

**8MANATEE COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION
REGULAR MEETING
COUNTY ADMINISTRATION CENTER, HONORABLE PATRICIA M. GLASS CHAMBERS
1112 Manatee Avenue West
Bradenton, Florida
April 14, 2022**

Meeting video link: <https://www.youtube.com/channel/UCUlgjuGhS-qV966RU2Z7AtA>

Present were Members:

William Conerly, Chairman
Mike Rahn, First Vice-Chairman
Cynthia Kebba, Second Vice-Chairman
Paul Rutledge, Third Vice-Chairman
John DeLesline
William W. Smock

Absent were:

H. David Roth
Michael Pendley (non-voting member representing the School Board)

Also present were:

Courtney De Pol, Development Services Director
Rossina Leider, Planning Section Manager
Camilo Soto, Assistant County Attorney
Sarah Schenk, Chief Assistant County Attorney
Quantana Acevedo, Deputy Clerk, Clerk of the Circuit Court

Chairman Conerly called the meeting to order at 9:02 a.m.

All witnesses and staff giving testimony were duly sworn.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Chairman Conerly led the Pledge of Allegiance.

AGENDA


PC20220414DOC001

Agenda Update Memorandum: 

PC20220414DOC002

- Item 4, PDR-21-07(Z)(G), Twin Rivers Estates (aka Estates at Rivers Edge) – Public Comments attached
- Item 5, PDMU-11-13(G)(R), Cross Creek – Neighborhood Workshop Summary and Public Comments attached
- Item 6, ORDINANCE 21-38/Heritage Harbour DRI 24 – Traffic Impact Statement attached
- Item 7, PDMU-98-08(G)(R11), Heritage Harbour – Traffic Impact Statement attached
- Item 9, Comprehensive Plan Amendment PA-22-04/Ordinance 22-30, Northeast Quadrant – Ordinance 22-30 attached
- Item 10, Comprehensive Plan Amendment PA-22-05/Ordinance 22-40, Northeast Quadrant – Ordinance 22-40 attached

CITIZEN COMMENTS (Future Agenda Items)


 Todd Kleperis inquired if the County has ever considered Economic Impact Zones to drive commercial development.

There being no supplementary citizen comments, Chairman Conerly closed citizen comments.

ADVERTISED PUBLIC HEARINGS (Presentations upon Request)


PC MB FY 21-22/38

2. ORDINANCE/ZONING

 A duly advertised public hearing was held to consider recommending adoption of proposed Zoning Ordinance Z-21-07, Farshad F. Nejad Rezone.

No ex-parte communications were disclosed.


There being no public comment, Chairman Conerly closed public comment.

 Based upon the staff report, evidence presented, comments made at the public hearing, and finding the request to be consistent with the Manatee County Comprehensive Plan and the Manatee County LDC, Member Rahn moved to recommend adoption of Manatee County Zoning Ordinance Z-21-07. The motion was seconded by Member Kebba and carried 6-0, with Member Roth absent.


PC20220414DOC003


(Depart Camilo Soto, Assistant County Attorney; enter Sarah Schenk, Chief Assistant County)

ADVERTISED PUBLIC HEARINGS (Presentations Scheduled)**3. ORDINANCE/ZONING**


 A duly advertised public hearing was held to consider recommending adoption of proposed Zoning Ordinance PDMU-91-01(G)(R8), Gateway North (fka Artisan Lakes)/Taylor Woodrow Communities LLC/Roers Capital LLC.

No ex-parte communications were disclosed.


 Sarah Schenk, Chief Assistant County Attorney, asked the applicant to clarify the (a) administrative approval of an access change, and (b) the two means of access for exceeding 100 units.

 Caleb Grimes, Attorney for Taylor Woodrow Communities LLC (Property Owner), reported the current approved General Development Plan depicts access to Buckeye Road and Artisan Lakes. Previously, a developer in Artisan Lakes worked with staff to coordinate moving the two access points to Artisan Lakes Parkway, which was approved with a Final Site Plan. When the applicant sought revisions for Parcel I, staff asked for the General Development Plan to be updated to reflect approved access locations. Developments with 100 lots or more have two means of access.


Chairman Conerly noted that staff has already reviewed and approved the Final Site Plan, which was confirmed by Mr. Grimes.

