

CITY OF VENICE

DEVELOPMENT SERVICES DEPARTMENT - PLANNING AND ZONING DIVISION

401 W. Venice Avenue, Venice, FL 34285

(941) 486-2626 ext. 7434

www.venicegov.com

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

| Project Name: 925 Tamiami Trail - Off Street Parking Addition | | |
|---|--|--|
| Brief Project Description: Construct off street parking. | | |
| | | |
| Address/Location: 925 Tamiami Trail, Venice, FL 34285 | | |
| Address/Location: 923 Tallialli Trall, Venice, FL 34285 | | |
| Parcel Identification No.(s): 0430-08-0004 | Parcel Size: 1.30 Acres | |
| Current Zoning Designation(s): CI/VUD COUNTY | Proposed Zoning Designation(s): CI/VUD | |
| ☐ Residential ⊠ Non-Residential | FLUM Designation(s): MIXED USE CORRIDOR | |
| concurrently filed land use petitions that qualify. Some pro New \$2908 | a minor or major amendment. A 35% reduction will be applied to bjects may be assessed an extended technical review fee of \$1400: | |
| hearings, regardless of approval status. Other fees may inc the City's consultant, verification by a consultant of the ac City Attorney fees. These fees are billed separately and mu | g and public notice fees in excess of \$50 will be billed after all public clude review of transportation/environmental reports and studies by accuracy of the legal description provided by the applicant/agent and just be paid before the Planning Commission public hearing. If these its are subject to delay. BILL TO: APPLICANT AGENT (SELECT) | |
| Applicant/Property Owner Name: Leslie Dunn, DUNN HA | VEN HOLDINGS LLC | |
| Address: 925 Tamiami Trail, Venice, FL 34285 | | |
| Email: srh@dunn-online.us | Phone: 703-989-1995 | |
| Design Professional or Attorney: Jeffery A. Boone, Esq. | | |
| Address: 1001 Avenida del Circo, Venice, FL 34285 | | |
| Email: jboone@boone-law.com | Phone: 941-488-6716 | |
| Authorized Agent (1 person to be the point of contact): | Fimothy E. Roane, P.E., DMK ASSOCIATES, INC. | |
| Address: 421 Commerical Court, Suite C-D, Venice, FL 342 | 92 | |
| Email: troane@dmkassoc.com | Phone: 941-412-1293 | |
| | Staff Use Only | |
| Petition No. 19 - Ola 27 | RECEIVED | |

Fee:

FEB 27 2019

PLANNING & ZONING

| (| |
|---|--|
| Application packages are reviewed by Planning Staff for comple hard & electronic copies, and additional copies may be reque bottom right corner visible. Concurrently filed applications mus is not being submitted. | ested. Large plans should be collated and folded to allow the |
| □ Application: (15 copies) | |
| □ Project Narrative: Provide A statement describing in detail to the statement described in th | he character and intended use of the development in addition |
| to the short description on page one of the application (15 co | pies). |
| ☑ CD with Electronic Files: Provide PDF's of ALL documents, ap for each parcel must be submitted in text (copyable) format a | nd will be verified by a consultant. |
| copy). | s. This individual will be the single point of contact for staff (1 $$ |
| Statement of Ownership and Control: Documentation of or County Property Appraiser or Tax Collector records will not surecognizing a person authorized to act on behalf of the entity Survey of the Property: Signed and sealed survey that acc | Iffice. Corporations or similar entities must provide documents (1 copy). Warranty Deed |
| must have its own legal description listed separately on the $\frac{7}{31}$ | survey, correctly labeled by parcel id. (1 copy) Date of Survey: |
| ☐ School Concurrency (RESIDENTIAL ONLY): School Impact A petition submittal (<i>1 copy</i>). NA | nalysis Receipt from Sarasota County dated within 10 days of |
| Public Workshop Requirements: (Section 86-41) Newspap | per advertisement $oxtimes$ Notice to property owners $oxtimes$ Sign-in sheet |
| ☑Written summary of public workshop (1 copy) | |
| Planning Commission Report: (15 copies) Per Code Section considerations/ findings: a. Whether the proposed change is in use pattern; c. Possible creation of an isolated district unrelated pattern and possible increase or overtaxing of the load on public existing district boundaries are illogically drawn in relation to exwesting district boundaries are illogically drawn in relation to exwesting district boundaries are illogically drawn in relation to exwesting district boundaries are illogically drawn in relation to exwesting district boundaries are illogically drawn in relation to exwestively increase traffic congestion or otherwise affect proposed change will adversely influence living conditions in the adeterrent to the improvement or development of adjacent proposed change will adversely affect property values in the adeterrent to the improvement or development of adjacent proposed change will constitute a grant of special privilege to Whether there are substantial reasons why the property cannot change suggested is out of scale with the needs of the neighbor other adequate sites in the city for the proposed use in district. | n conformity to the comprehensive plan; b. The existing land ed to adjacent and nearby districts; d. The population density blic facilities such as schools, utilities, streets, etc.; e. Whether existing conditions on the property proposed for change; f. If the proposed amendment necessary; g. Whether the he neighborhood; h. Whether the proposed change will create a bublic safety; i. Whether the proposed change will create a listy reduce light and air to adjacent areas; k. Whether the djacent area; l. Whether the proposed change will be a poperty in accord with existing regulations; m. Whether the an individual owner as contrasted with the public welfare; n. ot be used in accord with existing zoning; o. Whether the prhood or the city; and p. Whether it is impossible to find its already permitting such use. |
| Comprehensive Plan Compliance Report: Prepare a report | addressing the appropriate areas of the Comprehensive Plan |
| in order to determine compliance. | lic bearing will be exhaduled. The applicant or accust SALICT ha |
| Technical compliance must be confirmed 30 days before a public present at the public hearing and will be contacted by staff regother the subject property does hereby grant his/her consent to the property for the purposes of making any examinations, surveys, the subject property for the duration of the petition. | rarding availability. By submitting this application the owner(s) Zoning Official and his/her designee, to enter upon the subject |
| Authorized Agent Name & Date: //worsy E. Roane | Applicant Name & Date: |
| Authorized Agent Signature: 2/22/19 | Applicant Signature: |
| | |

Rezone Narrative - 925 Tamiami Trail

The subject property is located in Section 07, Township 39S, Range 19E in Sarasota County, Florida is owned by Dunn Have Holdings LLC. For proof of ownership and legal description of the parcel, please refer to a copy of the Deeds.

The Sarasota County parcel identification number is 0430-08-0004. More specifically, the project is located in the City of Venice at 925 Tamiami Trail S, Venice, Florida 34285 and contains 1.30 acres, more or less. The property is currently zoned Sarasota County (CI) with a City of Venice Overlay zoning of (VUD). An application to amend the zoning map to place a City of Venice zoning designation on the property has been requested by the City of Venice. The proposed City of Venice (CI) zoning is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan and Land Use Compatibility is consistent with existing neighborhoods.

The existing building is located in the southern corner of the property adjacent to US 41 (Tamiami Trail) and the easterly property line. The existing building contains a mixed use of office and residential which is consistent with the Mixed Use designation contained in the City's newly adopted Comprehensive Plan.

The adjacent zoning districts are as follows:

| North | Residential, Single Family (RSF-3) |
|-------|--|
| South | Office, Professional & Institutional (OPI/VUD) |
| East | Residential, Single Family (RSF-3) |
| West | Office, Professional & Institutional (OPI/VUD) |

The purpose and intent of this project is to construct an additional parking for the existing 5,280 square foot office/residential building. The three (3) existing paved spaces located in front of the building do not sufficiently meet the needs of the current occupancy. A total of 67 parking spaces; 62 standard and 5 ADA compliant spaces will provide the building occupants with sufficient parking to carry out their business operations. Upon approval of the Rezoning the Property Owner will submit site plans for review and approval.



