



City of Venice

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

Meeting Minutes Planning Commission

Wednesday, April 27, 2016

5:30 PM

Community Hall

Workshop

I. Call to Order

A Workshop Meeting of the Planning Commission was held this date in Community Hall at City Hall. Chair Barry Snyder called the meeting to order at 5:30 p.m.

II. Roll Call

Present: 7 - Chair Barry Snyder, Helen Moore, Jerry Towery, Shaun Graser, Tom Murphy, Charles Newsom, and Janis Fawn

Also Present

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

III. Updates

16-1963

COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE

Staff: Jeff Shrum, AICP, Development Services Director

Consultant: Kelley Klepper, AICP, Kimley-Horn

1. Upcoming calendar - discuss possible workshop dates (staff will provide overview of projects that may appear on upcoming regular meetings).
2. Discuss input/comments (Planning Commission members) - Future Land Use Mixed Use descriptions-definitions.
3. Discuss attached status update - information to be added or modified (using this as a tool to track major decisions from the planning commission).
4. Continue Discussion - Gateway/Waterway (Seaboard) Neighborhood.
5. Other Comprehensive Plan update topics.

Mr. Snyder spoke in regards to the upcoming calendar, possible workshop dates, overview, projects, upcoming petitions, regular meetings, workshops in community hall, all day meetings, finishing date, joint workshop with city council, draft date, public workshop comments, and the Tallahassee trip.

Mr. McKeon spoke on the strategic planning meeting, diseased trees, sidewalk expansion, moving of the public works department, and street improvements.

Mr. Shrum commented on joint planning area, problematic areas, map changes, policy language, and coordinating a discussion with the county.

Mr. Snyder spoke on the handouts, bed and breakfast and definition, low density residential, single family uses, and issues with Planned Unit Development (PUD) commercial component.

Discussion took place regarding PUD's, future land use, addition of a moderate category, underlying zoning, medium density, non-residential categories, high density, non commercial components, percentages, change of future land use, limit of commercial intent, change of mixed use, projection of mixed use, existing land use map, office space high density, non-residential uses, allowable uses, preservation of actual uses, existing zoning, mixed use categories, and ratio of residential to non-residential.

Discussion continued regarding defining non-residential, identifying lots, commercial pieces, high density residential, grandfather type situation, unintended consequences, refinancing of property, existing uses still being valid uses, areas of uses, addition of categories, mixed use downtown, walkable uses, planning area, supporting commercial over residential, non residential floor area ratio (FAR), lot coverage, analysis, over allocating, standards, potential building on properties, simplifying reading of the comprehensive plan, amount of square footage, zoning code height, high floor area ratios, and zoning changes.

Mr. Snyder spoke on intent of neighborhoods, different kind of categories, mixed use, high density residential, consistency of definitions, medium to high density for downtown area, describing density, non residential use areas, preference, land use definitions, and land use.

Discussion took place regarding implementing zoning districts, spoke on list not being complete, expansion of Central Business District (CBD), development bonuses, baseline minimums, legitimate transitions, general intent, density, intensity, mixed use corridors, industrial uses not being permitted, densities, minimum and maximums, FAR, PUD and Planned Commercial Development (PCD), revamping of zoning districts, initial caring capacity, under utilized uses, revisiting of floor area ratio, mixed use corridor 2, no minimums, limiting of FARs, commercial entryways, entire corridors, raising of density, commercial areas, underlying zoning, intensity, joint planning area, change of definition

very limited, language in the comprehensive plan, and changes of properties within the city limits.

Discussion continued on deletion of mixed use urban, bridges being in a mixed use category, Commercial Mixed Use (CMU) zoning, underlying development approvals, mixed use transition, mixed use regional, acreage, Industrial Light Warehousing (ILW) implemented zoning district, green space corridor, county owned property, negotiation of land with the county, industrial area, promenade development, height limit, consistency with mixed uses, ideas of what to put in the areas, land use category, starting point of change, visionary, workforce housing, strategic plan, facilitation of what can happen to area, allowable use, discussion of uses, transitioning of area, appearance of roads, John Nolen layout, lot sizes, commercial uses, county cooperating with the city, comprehensive plan level, flexibilities, being reluctant of studies, city council conversation, mixed use transition, and density/intensity.

Ms. Moore questioned employment activity center, definition by the city, water retention, ponds and wetlands are considered one or the other, recreation and open space, conservation wetlands being open space areas, and negative impacts.

Mr. Shrum stated he will speak on the northeast area at the next meeting and spoke on property owners, future land use amendment, and comments.

IV. Audience Participation

Jeff Boone Law Firm, spoke in regards to the comprehensive plan, market of professionals to design areas, design of comprehensive plan, uses, design standards, parking garages, focusing on what you want to see in the area, zoning of property, ILW zoning, change of zoning, parcels, rezoning, mixed use zoning districts, broad categories of uses, and percentages.

Pat Wayman, Border Road, spoke in regards to the development of areas, acreage, units per buildable acre, lot size, traffic, intersection, and county's approval of development.

V. Comments by Planning Division

There were no comments.

VI. Comments by Planning Commission Members

There were no comments.

VII. Adjournment

There being no further business to come before this Commission, the meeting was adjourned at 7:58 p.m.



Chair



Recording Secretary