 Colette Agabiti remarked on the following (a) Gillet Road being a narrow, winding and unlit road; (b) the proposed reduction in allowable parking density from 2.1 to 1.79 spaces per apartment reducing the number of parked cars and associated traffic; (c) the proposed increase in setback distances between the buildings to at least 75 feet being beneficial to the developer and adjoining communities; (d) the elimination of the 35-foot maximum height restriction would enable RC Palmetto Apartments LLC (Contract Purchaser and subsidiary of Roers Companies) to amend its application to build five-story residential buildings in which the increase in density would unduly burden the existing means of ingress/egress along Gillet Road; (e) if approved, RC Palmetto Apartments LLC should be required to erect an esthetically pleasing barrier to block access into the Artisan Lakes community and private roadways, which are paid for by the Artisan Lakes Community Development District (exclusive of Parcel I and (f) Moccasin Wallow Road needs to be expanded to four-lanes from U.S. 301 to U.S. 41. There being no further public comment, Chairman Conerly closed public comment.

Upon question, Marshall Robinson, Principal Planner, confirmed the request would not increase density; however, the height would be adjusted. Parcel I is entitled to 300 multi-family units, and the request would establish the development standards for the units as well as reduce the number of parking spaces. He confirmed the application is consistent with rules and regulations.


 During rebuttal, Mr. Grimes pointed out under the existing approval, buildings can be constructed to 35 feet or three stories. The applicant is seeking to modify the maximum building height from 35 feet in order to measure the three stories to match the current LDC. The applicant contributed to the proportionate share with the County for the widening of Moccasin Wallow Road and other improvements.


Member Rutledge asked staff to make sure the clarifications are a topic of discussion with the County Commission.

 Based upon the staff report, evidence presented, comments made at the public hearing, and finding the request to be consistent with the Manatee County Comprehensive Plan and the Manatee County LDC, as conditioned herein, Member DeLesline moved to recommend approval of Manatee County Zoning Ordinance PDMU-91-01(G)(R8); Approval of the revised General Development Plan with stipulations; Adoption of the Findings for Specific Approval; and Granting Specific Approval for an Alternative to LDC Section 1005.4.D (Reduction in parking requirements for multi-family use applicable for Parcel "I"). The motion was seconded by Member Smock and carried 6-0, with Member Roth absent.


PC20220414DOC004

4. ORDINANCE/ZONING

 A duly advertised public hearing was held to consider recommending adoption of proposed Zoning Ordinance PDR-21-07(Z)(G), Twin Rivers Estates (aka Estates at Rivers Edge).


 Rossina Leider, Planning Section Manager, stated this item was advertised as part of the North Central Overlay (NCO) District prior to the district being deleted from the LDC on April 7, 2022. The staff report would be corrected to remove the specific approval requests as related to the NCO District prior the County Commission meeting on May 5, 2022.

No ex-parte communications was disclosed.

 Linda Stewart, representing the applicant, used a slide presentation to review the aerial map, request, site plan, schedule of uses, specific approval requests (3), typical lot sections, buffers and access, environmental and utilities, roadways (Mulholland Road and Twin Rivers Trail), and an aerial map.


The request meets the open space requirements of 35 percent. The proposed site plan depicts the lot layouts for a Planned Development District with a small trail that encircles the lake for passive recreation and a small dock that extends out onto the lake. Three different lot sizes are being offered at 40-feet, 50-feet and 60-feet. At the northeast corner of the site, a child daycare is being proposed as the residential support use; however it could be changed to another use allowed within the Planned Development Residential (PDR) zoning district. With the removal of a section of Mulholland Road, residents of this project would not be able to travel west on Mulholland Road (to get to Fort Hamer Road). Instead residents would have to travel north on Twin Rivers Trail to Golf Course Road in order to travel east or west to Rye Road or Fort Hamer Road.

(Note: The decision regarding Mulholland Road was made on 1/6/22)

 Marshall Robinson, Principal Planner, noted since the section of Mulholland Road was removed from the thoroughfare map, the roadway buffer on the General Development Plan would be changed to reflect a greenbelt buffer as part of the requirements for PDR.


Member Rutledge asked if staff had any perceived negative aspects and/or impacts from the proposed request.


Mr. Robinson pointed out there could be a degree of impact, but it would be hard to measure at the General Development Plan stage.


 Chairman Conerly questioned whether this project could have more negative impacts than another greenfield construction.


Mr. Robinson responded that for this location any impacts would be similar to any impacts that were created by the similar development around the project site. Impacts cannot be measured by traffic or any density increases. The future land use has been designated and the permissibility for the residential development meets the minimum requirements of the LDC.


Public Comment

 H. Glen Ziegenfuss expressed concern that the County is overlooking traffic issues being created for Twin Rivers Trail with the deletion of the portion of Mulholland Road and the proposed request.

