Public Comment

Manatee County Government

Submitted On:
Aug 28, 2026, 04:39PM EDT

Full Name	**First Name:** Glen **Last Name:** Gibellina
Email	Glengibellina@gmail.com
Which meeting is this public comment for? (Please select date of meeting)	September 03, 2026
Topic/Agenda Item	PART 2 FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS
Comment	5. Specific Requests for Board Action For the reasons above, I respectfully request that the Board take the following actions before proceeding with Ordinance No. 26-19 / PA-25-03: 1. Continue or remove the ordinance from the current agenda. Do not transmit, adopt, or otherwise advance the Comprehensive Plan rewrite until the concerns described in this objection have been addressed in a public and documented manner. 2. Order an independent conflict-of-interest and procurement review. Require a written public report addressing the consultant's role, relevant private-client relationships, disclosure procedures, and safeguards against actual or perceived preferential treatment. 3. Require a complete change analysis. Direct staff to publish a searchable, side-by-side comparison of every proposed revision against the currently adopted Comprehensive Plan, including a plain-language explanation of each change's intended purpose and anticipated effect. 4. Publish all relevant records. Make readily accessible the consultant contract, scope of work, amendments, invoices, work products, staff directions, correspondence regarding substantive policy choices, meeting materials, version histories, and any conflict disclosures or screening protocols, subject to lawful exemptions. 5. Conduct independent public workshops. Hold multiple publicly noticed workshops in accessible locations and at varied times, including evening opportunities, before any final hearing. The workshops should allow residents to review each element, ask questions, and provide detailed comments. 6. Provide adequate review time after final revisions. Do not schedule a final action until the public has had a meaningful period to review the complete final text, including all exhibits and late changes. Any material alteration should restart or extend the public review period. 7. Create a formal response-to-comments record. Require staff to identify and respond to substantive public comments, explaining whether each concern resulted in a revision, was rejected, or requires further analysis. 8. Preserve the complete administrative record. Ensure that all written

public comments, exhibits, staff memoranda, consultant analyses, recordings, minutes, and materials considered by the Board are retained and clearly included in the record for this ordinance.

Conclusion

The Comprehensive Plan is the blueprint for Manatee County's future. It should reflect the public interest—not merely the interests of those best positioned to navigate or benefit from development regulations. Residents deserve a planning process that is transparent, independent, carefully documented, and open to meaningful participation. Where a consultant's public work may overlap with private development representation, the Board has an obligation to address the appearance of conflict directly and openly. Failure to do so will undermine public confidence in both this ordinance and future land-use decisions made under it.

Accordingly, I respectfully urge the Board to continue Ordinance No. 26-19 / PA-25-03, commission an independent review, provide complete public access to the proposed revisions and supporting records, and conduct sufficient public workshops before any further action is taken.

Please enter this letter into the official record for Ordinance No. 26-19 / PA-25-03 / PLN2506-0044. I request written confirmation that it has been received and included in the record.

Respectfully submitted,

Glen GADFLY Gibellina

Public Comment

Manatee County Government

Submitted On:
Aug 28, 2026, 04:38PM EDT

Full Name	**First Name:** Glen **Last Name:** Gibellina
Email	Glengibellina@gmail.com
Which meeting is this public comment for? (Please select date of meeting)	September 03, 2026
Topic/Agenda Item	PART 1 FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS COMP/TEXT PLAN
Comment	Regarding: Ordinance No. 26-19 / PA-25-03 Comprehensive Plan Rewrite — County-Initiated Comprehensive Plan Text Amendment Project No. PLN2506-0044 Subject: Formal Objection, Request for Continuance, and Demand for Independent Conflict Review and Meaningful Public Participation Dear Chair and Members of the Manatee County Board of County Commissioners: I submit this written objection to the continued consideration, transmission, adoption, or other action on Ordinance No. 26-19 / PA-25-03, Comprehensive Plan Rewrite, PLN2506-0044. I respectfully request that the Board remove this item from the agenda or continue it to a date certain until the County completes an independent review of the process, consultant relationships, proposed text, public-notice record, and public-engagement opportunities. This is not a routine text amendment. It is a County-initiated restructuring of the policy framework that will guide land use, conservation, coastal protection, mobility, infrastructure capacity, housing, recreation, historic resources, and intergovernmental coordination in unincorporated Manatee County for years or decades to come. The County's published notice identifies eleven Comprehensive Plan elements proposed to be amended and restated. Such a far-reaching rewrite requires an exceptionally transparent, independent, and deliberative process. My objection is based on concerns regarding the appearance and potential reality of a structural conflict of interest, insufficient disclosure, inadequate opportunity for residents to evaluate complex and evolving materials, and the resulting risk that the public process will not satisfy the level of fairness expected for legislation of this magnitude. 1. Appearance of Conflict Requires Independent Review

