

MINUTES OF A WORKSHOP  
CITY COUNCIL, VENICE, FLORIDA

JANUARY 26, 2010

A Workshop of the City Council to consider the Comprehensive Plan Objections, Recommendations, and Comments (ORC) Report was held this date in Council Chambers at City Hall. Mayor Martin called the workshop to order at 9:02 a.m.

**ELECTED OFFICIALS AND OTHERS PRESENT**

Roll was called with the following elected officials present: Mayor Ed Martin, Vice Mayor Ernie Zavodnyik, and Council Members Jim Bennett, Emilio Carlesimo, Sue Lang, Kit McKeon, and John K. Moore.

Also present: City Manager Isaac Turner, City Clerk Lori Stelzer, City Attorney Bob Anderson, and for certain items on the agenda: General Manager of Development Services Tom Slaughter.

**I. STAFF PRESENTATION OF PROPOSED POLICY ALTERNATIVES /  
RESPONSES TO THE OBJECTIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS, AND COMMENTS  
REPORT**

Mr. Slaughter introduced Amanda Warner, Chad Minor, and Dave Gildersleeve with Wade Trim, Inc., and attorney Linda Shelley from Fowler, White, Boggs and Banker. Mr. Slaughter noted that Sarasota County and Southwest Florida Water Management District staff were also in attendance.

Mr. Slaughter stated that in addition to agenda items, council members would discuss next steps, receive a briefing on additional meetings with Sarasota County and the Department of Community Affairs, and schedule additional workshops.

Mr. Bennett reported on the January 25, 2010 Sarasota Manatee Metropolitan Planning Organization meeting and a presentation concerning state rail legislation and assurances that rights of way were provided for the proposed light rail system located in the median of I-75. Mr. Bennett suggested including concepts in the Comprehensive Plan for access from the interchange at Laurel Road to a hypothetical rail station.

Discussion ensued regarding the Jacaranda interchange, Joint Planning Agreement areas, and looking at larger geographic areas for the rail system.

**A. Objection No. 1, Planning Period Timeframe**

Ms. Warner outlined additional language referencing short term planning periods and staff's recommendation to revise Volume I and Volume II text identifying the short-term horizon as 2015 and the long-term horizon as 2030. Ms. Warner answered questions concerning methodology, growth rate calculations, and updating population growth rate tables.

There was **consensus** to accept staff's technical memo regarding Objection No. 1, including the change on Page 2, *Using 25 percent of that population for the short-term (2015), it is estimated that the maximum population of the potential annexation areas will be approximately 5,893 people in the near future.*

B. Objection No. 3, Population Projections

Ms. Warner reviewed language describing the methodology utilized to create population projections.

There was **consensus** to accept staff's technical memo regarding Objection No. 3.

C. Objection No. 6(d), Future Land Use Element Goals, Objectives, and Policies; Future Land Use Management; and Joint Planning Agreement (JPA)/Interlocal Service Boundary Agreement (ILSBA) (continued from January 12, 2010)

Mr. Minor informed council members the policy included in Objection No. 6(d) was introduced as a result of Objection No. 8.

D. Objection No. 8, JPA/ILSBA, Future Land Use Element

Mr. Slaughter handed out an updated response to Objection No. 8, prepared from input received from city council and county staff.

Mr. Minor explained that Objective No. 17, Standards for Joint Planning Areas, was not included in the agenda packet because there were no proposed changes, and discussed a new Objective No. 16, Standards for New Development Planning Areas, that utilizes Sarasota County's language when the JPA was successfully adopted through their Comprehensive Plan in 2007.

Discussion ensued regarding language in Policy 16.3, South Laurel Neighborhood; revisions to Policy 16.4, South Laurel Neighborhood Standards; densities; standardizing area names in the JPA and Comprehensive Plan; glossary revisions; and the definition of "*Density, residential dwelling*" and the use of "residential units" and "residents".

(9:39) After discussion, and with no objection from council, Ms. Shelley advised that "residents per acre" would be stricken, *An objective measurement of the number residential units allowed per unit of land, such as residents per acre. [Rule 9J-5.003 (31), F.A.C.]*.

Bob Burrus, 300 Sorrento Ranches Drive, discussed concerns with staff recommended language for Policy 16.3, and offered proposed alternative language noting that Table 16.4 JPA/ILSBA Planning Area Land Use and Development Scenario was not necessary as long as the caveat is made that a small scale amendment will be used if the proposed future land use designation through the Future Land Use Map (FLUM) amendment is consistent with the Venice Comprehensive Plan and the JPA/ILSBA.

Without objection, Mr. Burrus' language for Policy 16.3 was accepted by city council, *Policy 16.3, JPA/ILSBA Planning Area Future Land Use Map Amendments. An amendment to the Future Land Use Map providing a Venice future land use designation shall be required following annexation of*

*any property within a JPA/ILSBA Planning Area. Such Future Land Use Map amendment shall be processed as a small-scale amendment provided its future land use designation is consistent with the City of Venice Comprehensive Plan and the JPA/ILSBA.*

Mr. Burrus continued with a discussion of Table 16.4 including concerns regarding JPA language pertaining to land uses, and suggested alternate language, “Policy 16.4, JPA/ILSBA Planning Area Development Standards. The City has evaluated the land use densities and intensities established for each JPA/ILSBA Planning Area within the JPA/ILSBA and Policy Series 17 provides the land use categories determined by the City in this Comprehensive Plan and agreed to by Sarasota County.”