 Danelle Cubria submitted a handout (modifications and stipulations, site characteristics, and Twin Rivers map) and noted the developer of Twin Rivers tried to purchase this site and the owner at the time declined the offer. Twin Rivers was developed around it, thus the site has been landlocked within the community. She utilized a slide presentation to express concern with the proposed projects incompatibility (lot sizes, landscaping, and commercial aspects) with the current Twin Rivers project. She suggested the project be recommended for approval if significant modifications and stipulations are made to the plan that would make it consistent with the Comprehensive Plan. The request would impact residents of Twin Rivers negatively (indirectly and directly) and the Planning Commission should deny the request and request the density be decreased.

 Todd Kleperis questioned techniques for analyzing potential impacts.

 Vicki Moore, Twin Rivers resident, expressed concern with potential noise and traffic pollution, safety of gopher tortoises, proposed lot sizes, and future uses such as a drug rehabilitation center.

 John Wren, 37th Court East resident, stated he bought his home due to the lot sizes and design of the Twin Estates. He signed the petition as referenced by Danelle Cubria and opposed the request, because the proposed plan would impact his lifestyle. He disclosed that his statement is strictly as a resident of the County (personal in nature) and not as a County employee.

There being no additional public comment, Chairman Conerly closed public comment. Upon question, Mr. Robinson noted Twin Rivers Trail is a public right-of-way and there are no

opportunities for access to be restricted.

Rossina Leider, Planning Section Manager, spoke to uses and density as allowed with the FLUC.



Merih Wahid, Transportation Planning, reported staff does not have traffic counts for Twin Rivers Trail. Speed mitigation and a second round of the traffic study would be conducted during Final Site Plan by staff.

Mr. Robinson did not have closing comments.



Ms. Stewart stated the playground would be associated with the daycare so there would not be lights, it would not be open at night or on weekends, and would be benefit residents. There are a lot of uses that could be built and the proposed uses are considered to be compatible. She reported that the applicant would not continue with the Twin River Estates name. The site had existing agricultural use as a tree farm in the past, and gopher tortoises would be handled accordingly.



Member Smock stated he is opposed, because this is incompatible with the surrounding neighborhood. If Mullholland Road was going through and connecting to Ft. Hamer it would be better.

Member Rutledge stated he doesn't like commercial within a subdivision. The document from the citizen (attached) is compelling, and this is incompatible with the neighborhood.

Member Rahn, stated this isn't compatible with the neighborhood, he agrees with other Planning Commissioners.

Chairman Conerly stated his metric is whether the request is consistent with the rules and regulations, and if it is presented such then he does not know if they have a basis of denial. Compatibility is a hard thing to define, and it is difficult to argue that residential is not compatible next to residential. Even the denial is not consistent with rules and regulations there is an opportunity for this request to be move forward even if it is denied through the judicial process, and that removes the opportunity for Manatee County to be a party to the process. The same process rules, regulations, and property rights that protect everyone's right to come and speak against the request also gives the applicant the right to present the application. The Planning Commission consists of volunteers and is a recommending body, and their job is to vet and talk about the matter.

Member Kebba agreed that residential is compatible with residential, because it is not the same density necessarily. She prefers development with more connectivity, and would like to also see a grid system to help with traffic issues and fewer cul-de-sacs. Neighborhood uses are a convenience for the neighborhood.


Motion – Denial



Based upon the staff report, evidence presented, comments made at the public hearing, and finding the request to be inconsistent with the Manatee County Comprehensive Plan and the Manatee County Land Development Code, as conditioned herein, Member Rutledge moved to recommend denial of Manatee County Zoning Ordinance PDR-21-07(Z)(G); Denial of a General Development Plan; Denial of the Findings for Specific Approval; and Denial of the Specific Approvals for an alternative to Land Development Code Sections: (1) 403.12.D.(5) –

Reduce the required 50-foot roadway buffer for residential and other uses to 20 feet in the North Central Overlay (NCO) District; (2) 401.3.E.4 – Reduce the required front-yard from 20 feet to 15 feet for front-yard building that function as side yards on corner lots; and (3). 402.D.7.d.7 – Reduce the required front yard of 25 feet to 20 feet while providing five feet of separation between the interior lot line and the edge of sidewalk. The motion was seconded by Member Smock, and tied 3-3 with Members Conerly, DeLesline and Kebba voting nay and Member Roth absent.