The County retained Kimley-Horn & Associates in connection with the Comprehensive Plan rewrite. At the same time, Kimley-Horn is widely known to provide engineering, planning, entitlement, and land-development consulting services for private-sector clients, including entities seeking development approvals in local jurisdictions.

That circumstance does not, by itself, establish wrongdoing, bias, or an actual legal conflict. However, it creates a serious appearance-of-conflict concern when a firm involved in preparing the County's long-range land-use rules may also represent private clients whose development proposals could be affected by, interpreted under, or benefit from those same rules.

The issue is not whether private consultants may work for public agencies. The issue is whether the County has established adequate safeguards to assure the public that:

The consultant's work was directed solely by the County's public-interest objectives.

No private client influenced proposed policies, definitions, maps, standards, or implementation language.

No language was drafted, revised, omitted, or structured to create a future advantage for a category of development, landowner, applicant, or client.

County staff and the Board received complete disclosure of any actual, potential, or perceived conflicts related to the consultant's local private-development work.

The public has access to a meaningful explanation of the process used to protect the independence of the rewrite.

A Comprehensive Plan is the County's basic constitutional and policy framework for growth and resource protection. It should not merely be impartial; it must also appear impartial to the residents whose quality of life, property, water resources, coastal environment, roads, public facilities, and neighborhoods are governed by it.

The Board should not ask the public to accept assurances alone. It should require a documented, independent conflict review and place that review in the public record before taking further legislative action.
2. This Rewrite Governs Core Public Interests

The proposed ordinance is unusually consequential because it proposes to amend and restate eleven elements of the Manatee County Comprehensive Plan, including Future Land Use, Conservation,

Coastal Management, Transportation, Housing, Recreation and Open Space, Public Facilities, and Intergovernmental Coordination.

Those elements are not technical housekeeping provisions. They establish the long-term public-policy direction for questions such as:

Where and at what intensity future growth may occur.

How wetlands, wildlife habitat, water resources, flood-prone areas, and coastal systems are protected.

Whether roads, drainage, potable water, wastewater, schools, parks, and emergency services can support growth.

How the County addresses housing availability, affordability, and compatibility with established communities.

How development decisions account for storm vulnerability, sea-level and flooding concerns, evacuation, and coastal resilience.

How the County coordinates with municipalities, school districts, state agencies, and neighboring governments.

Changes to definitions, goals, objectives, policies, standards, and internal cross-references can materially affect future decisions even when the impact is not immediately obvious to the average resident. A seemingly narrow revision to a definition, an exception, a level-of-service provision, a concurrency standard, a conservation policy, or a future-land-use criterion can later shape whether a proposed development is approved, conditioned, denied, or entitled to additional density or intensity.

For that reason, the Board should not proceed with a compressed or unclear review process. It should ensure that each material change is specifically identified, explained in plain language, and evaluated for its impact on residents, infrastructure, natural resources, and future land-use decisions.

3. Due Process and Meaningful Participation Require More Time

The proposed rewrite involves a substantial volume of technical material, including multiple Comprehensive Plan elements and related revisions needed for internal consistency. The County's notice expressly recognizes that additional amendments to supportive materials may be necessary to implement the changes and maintain internal consistency.

That acknowledgment underscores why residents need sufficient time and accessible materials to understand the proposal as a whole—not merely as isolated chapters or redlined excerpts.

Meaningful public participation requires more than making documents technically available shortly before a hearing. Residents should have a reasonable opportunity to:

Obtain the complete proposed ordinance, exhibits, staff reports, and supporting materials.

Compare the adopted Comprehensive Plan language with every proposed revision.

Understand the purpose and practical effect of each change.

Identify whether any prior public comments or Planning Commission recommendations were incorporated, rejected, or altered.

Review versions of the proposal in a clear, searchable, side-by-side format.

Ask questions of County staff, the consultant, and independent subject-matter experts in workshops that are separate from the final legislative hearing.