Comprehensive Plan Consistency Analysis - 925 Tamiami Trail

The subject property is located at 925 Tamiami Trail within the Island Neighborhood of the City's Comprehensive Plan, and the property has a Future Land Use Designation of Mixed Use Corridor (MUC). The subject property is currently zoned Sarasota County (CI) with a City of Venice Overlay zoning of (VUD). The City has required the applicant to amend the zoning map to place a City of Venice zoning designation on the property, and the applicant proposes to place the City zoning designation of (CI) on the property. The proposed City of Venice (CI) zoning designation is consistent with Comprehensive Plan Strategy LU 1.2.9- Mixed Use Category which establishes (CI) as an implementing zoning district in the MUC land use designation.

The proposed rezoning will further implementation of *Strategy LU_IS 1.1.1 Redevelopment* wherein the City recognizes the minimal opportunities for development in the neighborhood, and supports the development of underutilized properties to encourage a diversity of non-residential uses capable of supporting the adjacent residential areas.

Finally, the proposed rezoning is consistent with Comprehensive Plan Transitional Policy 8.2 as analyzed 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:

Since the rezoning of the property from Sarasota County (CI) to City of Venice (CI) will not expand the uses currently permitted on the property, there is no compatibility issue. Nevertheless, the below responses are provided.

- A. Land use density and intensity.
 - The proposed rezoning which seeks to place a City of Venice zoning designation (CI) on the property is consistent with the existing land use, will not expand the list of uses already permitted on the property, and is consistent with uses permitted on other nearby properties and therefore will not create an isolated district unrelated to adjacent and nearby districts.
- B. Building heights and setbacks.

 The proposed rezoning which seeks to place a City of Venice zoning designation (CI) on the property will not expand building heights and setbacks beyond those already permitted on the property.
- C. Character or type of use proposed. The proposed rezoning which seeks to place a City of Venice zoning designation (CI) on the property is consistent with the existing land use, will not expand the list of uses already permitted on the property, and is consistent with uses permitted on other nearby properties and therefore is compatible with the neighborhood
- D. Site and architectural mitigation design techniques.

 Site and architectural mitigation design techniques will be addressed at the time of a Site & Development plan application for development of the property.

 RECEIVED



Considerations for determining compatibility shall include, but are not limited to, the following: Since the rezoning of the property from Sarasota County (CI) to City of Venice (CI) will not expand the uses currently permitted on the property, there is no compatibility issue. Nevertheless, the below responses are provided.

- E. Protection of single-family neighborhoods from the intrusion of incompatible uses. The proposed rezoning which seeks to place a City of Venice zoning designation (CI) on the property is consistent with the existing land use, will not expand the list of uses already permitted on the property, and is consistent with uses permitted on other nearby properties and therefore is compatible with the neighborhood.
- F. Prevention of the location of commercial or industrial uses in areas where such uses are incompatible with existing uses.
 - The proposed rezoning which seeks to place a City of Venice zoning designation (CI) on the property is consistent with the existing land use, will not expand the list of uses already permitted on the property, and is consistent with uses permitted on other nearby properties and therefore is compatible with the neighborhood.
- 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 rezoning which seeks to place a City of Venice zoning designation (CI) on the property is consistent with the existing land use, will not expand the list of uses already permitted on the property, and is consistent with uses permitted on other nearby properties and therefore is compatible with the neighborhood

Potential incompatibility shall be mitigated through techniques including, but not limited to: Since the rezoning of the property from Sarasota County (CI) to City of Venice (CI) will not expand the uses currently permitted on the property, there is no compatibility issue. Nevertheless, the below responses are provided.

- Providing open space, perimeter buffers, landscaping and berms.
 Open space, perimeter buffers, landscaping and berms will be evaluated through the Site & Development Plan review process at the time development is proposed for the property.
- J. Screening of sources of light, noise, mechanical equipment, refuse areas, delivery and storage areas.
 - Screening of sources of light, noise, mechanical equipment, refuse areas, delivery and storage areas will be evaluated through the Site & Development Plan review process at the time development is proposed for the property.
- K. Locating road access to minimize adverse impacts.
 Road access will be evaluated through the Site & Development Plan review process at the
- time development is proposed for the property.

