



City of Venice

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

Meeting Minutes Planning Commission

Wednesday, February 10, 2021

1:30 PM

Council Chambers

Land Development Regulations Workshop

[21-4895](#)

Instructions on How to Watch and/or Participate in the Meeting

I. Call to Order

Chair Barry Snyder called the meeting to order at 1:30 p.m.

II. Roll Call

Mr. Lawson joined the meeting at 1:40 p.m. and Mr. Jasper joined the meeting at 2:10 p.m.

Present: 7 - Chair Barry Snyder, Shaun Graser, Kit McKeon, Richard Hale, Bill Willson, Richard Lawson and Jerry Jasper

Also Present

Liaison Mayor Ron Feinsod, City Attorney Kelly Fernandez, City Clerk Lori Stelzer, Development Services Director Jeff Shrum, Information Technology Director Christophe St. Luce, Deputy City Clerk Danielle Lewis, and Recording Secretary Toni Cone.

All Planning Commission members attended via video conference.

III. Audience Participation

Don O'Connell, 500 Hauser Lane, commented on residential multi-family structures, minimum lot width, 1980 County zoning code that was adopted by the City, and non-conforming lots in the historical district. He suggested that the standard be amended for this zoning district, adopting John Nolen standards for those properties.

IV. Workshop

[21-4896](#)

Land Development Regulations Update - Section 4
Staff: Jeff Shrum, AICP, Development Services Director
Consultant: Kelley Klepper, AICP, Kimley-Horn & Associates

Mr. Shrum commented that the basic framework in place today was based on a county code and suggested that the board take a look at that as the county structures their code differently than the city.

Mr. Lawson joined the meeting at 1:40 p.m.

Mr. Snyder asked if they could easily identify the John Nolen properties.

Mr. Shrum suggested they look at other communities to see what they do for specific zoning districts and recommended further conversation on what the board intends to do on the demolition topic for city properties.

Mr. Snyder presented images of the city's current zoning map and noted that it is not fully up-to-date due to recent annexations.

Mr. Shrum clarified that the 2021 draft zoning map does not show the Rustic Road properties and needs some clean up and outlined potential plans for rectifying the non-zoned areas on the zoning district map. He stated that this draft map should not be considered as anything formal or final as there will be further changes.

Mr. Snyder noted the two categories presented in the document are traditional and mixed-use, but mixed-use will be discussed at next week's meeting where the board will discuss the different zoning standards for traditional and mixed use and allowable uses for both categories.

Mr. Snyder presented a table on residential single family (RSF) standards and explained that the table has sections for RSF-1, RSF-2, RSF-3 and RSF-4 and spoke on height exceptions in the residential multi-family districts.

Discussion ensued on clarification of Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) and flood standards in the future zoning code and comprehensive plan.

Mr. Shrum suggested they clarify the building height exception to explain four story maximum means one additional story to reach four stories maximum and recommended that property owner rights be clarified for demolition and rebuild.

Kelly Klepper, Kimley-Horn & Associates, stated that the tables should be consistent throughout so that there is no room for interpretation.

Mr. Snyder asked Mr. Shrum if the lot coverage changed for single-family dwellings and two-family dwellings. Mr. Shrum explained the correlation

between lot coverage and structure height. For residential manufactured homes, they are proposing a distinction between a residential manufactured home park and a manufactured home subdivision. Discussion ensued on the development standards for parks and for subdivisions.

Discussion followed on inactive districts (RMH).

Mr. Jasper arrived to the meeting at 2:10 p.m.

Mr. Klepper stated that the 35 foot maximum for manufactured homes also applies to service structures and other structures within a neighborhood.

Discussion continued on height restrictions and setbacks.

Mr. Snyder commented on design alternatives to achieve affordable/alternative housing and suggested alternative be used.

Mr. Lawson left the meeting at 2:15 p.m.

The board reviewed the non-residential office standards, non-residential commercial standards, as well as the non-residential industrial standards and the non-residential governmental standards. Discussion ensued on the building height and exception for non-residential industrial.

Discussion ensued regarding open space conservation, planned unit development (PUD) districts, the general standards, and buffering requirements and compatibility.

Board members reviewed planned commercial development (PCD) districts and planned industrial development (PID) districts.

Mr. Lawson returned to the meeting at 2:45 p.m.

Mr. Shrum and Mr. Snyder discussed that Venetian Gateway standards will be going away based on the current proposal and they will be discussed under mixed use standards.

Mr. Snyder spoke about the traditional zoning use table and the board talked about Office, Professional, and Institutional (OPI) restrictions. It was noted that there are five districts in the inactive category and they will no longer be zoning districts going forward.

Discussion followed regarding county-zoned properties. Properties that are not rezoned to a corresponding city designation will be shown as Zoned

SC on the zoning map. Mr. Shrum said the proposed changes to planned districts do not have any bearing on the existing planned districts.

V. Future LDR Workshop Discussion

[21-4897](#)

LDR Workshop Discussion

Staff: Jeff Shrum, AICP, Development Services Director

Mr. Shrum noted the agenda for next week will be the same as this week, a continuation of today's discussion on zoning, and staff is finalizing language with the consultant on Sections 9 and 10.

Discussion ensued on historic districts, demolitions, local register and homes in the historic district.

VI. Comments by Planning Division

There were none.

VII. Comments by Planning Commission Members

The board spoke on property rights and historic properties.

Staff presented the map of Architectural Review Board's (ARB) jurisdiction.

Mr. Shrum said that the historic district applies to residential and non-residential and the theme district applies to non-residential and multi-family.

Mr. Shrum discussed comprehensive plan requirements from the state.

Mr. O'Connell discussed merging the ARB with the Historic Preservation Board (HPB).

Mr. Snyder commented that different cities and locations have different historic aspects and standards than Venice does.

Mr. Shrum stated what materials he will provide to the board for the next workshop meeting.

All of the board members confirmed they favor combining ARB and HPB.

Mr. Shrum suggested adding this topic to the next workshop agenda since it was not in today's published agenda.

Mayor Feinsod advised he felt that consolidating boards was the right direction.

Mr. Snyder noted that all of the mixed use areas to be discussed next week have architectural components.

VIII. Adjournment

There being no further business to come before this Commission, the meeting was adjourned at 4:22 p.m.

Chair

Recording Secretary