

City of Venice

Meeting Minutes Planning Commission

| Tuesday, January 3, 2017 | 1:30 PM | Community Hall |
|--------------------------|---------|----------------|
| | | - |

I. Call to Order

A Regular Meeting of the Planning Commission was held this date in Council Chambers at City Hall. Chair Barry Snyder called the meeting to order at 1:30 p.m.

II. Roll Call

Present: 6 - Chair Barry Snyder, Helen Moore, Shaun Graser, Tom Murphy, Charles Newsom, and Janis Fawn

Excused: 1 - Jerry Towery

Also Present

Liaison Councilmember Kit McKeon, Assistant City Attorney Kelly Fernandez, Development Services Director Jeff Shrum, Senior Planner Scott Pickett, and Recording Secretary Michelle Girvan.

III. Approval of Minutes

<u>17-2423</u> Minutes of the December 6, 2016 Regular Meeting and the December 14, 2016 Workshop Meeting

A motion was made by Ms. Moore, seconded by Mr. Murphy, that the Minutes of the December 6, 2016 and December14, 2016 meetings be approved as written. The motion carried by voice vote unanimously.

IV. Public Hearings

<u>16-05VZ</u> VARIANCE - 104 ALBA ST. W Planner: Scott Pickett, AICP, Senior Planner Applicant: Jacques & Gayle Famy

Mr. Snyder stated this is a quasi-judicial hearing, read a memorandum of advertisement with no written communications, and opened the public hearing.

Ms. Fernandez queried board members regarding ex-parte communications and conflicts of interest all members stating site visits only with no communication or conflicts of interest.

Mr. Pickett, being duly sworn, provided a presentation regarding the variance petition to include the application, narrative and exhibits, site plan of the lanai expansion, applicable code standards, proposed improvements, square footage, aerial photo of subject and surrounding properties, photos of property, future land use map, existing zoning, planning commission review and action, expiration of requested variance, and staff finding.

Discussions took place regarding responses from neighbors, lot coverage, knowledge of variance, and dividing surrounding lots.

Mr. Famy, being duly sworn, spoke in regards to the variance, lots being unequally divided, square footage of lots, surrounding lots, frontage square footage, setbacks, fence, and criteria.

Discussion took place regarding timeframe of the project.

Mr. Pickett spoke regarding lots and variances.

Mr. Snyder closed the public hearing.

A motion was made by Ms. Fawn, seconded by Ms. Moore, that based on the staff report and the presentation, the Planning Commission, sitting as the local planning agency and land development regulation commission, finds this petition consistent with the Comprehensive Plan, in compliance with the Land Development Code and with the affirmative Findings of Fact in the record, and moves to Approve Variance Petition No. 16-05VZ. The motion carried by the following vote:

Yes: 6 - Chair Snyder, Ms. Moore, Mr. Graser, Mr. Murphy, Mr. Newsom and Ms. Fawn

Excused: 1 - Mr. Towery

V. Unfinished Business

17-2422 COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE - Draft Plan Staff: Jeff Shrum, AICP, Development Services Director

Public Comment for Comprehensive Plan Update

Mr. Shrum provided an update on the comprehensive plan, changes of boundaries, workshop and regular meeting schedule, and section on transition.

Mr. Snyder spoke in regards to the comprehensive plan regarding overview of the island, existing land use, neighborhoods, acreage, residential units, city code, throughfares, unique neighborhood and number strategies, maps, changes, mixed uses, maximum of residential and non-residential, crowth, limitations, characteristics, projections, areas of unique concern, and the land development code. Discussion took place regarding complete street scapes, form based codes, non-mixed use areas, architecture, open space, subjects for discussion, overview of existing land use, previous elements, strategies, historic preservation, unintended consequences of the historic preservation board, and the local register.

Ms. Fawn spoke in regards to a letter she received from Greg Watkins regarding historic landmark commission, Certified Local Government (CLG), preservation of older homes, and influence.

Discussion took place regarding component of identifying structures that are more than 100 years, group of properties, funding opportunities, historic value of homes, architectural design, grandfathering rules for historic structures, mixed uses, constringent criteria, and resort dwellings.

Discussion ensued on mixed use in the downtown area, zoning, acreage, Sarasota property appraiser, residential and non-residential square footage, growth, planning area residential units, vertical uses, having room for growth, mixed use airport, and form based code.

Discussion continued on architectural housing, differences, new Florida architecture, new versus existing northern architecture designs, old Florida architecture cinder block homes, row houses, suggestion of having Mr. Klepper and Mr. Shrum report at the next meeting with definitions and examples of various architectural housing, preserving and promoting architectural style, historic nature of the island, content, precedence of the historic preservation board, better definitions and graphics, and non-compatible structures.

Discussion took place regarding the language in the comprehensive plan, recommendations on the architectural style, regulation topic, caveats, major regulatory aspect, mixed use areas, public input regarding the island, neighborhoods, affordable apartment buildings, diversity, land development code, consensus of items being removed from the plan, unintended consequences of items that are removed, and what it should look like.

Discussion ensued regarding transportation, complete streets, elements, sidewalks, allowance of possibility, and on street parking.

Discussion followed regarding parking lots, opportunities, pedestrian plaza, changes on Venice Avenue, traffic issues, the nature of change of the Venice Avenue bridge.

Discussion continued regarding the gateway to Venice, mixed use

Seaboard area, acreage, non-residential area, waterfront, architectural being taken out of plan, infrastructure, items for future consideration, parking, parking garage, and the clarification of neighborhoods.

Discussion continued regarding East Venice Avenue, key roadway segments, driveway connections, on street parking, and areas of future consideration.

Discussion followed regarding Pinebrook area overview, roadway improvements, additional items, widening of Pinebrook, area of future consideration, police department, road segments, open space connectivity, expansion of Wellfield Park, and the Joint Planning Areas (JPAs) timeframe.

Discussion ensued regarding Laurel Road, mixed use corridor, change of geography, changing of numbers, the change in the maximum of corridor neighborhoods, residential and non-residential neighborhoods, and residential adequacy.

Ms. Fernandez spoke in regards to modifications of the categories and maps.

Discussion continued regarding density and intensity, mixed use small shops, nature of mixed use corridors, market requirements, interstate incentives, and non-residential activities.

Discussion took place regarding gateway features, aerial photos and vision, strategy of the gateway, wayfinding signs, visualization in the comprehensive plan, and graphics.

Discussion followed in regards to northeast Venice, square footage numbers, open space, land development code, broader statement of what is allowed, and transition area.

Discussion took place on complete streets, roadways, existing development, wildlife corridors, JPAs, and connectivity.

Discussion followed regarding Knights Trail, corridors, land use map, consistency, density, flexibility, compatibility, housing, city property, changing of numbers, industrial and non-industrial uses, complete streets, and future JPAs.

VI. Audience Participation

No one signed up to speak.

VII. Comments by Planning Division

Discussion took place regarding meetings and workshop schedule dates and times, draft changes, discussion draft, and agenda items.

VIII. Comments by Planning Commission Members

Mr. Murphy spoke in regards to his excused absence on January 17, 2017.

Discussion took place regarding absent members and meeting dates.

IX. Adjournment

There being no further business to come before this Commission, the meeting was adjourned at 5:02 p.m.

Recording Secretary