 L. Adjusting building setbacks to transition between different uses.

 Building setbacks will be evaluated through the Site & Development Plan review process at the time development is proposed for the property.
- M. Applying step-down or tiered building heights to transition between different uses.

- Step-down or tiered building heights will be evaluated through the Site & Development Plan review process at the time development is proposed for the property.
- N. Lowering density or intensity of land uses to transition between different uses.

 Lowering density or intensity of land uses will be evaluated through the Site & Development Plan review process at the time development is proposed for the property.

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

permitted on the property.

facilities.

- (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 compliance with the comprehensive plan. Please see attached Comprehensive Plan Consistency Analysis.
- The existing land use pattern.
 The proposed rezoning which seeks to place a City of Venice zoning designation (CI) on the property is consistent with the existing land use, and will not expand the list of uses already
- c. Possible creation of an isolated district unrelated to adjacent and nearby districts.

 The proposed rezoning which seeks to place a City of Venice zoning designation (CI) on the property is consistent with the existing land use, will not expand the list of uses already permitted on the property, and is consistent with uses permitted on other nearby properties and therefore will not create 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.
 The proposed rezoning which seeks to place a City of Venice zoning designation (CI) on the property is consistent with the existing land use, will not expand the list of uses already permitted on the property, and therefore will not increase or overtax the load on public
- e. Whether existing district boundaries are illogically drawn in relation to existing conditions on the property proposed for change.
 - The proposed rezoning to a City of Venice zoning designation seeks to place the (CI) designation on the property which the most similar designation to the current County designation on the property (CI), and therefore is not illogical.
- f. Whether changed or changing conditions make the passage of the proposed amendment necessary.
 - Annexation of the property into the City of Venice makes the passage of the proposed amendment necessary.
- g. Whether the proposed change will adversely influence living conditions in the neighborhood. The proposed rezoning to a City of Venice zoning designation seeks to place the (CI) designation on the property which the most similar designation to the current County designation on the property (CI), and therefore will not adversely influence living conditions in the neighborhood.
- h. Whether the proposed change will create or excessively increase traffic congestion or otherwise affect public safety.
 - The proposed rezoning to a City of Venice zoning designation seeks to place the (CI) designation on the property which the most similar designation to the current County designation on the property (CI), and therefore 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 rezoning to a City of Venice zoning designation seeks to place the (CI) designation on the property which the most similar designation to the current County designation on the property (CI), and therefore will not create a drainage problem.

- j. Whether the proposed change will seriously reduce light and air to adjacent areas. The proposed rezoning to a City of Venice zoning designation seeks to place the (CI) designation on the property which the most similar designation to the current County designation on the property (CI), and therefore will not seriously reduce light and air to adjacent areas.
- k. Whether the proposed change will adversely affect property values in the adjacent area. The proposed rezoning to a City of Venice zoning designation seeks to place the (CI) designation on the property which the most similar designation to the current County designation on the property (CI), and therefore will not adversely affect property values in the area.
- I. Whether the proposed change will be a deterrent to the improvement or development of adjacent property in accord with existing regulations.
 The proposed rezoning to a City of Venice zoning designation seeks to place the (CI) designation on the property which the most similar designation to the current County designation on the property (CI), and therefore will not 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.
 - The proposed rezoning to a City of Venice zoning designation seeks to place the (CI) designation on the property which the most similar designation to the current County designation on the property (CI), and therefore 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 City has required a City of Venice zoning designation be placed on the property.
- o. Whether the change suggested is out of scale with the needs of the neighborhood or the city. The proposed rezoning to a City of Venice zoning designation seeks to place the (CI) designation on the property which the most similar designation to the current County designation on the property (CI), and therefore will not be 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 City has required a City of Venice zoning designation be placed on the property.