

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 consistent with all applicable elements of the Comprehensive Plan.**
  - b. The existing land use pattern.  
**The proposed RMF-3 rezoning will allow for development of a community of paired villas which will integrate well with the range of existing and planned uses in the area including single-family residential, multi-family residential, commercial retail, medical office and hospital.**
  - c. Possible creation of an isolated district unrelated to adjacent and nearby districts.  
**The proposed rezoning to the RMF-3 zoning district 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 RMF-3 rezoning will not result in an overtaxing of the load on public facilities such as schools, utilities and streets.**
  - e. Whether existing district boundaries are illogically drawn in relation to existing conditions on the property proposed for change.  
**The proposed rezoning to the RMF-3 zoning district is necessary to place a City of Venice zoning designation on the property upon annexation.**
  - f. Whether changed or changing conditions make the passage of the proposed amendment necessary.  
**The annexation of the property makes the passage of the proposed rezoning necessary.**
  - g. Whether the proposed change will adversely influence living conditions in the neighborhood.  
**The proposed RMF-3 zoning district 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 change will not excessively create or 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.  
**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.  
**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.  
**The proposed change will not be a deterrent to the improvement 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, it is a requirement of the City following annexation.**
- n. Whether there are substantial reasons why the property cannot be used in accord with existing zoning.  
**The property currently maintains a Sarasota County zoning designation, annexation of the property requires zoning to a City zoning district.**
- o. Whether the change suggested is out of scale with the needs of the neighborhood or the city.  
**The proposed change is not out of scale with the needs of the neighborhood, in fact the proposed change is necessitated by the recent changes in the scale of development in the area.**
- p. Whether it is impossible to find other adequate sites in the city for the proposed use in districts already permitting such use.  
**The City lacks adequate sites for the proposed use in the area.**