

TECHNICAL REVIEW COMMITTEE MINUTES

Community Hall – 401 West Venice Avenue
Wednesday, January 29, 2020– 9:00 AM

I. CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order by Mr. Clark at 9:05 AM.

II. ROLL CALL

Present: for Building – Frank Conorozzo & Greg Schneider; for Engineering - Jonathan Kramer & Kathleen Weeden; for Planning & Zoning – Roger Clark, Christina Rimes, & Nicole Tremblay; for Development Services – Jeff Shrum; for Public Works – Bob Moroni; for Utilities – Jimmy Bennett; and for Sarasota County Schools – Micki Ryan and Diane Cominotti

III. TRC MEMBER COMMENTS

Ms. Weeden discussed the Lord Higel House site & development plan and moving forward with just the parking lot portion of the petition, but not the restroom building because they do not have an architect yet. Mr. Shrum indicated that the certificate of occupancy would not be issued but the plans can reflect the conceptual plan for the building and the applicant can request an amendment from Planning Commission. He also indicated that they could request an extension on the development order.

IV. NEW BUSINESS

Mr. Shrum discussed new legislation regarding review of land development applications and how it will affect the review process. The legislation addresses the timing of the review of projects for quasi-judicial applications submitted to the City of Venice. The process has not changed yet, but Mr. Shrum will send notice to all TRC members when the changes become effective. The completeness check process may change.. Mr. Shrum anticipates after the completeness check review that the initial review of the petition will be shorter. There is some concern over projects moving forward to City Council in time because the delay between the Planning Commission meeting and the City Council public hearing. If any departments have items that they need that are not listed on the application, they can advise Development Services. Ms. Weeden discussed clarification on the difference between completeness check and initial review, and Mr. Shrum explained that the comments need to be clear on what is required for completeness check versus initial review comments. Ms. Weeden discussed the coastal permits and the state's timeline in line with the City's timeline. The time that the applicants have to resubmit will need to be discussed in the future.

V. AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION

Mr. Boone discussed the timing of receiving the comments from staff and the possibility of receiving them as they are issued by other members of TRC. Mr. Shrum discussed allowing applicants to proceed to public hearing without being technically compliant; there will be a maximum of three requests for revisions. There was discussion on the definition of a project being code compliant. Mr. Boone discussed required revisions versus recommended revisions that staff provide to the applicants. There was discussion on conceptual and technical plans, rather than processing full plan submittals, followed by construction plans. There was discussion from Sarasota County Schools on issuing their comments at the point of application as opposed to after the fact. There was continued discussion with TRC on the current timing of land development application review.

VI. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 9:58 AM.