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 Comprehensive Plan.
- b. The existing land use pattern.
The proposed change is consistent with the existing land use pattern and will result in a reduction in density/intensity of development on the site.
- c. Possible creation of an isolated district unrelated to adjacent and nearby districts.
The proposed PUD amendment will not create an isolated district unrelated to nearby districts.
- d. The population density pattern and possible increase or overtaxing of the load on public facilities such as schools, utilities, streets, etc.
As the proposed change will result in a reduction in density/intensity of development, the proposed PUD amendment will reduce the load on public facilities.
- e. Whether existing district boundaries are illogically drawn in relation to existing conditions on the property proposed for change.
Not applicable, the proposed change does not seek to change the PUD zoning designation of the property.
- f. Whether changed or changing conditions make the passage of the proposed amendment necessary.
The need to modify the PUD plan to allow for reduced density and building heights makes the proposed amendment necessary.
- g. Whether the proposed change will adversely influence living conditions in the neighborhood.
The proposed change will not adversely influence living conditions in the neighborhood as the amendment will reduce impacts to the neighborhood.
- h. Whether the proposed change will create or excessively increase traffic congestion or otherwise affect public safety.
As the proposed change will result in a reduction in density/intensity of development, the proposed change will not create or 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.
- j. Whether the proposed change will seriously reduce light and air to adjacent areas.
As the proposed change will result in a reduction in density/intensity of development, the proposed change will not seriously reduce light and air to adjacent areas.
- k. Whether the proposed change will adversely affect property values in the adjacent area.
As the proposed change will result in a reduction in density/intensity of development, the proposed change will not 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.
As the proposed change will result in a reduction in density/intensity of development, the proposed change will not be a deterrent to 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 to the owner.

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

Not applicable, the proposed amendment does not seek to change the PUD zoning for the property.

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

As the proposed change will result in a reduction in density/intensity of development on the property, it is not out of scale with the needs of the neighborhood or City.

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

Not applicable, the proposed amendment does not seek to change the PUD zoning for the property.