Submit written comments early enough for staff and the Board to consider and respond to substantive issues.

The County's public notice states that interested parties may submit written comments and that those comments will be entered into the record. It also provides that the hearing may be continued. The Board should use that authority to provide a genuine opportunity for public review rather than treating continuation as a procedural inconvenience.

A hearing should not become the public's first realistic opportunity to understand a proposal of this scale. By the time of a final legislative vote, the Board should have before it a transparent record demonstrating that the public had adequate notice, access to the materials, and a meaningful chance to comment on all material revisions.

4. Need for an Independent Technical and Ethics Review

Before this ordinance is considered further, the Board should direct an independent party—one with no current or recent financial involvement in local development entitlements that may be affected by the rewrite—to conduct a written review addressing the following:

The scope of Kimley-Horn's role in drafting, editing, analyzing, or recommending Comprehensive Plan language.

The County's consultant-selection process, contract scope,

deliverables, and oversight procedures.

Any disclosures concerning Kimley-Horn’s representation of private development applicants, landowners, or related interests in Manatee County during the period of the rewrite.

Any conflict-management measures, screening procedures, non-disclosure safeguards, or County review protocols used to prevent improper influence.

A policy-by-policy analysis identifying all substantive changes from the current Comprehensive Plan.

An analysis of whether any changes disproportionately benefit particular development types, geographic areas, land classifications, or applicant categories.

A review of the consistency of the proposed text with adopted County policies, state requirements, environmental protections, infrastructure planning, and public-facility capacity.

A public-facing summary written in plain language that explains the practical effect of every major change.

The independent reviewer should be selected through a transparent process and should report directly to the Board or an appropriate independent County authority, not solely through the consultant whose work is under review.

From: srnsemmer@aol.com <srnsemmer@aol.com>
Sent: Wednesday, August 5, 2026 10:33 PM
To: Charlie Bishop <charlie.bishop@mymanatee.org>
Subject: Legacy Village 2

> You don't often get email from srnsemmer@aol.com. Learn why this is important

CAUTION:This email originated from an external source.
Be suspicious of Attachments, Links and Request for Login Information and utilize the REPORT MESSAGE Button in Outlook if you feel this is a Phishing email.

Dear Mr. Bishop,

I have been attempting to submit a statement for the Land Use Meeting being held at 9am tomorrow! I am not the only one who has attempted to do so. Thus I am submitting to you as the person in charge and can only hope you will read and respond!

I thank you in advance and look forward to hearing from you.

My name is Sharon Semmer and I live in Whitfield Ballentine. I am writing to ask for your help in enforcing our Whitfield Residential Overlay which has been openly disregarded in the administrative approval of Legacy Village 2.

The land development code is absolutely clear: All residential units in the WRO must be 950 square feet. Yet Legacy Village 2 proposes 72 units with units barely 638 square feet . Certainly not big enough for two people or anyone with children. There has not been a single meeting to discuss this point or many others. ADUs and similar undersized plans are prohibited in the Overlay. LV2 is a multi-family residential building on a single lot , exactly as defined in Section 200 of the LDC, and must be held to the Overlay language.

This is not a matter of interpretation, it is a matter of compliance!

If the County can ignore the overlay here - despite clear language, clear boundaries, and clear public concern- then every neighborhood overlay in Manatee County is at risk. What protects Whitfield today protects your neighborhood tomorrow!

I respectfully ask the Commission to enforce the WRO, require compliance with the 950 square foot minimum and restore trust in the integrity of our land use process.

Sincerely,

Sharon Semmer

630-951-0110

Public Comment

Manatee County Government

Submitted On:
Aug 4, 2026, 05:43PM EDT

Full Name	**First Name:** Tamara **Last Name:** Harte
Email	tamara4manatee@gmail.com
Which meeting is this public comment for? (Please select date of meeting)	August 06, 2026
Topic/Agenda Item	Long Bay Pointe - Sarasota Bay
Comment	Please Commissioners Protect the last strong hold of mangroves at Long Bay Pointe on Sarasota Bay. Do not let the developers destroy what is left of the mangroves. We need the mangroves to make our communities along Sarasota bay resilient, protecting habitat and our quality of life. Once YOU let these mangroves get bulldozed down - they won't come back. Concerned Florida Voter and grandma Tamara Harte