Ms. Shelley advised that council members could determine whether or not to include Table 16.4 in the Comprehensive Plan, and concurred with Mr. Burrus’ proposed language.

Discussion followed regarding whether or not it’s necessary to include Table 16.4 and adding “Comprehensive Plan” before “Policy Series 17”, “...and Comprehensive Plan Policy Series 17 provides...”

There was **consensus** to accept Mr. Burrus’ recommended language, *Policy 16.4, JPA/ILSBA Planning Area Development Standards. The City has evaluated the land use densities and intensities established for each JPA/ILSBA Planning Area within the JPA/ILSBA and Comprehensive Plan Policy Series 17 provides the land use categories determined by the City in this Comprehensive Plan and agreed to by Sarasota County*, and to delete Table 16.4.

(9:57) Mr. Minor advised that Policies 16.5 through 16.8 would appear in the Future Land Use Element and additional policies were proposed for the Utilities, Conservation and Open Space and Capital Improvements Elements.

There was **consensus** to accept Objection No. 8 with Mr. Burrus’ changes.

There was **consensus** to accept Objection No. 6(d) as part of Objection No. 8.

E. Objection No. 11, Airport Compatibility

Mr. Minor reviewed changes to *Policy 4.3, Airport Compatibility, ~~Seek to minimize negative impacts to surrounding neighborhoods resulting from airport operation. By June 30, 2012 the City shall amend the Future Land Use Element of the Comprehensive Plan to include criteria and address compatibility of lands adjacent, or in close proximity, to the Airport. At a minimum, the process employed by the City will include the following consistent with Section 333.02, F.S.: A. An evaluation of existing land use and zoning regulations and recommendations/strategies to achieve greater land use compatibility.~~*

There was **consensus** to accept Objection No. 11, staff’s revisions to Policy 4.3.

F. Objection No. 12, Definition of Terms, Coastal Element

Mr. Minor reviewed Objection 12 relating to prohibiting densities and intensities within the Coastal High Hazard Area, and staff recommended language which conforms to state statutes dealing with

assurances that any development shall not further impact or destroy coastal resources.

Jeff Boone, Boone Law Firm, representing clients who expressed concerns at the January 12, 2010 workshop, offered support of the proposed new language.

There was **consensus** to accept staff's response to Objection No. 12.

G. Objection No. 20, Affordable Housing, Future Land Use Element

Ms. Shelley discussed objections including Policy 13.3 which requires a FLUM amendment to designate a density bonus, and outlined staff recommendations to delete Policy 13.3, revise Policy 1.1, *Definitions*. *The City will consider the following definitions for Affordable Community Housing within the Housing Element*, and clarify definitions.

Marty Black, Kimley-Horn and Associates, stated that the proposed change streamlined the affordable housing process, but questioned where the affordable housing density incentive would be located.

Ms. Warner referenced Policy 3.6, Affordable Housing Density Bonus, and explained the affordable housing density bonus would be allowed in any land use category permitting 18 units per acre.

Ms. Shelley stated that additional clarification concerning the affordable housing density bonus would be provided.

There was **consensus** to accept staff's recommended language in Objection No. 20 with Ms. Shelley's revision.

Discussion ensued regarding tracking affordable housing sites, metropolitan statistical areas, specifying future affordable housing sites, interspersing affordable housing throughout the community, affordable housing requirements, inclusionary zoning, expediting the application process, including affordable housing in the pre-annexation agreement process, pre-annexation policies, concessions made during previous annexations, and Planning Commission and council reviewing proposed pre-annexation agreements.

(10:26) Mr. Zavodnyik discussed revising Policy 1.6, Coastal High Hazard Area Infrastructure.

There was **consensus** to accept Mr. Zavodnyik's language revision of *Policy 1.6, The City will minimize public utility infrastructure and limit public liability by limiting the expenditure of public funds in the Coastal High Hazard Area.*

Mr. Boone requested meetings with staff to discuss materials handed out at today's workshop, and commented on exactions such as partial payment of traffic lights, providing a fire station site, and land dedications which the city received through pre-annexation agreement negotiations.

Discussion followed regarding current policies not including Planning Commission or city council review early in the pre-annexation agreement process, negotiating pre-agreements, and involving council.

Mayor Martin suggested that Mr. Turner take this issue under consideration and establish a process including council review.

Mr. Slaughter reviewed anticipated Comprehensive Plan workshops, advising that the February 8, 2010 workshop was not necessary, and suggested scheduling a workshop after staff meets with the Department of Community Affairs on February 8, 2010.

Without objection from council, the February 2, 2010 Comprehensive Plan workshop was canceled.

Ms. Shelley stated she was very encouraged with the current policy direction and did not anticipate any major problems.

Mr. Slaughter noted that language concerning Senate Bill 360 and concurrency would be discussed at the meeting with state officials.

Ms. Warner informed council members that remaining objections dealt with changes to tables and maps.

Ms. Shelley discussed Senate Bill 360 and mobility strategies, and confirmed that council members would have the ability to exercise options prior to the July 2011 deadline.

Mr. Bennett discussed “compatibility” and “incompatible land use” and suggested that the definitions be more consistent.

Ms. Shelley stated she would revise those definitions per Mr. Bennett’s request.

## **II. ADJOURNMENT**

There being no further business to come before council, the meeting was adjourned at 10:48 a.m.

ATTEST:

Mayor – City of Venice

City Clerk