



City of Venice

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

Meeting Minutes Planning Commission

Wednesday, March 10, 2021

1:30 PM

Council Chambers

Land Development Regulations Workshop

21-4940

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

I. Call to Order

Chair Barry Snyder called the meeting to order at 1:31 p.m.

II. Roll Call

Present: 6 - Chair Barry Snyder, Shaun Graser, Kit McKeon, Richard Hale, Richard Lawson and Jerry Jasper

Excused: 1 - Bill Willson

Mr. Willson's absence was excused by consensus.

Also Present

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

In person: Mr. Lawson

Via video conference: Mr. Snyder, Mr. Graser, Mr. Hale, Mr. McKeon, and Mr. Jasper.

III. Audience Participation

Don O'Connell, 500 Hauser Lane, spoke on existing zoning code, John Nolen apartment district, lot sizes, density, side yards, replica housing, workforce housing, comprehensive plan, and asked planning commission to consider form-based zoning in historic apartment district.

Ed Martin, 409 Everglades Drive, thanked staff and commission members for their work on the Land Development Regulations (LDRs), expressed concern that raising building heights will be an incentive to tear down

buildings and replace with three-story buildings, and inquired whether staff or planning commission has looked at impact to the community.

Tommye Whittaker, 613 West Venice Avenue, read her written comment requesting planning commission to keep current height requirements, inquiring about a state regulation, and historic preservation.

Nancy DeForge, Venice Historical Society, recommended utilizing historical resources staff and best practices for historic preservation ordinances.

Mr. Snyder noted that some questions brought up during public comment would be answered later in the workshop and that the commission has not cited a state regulation regarding building heights; however, they have received input from architects.

IV. Workshop

21-4941

Land Development Regulations Update

Staff: Jeff Shrum, AICP, Development Services Director

Mr. Shrum reviewed the meeting schedule for future workshops, noted that after the initial draft is complete it will be available to the public and other advisory boards for input, written comments have been received from the architectural review board (ARB), historic preservation board (HPB) and environmental advisory board (EAB), and will be provided during the appropriate sections of the LDR update along with the staff and consultant proposal for the text.

Mr. Snyder provided a presentation on Sections 5 and 6, Chapter 87, land development framework, with a focus on design and development standards, and compatibility standards. He also spoke to general development standards, including building height, block and lot configuration, and building placement.

Mr. Shrum recommended taking a cautious approach when removing rights of a property owner and recommended considering a specific design alternative.

Mr. Snyder noted staff and consultant have brought best practices from other communities while improving parts of the code that are not working well, and spoke on building height as being defined by stories and feet, and noted that local architects have informed planning commission and staff that three stories cannot be built in 35 feet. He commented that urbanism, where people can live and work in the same area, was recommended when creating the comprehensive plan, and shared a diagram illustrating building height regulations.

Discussion ensued about appurtenances, restrictions, design alternatives, and designation of floors for commercial, office, or residential.

Mr. Snyder presented block configurations and discussion ensued about zoning districts relating to this.

Mr. Snyder spoke regarding lot configurations.

Mr. Shrum noted that proposed code will recognize existing lots as they are at time of new code adoption.

Mr. Snyder spoke to building placement, setbacks, front yards, side yards, and noted that the address is in the front yard.

Discussion occurred regarding the difference between yards and setbacks.

Mr. Snyder discussed preservation of natural features, soil, flood hazards, and building sites.

Mr. Snyder and Mr. Shrum noted easement requirements, access management, accessory uses and structures, and stormwater and utilities are all technical aspects of the code.

Discussion took place regarding mixed-use districts frontage requirements, encroachments, and active use areas.

Mr. Snyder presented entrances in mixed-use districts, and spoke on streets and sidewalks.

Discussion ensued on the document Standard Details, General Notes and Testing Requirements and how to reference it in the land development code. Ms. Fernandez noted options on how to reference this document in relation to the land development code.

Mr. Snyder spoke on complete streets, the complete street design standards table, and mixed-use districts.

Discussion took place on multi-use recreational trails (MURTs), the comprehensive plan, sidewalk requirements, design alternatives, bike paths, and planned unit developments (PUDs).

Mr. Snyder spoke regarding prohibited, exempt, temporary, permitted sign types, and design alternatives.

Discussion followed regarding signs with offensive language, Supreme Court rulings, and Ms. Fernandez recommended limiting number of signs on a property.

Mr. Snyder spoke to permitted signs in mixed-use districts, not including residential.

Mr. Snyder discussed parking standards applicability and requirements by use and noted these would apply only to new development or redevelopment.

Mr. Shrum shared parking requirements by use table.

Discussion ensued about parking requirements.

Mr. Snyder spoke to alternative vehicle parking provisions and discussion ensued regarding this as a methodology becoming more common across the country. Staff recommended clarifying recreational vehicle parking in provisions.

Mr. Snyder discussed remote parking standards, presented general design standards, and discussion ensued regarding minimums with no design alternatives and concerns regarding parking space lengths.

Discussion occurred regarding landscaping materials and requirements, invasive plants, and parking lot landscaping requirements.

Mr. Shrum noted further policy discussion needs to occur regarding removal of invasive species and design alternatives.

Mr. Snyder spoke regarding fences, walls, berms and retaining walls in regards to specific material and design standards.

Mr. Shrum clarified that the proposed code implements standards of the comprehensive plan and addresses the wildlife corridor relating to walls and fencing.

Mr. Snyder discussed lighting design standards. A design alternative was noted for outdoor lighting, as long as the proposed lighting does not impact any regulations related to Marine Turtle Lighting standards.

Recess was taken at 3:34 p.m. until 3:44 p.m.

Mr. Snyder shared section six regarding compatibility with the goal of

facilitating the integration of previous comprehensive plan policy 8.2 into land development code (LDC). He spoke to elements such as annexation, density and intensity, building heights and setbacks, character or type of use proposed, site and architectural design techniques, considerations for determining compatibility, mitigation techniques, the basic concepts for compatibility, and the issue of design alternatives.

Discussion ensued about compatibility setback multipliers, zoning districts, buffer types, and situations where there may be additional compatibility mitigation needed.

V. Future LDR Workshop Discussion

21-4942

LDR Workshop Discussion

Staff: Jeff Shrum, AICP, Development Services Director

Mr. Shrum reviewed revised workshop schedule at beginning of the meeting.

VI. Comments by Planning Division

There were none.

VII. Comments by Planning Commission Members

Mr. Snyder stated the planning commission has heard from HPB multiple times, the commission is looking to see if HPB and ARB can be merged into one board and it is important that staff and the consultant be allowed to provide a draft of the pertinent section, and then get feedback from the other boards. He noted becoming a certified local government (CLG) is a policy decision.

VIII. Adjournment

There being no further business to come before this Commission, the meeting was adjourned at 4:35 p.m.

Barry R. Snyder

Chair



Recording Secretary

Signature:


Barry R. Snyder (Mar 13 2021 11:34 EDT)

Email: bsnyder@venicegov.com