

## CONDITIONAL USE STAFF REPORT WATERMARK AT VENICE



GENERAL INFORMATION		
Petition Numbers:	21-13SP & 21-29SE	
Address:	500 R&F Ranch Road, 2800 & 2806 Curry Lane	
Request:	Allowing for gates in a proposed multifamily development	
Owner:	Thompson Thrift Development, Inc.	
Agent:	Jackson Boone, Esq. – Boone Law Firm	
Parcel IDs:	0387120001, 0387140004, 0387140003	
Property Size:	$29.4 \pm acres$	
Future Land Use:	Medium Density Residential/Moderate Density Residential	
Zoning:	Residential Multi-Family 3 (RMF-3)/RMF-1	
Comprehensive Plan Neighborhood:	Pinebrook Neighborhood	
Application Date:	April 27, 2021	

## **RELATED PETITIONS**

- Site and Development Plan Petition No. 21-13SP
- Special Exception Plan Petition No. 21-29SE

## **ASSOCIATED DOCUMENTS**

A. Application Information (completed petition)

# I. PROJECT DESCRIPTION

### **Conditional Use**

The subject petition proposes internal vehicular gates. The gates will be located at one Pinebrook Road access point and three Curry Lane access points, with one of these being siren-activated for emergency vehicle use only. The emergency gates are not part of the conditional use; the request applies to the resident entrances. Excerpts from the site and development plans are shown below, higlighting the locations of the gates in yellow.



Pinebrook Road Entrance



# **II. Existing Conditions**



### **Site Photos**



View towards the south along Pinebrook Road

View at the corner of Curry Lane and Pinebrook Road



View towards the east down Curry Lane

### **Future Land Use**

There are two Future Land Use (FLU) designations on the subject property. The recently-annexed parcel ( $20\pm$  acres) has a designation of Medium Density Residential (MEDR), and the  $10\pm$  acre parcel on the east side of the project is designated Moderate Density Residential (MODR). To the east and south are Medium Density Residential designations, and other properties to the south have a Mixed Use Residential designation or are located within Sarasota County. West of the subject property is designated Mixed Use Residential. To the North, parcels alternate between City Institutional Professional designations and Sarasota County designations.



## Zoning

There are also two zoning districts represented on the subject property. The recently-annexed parcel ( $20\pm$  acres) is zoned Residential, Multi Family 3 (RMF-3), and the  $10\pm$  acre parcel on the east side of the project is RMF-1. Properties to the east and south are also zoned RMF-1, and other properties to the south have a Planned Unit Development (PUD) zoning or are located within Sarasota County. West of the subject property is designated PUD as well. To the North, parcels alternate between City Office, Professional and Institutional (OPI) and Sarasota County zoning districts.



Direction	Existing Land Use(s)	Current Zoning District(s)	Future Land Use Map Designation(s)
North	Medical offices & rehabilitation hospital, single-family residential	OPI, Sarasota County	Institutional Professional, Sarasota County
West	Residential (Windwood)	Planned Unit Development (PUD)	Mixed Use Residential (MUR)
South	Residential (Waterford), vacant land, and single-family residential	PUD, RMF-1, Sarasota County	MUR, MODR, Sarasota County
East	Residential	RMF-1	MODR

# **III. PLANNING ANALYSIS**

In this section of the report, analysis of the subject conditional use petition evaluates 1) consistency with the Comprehensive Plan, and 2) compliance with the City's Land Development Code (LDC), and 3) compliance with requirements for Concurrency/Mobility.

### Consistency with the Comprehensive Plan

A review of the Comprehensive Plan produced no strategies or intents that would conflict with the proposed conditional use of a gated community.

### **Conclusions / Findings of Fact (Consistency with the Comprehensive Plan):**

Analysis has been provided to determine consistency with the Land Use Element strategies applicable to the Medium and Moderate Density Residential future land use designations, strategies found in the Pinebrook Neighborhood, and other plan elements. This analysis should be taken into consideration upon determining Comprehensive Plan consistency.

### **Compliance with the Land Development Code**

The subject petition has been processed with the procedural requirements to consider a conditional use petition. In addition, the petition has been reviewed by the Technical Review Committee and no issues regarding compliance with the Land Development Code were identified.

The applicant has provided responses to Sec. 86-42(e)1-9, addressing the Planning Commission's bases for decisions on this petition type:

(1) Compliance with all applicable elements of the comprehensive plan:

Applicant Comment: The proposed gated community is consistent will all applicable elements of the comprehensive plan.

**Staff Comment**: A review of the Comprehensive Plan has not produced any strategies or intents that would conflict with the proposed conditional use.

### (2) General compatibility with adjacent properties and other properties in the district;

Applicant Comment: The proposed gated community is compatible with adjacent properties and other properties in the district, in fact, gated communities are common in the area.

# (3) Scale of development. The relationship of the project or development in terms of its size, height, bulk, massing, intensity, and aesthetics, to its surroundings;

Applicant Comment: Not applicable.

#### (4) Required yards and other open space;

Applicant Comment: Not applicable.

### (5) Screening and buffering, with reference to type, dimensions and character;

Applicant Comment: Not applicable.

# (6) Transportation access management and congestion with particular reference to automotive and pedestrian safety and convenience, traffic flow and control;

Applicant Comment: The proposed gated community will control traffic flow through the development thereby enhancing pedestrian safety and convenience.

**Staff Comment:** The City's transportation consultant has reviewed this project and no issues have been identified regarding access management, safety, traffic flow, or control.

### (7) Off-street parking and loading areas, where required;

Applicant Comment: Not applicable.

(8) Value added considerations including tax base diversification, employment, and affordable housing unit expansion;

Applicant Comment: Not applicable.

# (9) Any special requirements set out in the schedule of district regulations of this chapter for the particular use involved.

Applicant Comment: Not applicable.

**Summary Staff Comment:** The conditional use request for gates is not expected to impact surrounding land uses in any way. The gates will be used to guide internal traffic through the development only. No variations to code standards regarding required yards, buffering, or parking are proposed as a result of the addition of gates.

#### **Conclusions / Findings of Fact (Compliance with the Land Development Code):** No inconsistencies have been identified with the LDC.

### **Concurrency/Mobility**

Regarding public facilities concurrency, no issues were identified by the Technical Review Committee regarding the conditional use request.

An analysis of transportation concurrency for the site and development plan has been performed by the City's traffic consultant and has been deemed compliant per this review. The conditional use petition did not impact the transportation review.

### **Conclusions / Findings of Fact (Concurrency):**

No issues have been identified regarding adequate public facilities capacity to accommodate the development of the project per Chapter 94 of the Land Development Regulations.

### **Conclusions/Findings of Fact (Mobility):**

The applicant has provided traffic analysis that has been reviewed by the City's transportation consultant. No additional issues have been identified.

## **IV. CONCLUSION**

#### Planning Commission Report and Recommendation to City Council

Upon review of the petition and associated documents, comprehensive plan, land development code, staff report and analysis, and testimony provided during the public hearing, there is sufficient information on the record for the Planning Commission to make a recommendation on Conditional Use Petition No. 21-14CU.