



Public Comment

Manatee County Government

Submitted On:

Aug 12, 2026, 10:41PM EDT

Full Name	First Name: Winay Last Name: Virkud
Email	wwirkud@gmail.com
Which meeting is this public comment for? (Please select date of meeting)	August 13, 2026
Topic/Agenda Item	application PDMU-07-07(Z)(P)(R2)- Crosswind point PLN2406-0119
Comment	I am an adjacent property owner and am writing to express my opposition to portions of application PDMU-07-07(Z)(P)(R)2 / PLN2406-0119, specifically proposed amendments #3 and #5. Regarding #3, the addition of a Personal Wireless Service Facility (PWSF), I do not believe the application provides sufficient justification for introducing this use into a development immediately adjacent to established residential neighborhoods. Before approving such a facility, the County should require clear information regarding its proposed location, height, design, setbacks, visibility from surrounding homes, lighting, landscaping and screening, and whether less intrusive locations are available. A wireless facility can have a substantially different visual and neighborhood impact than the residential and commercial uses residents reasonably anticipated when purchasing homes in this area. I am also concerned with #5, which seeks to “modify certain conditions” for internal consistency, departmental practices, and other amendments to obligations. This language is extremely broad. Existing development conditions are important safeguards that residents and property owners rely upon when evaluating the impacts of a large, nearly 275-acre planned development. Conditions should not be weakened, removed, or materially altered under a generalized request for “internal consistency” without clearly identifying each condition being changed, the reason for the change, and its potential impact on surrounding properties and infrastructure. This area is already experiencing significant growth and development. I am not opposed to reasonable development of the property, but changes to an established development plan should demonstrate a clear public benefit and should not unnecessarily increase impacts on neighboring homeowners. I respectfully request that the Planning Commission and Board of County Commissioners deny amendments #3 and #5 as currently

proposed, or at minimum require additional disclosure and specific enforceable conditions addressing the location, height, screening and neighborhood impact of the proposed wireless facility and identifying exactly which existing development conditions would be modified or eliminated before granting approval.

Thank you for considering the concerns of adjacent property owners.



Public Comment

Manatee County Government

Submitted On:

Aug 12, 2026, 10:32PM EDT

Full Name	First Name: Nicole Last Name: Virkud
Email	nacummi22@gmail.com
Which meeting is this public comment for? (Please select date of meeting)	August 13, 2026
Topic/Agenda Item	Cell phone tower proposal
Comment	I am strongly opposed to the proposed cellphone tower being placed so close to my home and our neighborhood at crosswind point. As a homeowner and, more importantly, a parent, I have serious concerns about having a telecommunications tower located so close to where my family lives, sleeps, and spends our time. There are still unanswered questions and legitimate concerns surrounding long term exposure to radio frequency emissions, and I do not believe residents should be expected to simply accept that risk when alternative locations exist. Manatee county is a very spacious county, there are better locations for it. I am also deeply concerned about the impact this tower could have on our homes and property values. We have invested in our home with the expectation that our neighborhood would remain a desirable place to live. A large cellphone tower placed in such close proximity could negatively affect the appeal and resale value of surrounding properties. Homeowners should not be forced to absorb that potential loss because a more convenient location was chosen for a commercial structure. This is not about being against improved cell service. I understand that infrastructure is necessary. But location matters. There is a significant difference between placing a tower where it serves the community and placing one immediately next to established homes when other options are be available. I respectfully ask the decision makers to listen to the residents who will have to live with this decision everyday. Please consider alternative locations that provide the necessary service without placing an unnecessary burden on families and homeowners.



Public Comment

Manatee County Government

Submitted On:
Aug 13, 2026, 06:30AM EDT

Full Name	First Name: Pietro Last Name: Romanino
Email	romaninogc@gmail.com
Which meeting is this public comment for? (Please select date of meeting)	August 13, 2026
Topic/Agenda Item	Crosswind point PDMU-07-07(z)(p)(r2)
Comment	I don't want a cell tower

From: Matthew Munroe <matt4munroe@gmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, August 12, 2026 4:37 PM

To: Robert Brown <robert.brown@mymanatee.org>; Lorraine Prosser <lorraine.prosser@mymanatee.org>; Bruce Stamm <bruce.stamm@mymanatee.org>; John DeLesline <john.delesline@mymanatee.org>; Matt Bower <matt.bower@mymanatee.org>; Anthony Sciuillo <anthony.sciuillo@mymanatee.org>; Scott Ziegler <scott.ziegler@mymanatee.org>

Subject: Agenda Items 5 and 6

You don't often get email from matt4munroe@gmail.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.

Good afternoon,

I am writing to offer my enthusiastic endorsement of Ordinance 26-10/LDCT-26-01 (Exemption From Minimum Lot Sizes Within The Urban Service Area) and Ordinance 26-21/LDCT-26-03 (Parking Minimums).

Eliminating minimum lot sizes will allow for small and wonky parcels in the Urban Service Area to be developed into small and affordable housing projects. It will also allow for large parcels in the urban area to be built up into more productive land uses that contribute to our housing needs and the tax base.

Reducing parking minimums is one of the most common-sense zoning reforms which a local government can adopt. Local businesses are the best experts in deciding how much parking they will actually require, not completely arbitrary government regulations. By reducing these minimums, we can open up hundreds of acres of unused land to development that promotes new local businesses, housing, open space, and a more productive tax base. I would also like to remind the Planning Commission that as the BOCC has noted in the past, the Planning Commission is allowed to make recommendations to the BOCC with an item. I would therefore recommend that the Planning Commission recommend the expansion of this Ordinance to the entire Urban Service Area, rather than requiring a complicated review process to "reduce" parking minimums. There is absolutely no empirical data to suggest that parking minimums should EVER be in place, period. If a property owner doesn't build enough parking, then they'll have to reap the consequences. But when too much parking is built, the infrastructure costs to support it far outweigh the productivity it produces, and the taxpayer reaps the consequences. This Ordinance is good in of itself, but should go further.

FURTHER READING:

How Minimum Lot Size Requirements
Maximize the Housing Crisis

archive.strongtowns.org



The Case for Ending Parking Minimums

matthewmunroe.substack.com

Thank you for your time,

Matthew Munroe