Motion – Approval


 Based upon the staff report, evidence presented, comments made at the public hearing, and finding the request to be consistent with the Manatee County Comprehensive Plan and the Manatee County LDC, as conditioned herein, Member Kebba moved to recommend adoption of Manatee County Zoning Ordinance PDR-21-07(Z)(G); Approval of a General Development Plan with Stipulations A.1-A.8, B.1-B.6, C.1-C.2, D.1-D.4 and E.1: Adoption of Findings for Specific Approval; and Granting Specific Approval for alternatives to LDC Sections: (1) 403.12.D.(5) – Reduce the required 50-foot roadway buffer for residential and other uses to 20 feet in the North Central Overlay (NCO) District; (2) 401.3.E.4 – Reduce the required building setback from 20 feet to 15 feet for required front yards that function as side yards on corner lots; and (3) 402.D.7.d.7 – Reduce the required front yard of 25 feet to 20 feet while providing five feet of separation between the interior lot line and the edge of sidewalk. The motion was seconded by Member DeLesline and tied 3-3 with Members Smock, Rahn and Rutledge voting nay and Member Roth absent.

Upon question, Sarah Schenk, Chief Assistant County Attorney, pointed out there would not be a recommendation to the County Commission, because the Planning Commission did not find the request to be consistent with the Comprehensive Plan. PC20220414DOC005

(Depart Sarah Schenk, Chief Assistant County Attorney; enter Camilo Soto, Assistant County Attorney)

1. ORDINANCE/LAND DEVELOPMENT CODE


 A duly advertised public hearing was held to consider recommending adoption of proposed Land Development Code Text Amendment LDCT-21-04/Ordinance 22-10, Heavy Manufacturing Zoning District (Private-Initiated).

 Patrick Seidensticker, Attorney for the applicant, explained the request is to add four uses to the Heavy Manufacturing (HM) zoning district: 1. Vehicle Sales, Rental, Leasing; 2. Vehicle Repair: Community Serving; 3. Vehicle Repair: Neighborhood Serving; 4. Mini Warehouses, Self-Storage; and, 5. A fifth use, Equipment Sales, Rental, Leasing, Storing And Repair – Heavy, is being added by staff to correct a scrivener's error.

William O'Shea, Principal Planner, was available to address any comments.

There being no public comment, Chairman Conerly closed public comment.

There were no applicant or staff closing comments.


 Based upon the staff report, evidence presented, comments made at the public hearing, and finding the request to be consistent with the Manatee County Comprehensive Plan and in accordance with the criteria for LDC Text Amendments in Section 341 of the LDC, as conditioned herein, Member DeLesline moved to recommend adoption of Manatee County Ordinance 22-10 (LDCT-21-04), amending the Manatee County LDC. The motion was

seconded by Member Rahn and carried 6-0, with Member Roth absent.


PC20220414DOC006


RECESS/RECONVENE: 10:26 a.m. – 10:35 a.m. All Members were present except Chairman Conerly due to a Conflict of Interest for Item 5 and Member Roth absent. Depart Camilo Soto, Assistant County Attorney; enter Sarah Schenk, Chief Assistant County Attorney.


5. **ORDINANCE/ZONING**


 A duly advertised public hearing was held to consider recommending adoption of proposed Zoning Ordinance PDMU-11-13(G)(R), Cross Creek.

No ex-parte communications were disclosed.


 Scott Rudacille, Attorney for the applicant, utilized a slide presentation to review the proposed changes, location, acreage, entitlements, and project history, including previous zoning approvals and preliminary site plan.


 Christie Barreiro, representing the applicant, continued the slide presentation to review the request to add 15.27 acres, 144 additional residential units, adopted FLUC, request – increase height, changes to the approval ordinance, specific approval requests (10), virtual neighborhood meeting, public concerns, and the 2012 aerial map.


 Discussion took place on the fire department, and the previous proposed use for the 15 acres.


 Carol Clark, representing the applicant, stated the applicant reached out to the fire department who has an agreement with the East Manatee Fire District.

Carlos Beruff, applicant, addressed the 15 acres.


 William O'Shea, Principal Planner, used a slide presentation to review the site location map, FLUC, zoning, request, GDP – North and South, specific approval requests (5 involve the NCO District), positive and negative aspects, and mitigating factors. The request appears to be consistent with the LDC and the Comprehensive Plan.


 There was discussion on the parking space reduction, and staff being cognizant of trees and the height of buffers.


 Eileen Archdemon opposed the request due to the proposed roadway (84 feet) which would create headlight pollution for her.


 Ana Penrose, Cross Creek resident, opposed the request due to potential traffic issues, safety concerns for students, the condition of Cross Creek including the swimming pool, and roadways.


 Mari Burleson asked that the Planning Commission consider safety of students, traffic on Fort Hamer Road, design standards (LDC Section 903), and the need for a middle school.


 Connie Riggs, McKinley Oaks, expressed concern with impacts to the conservation area, potential in increased traffic, elimination of green space, and the location of egress to Mulholland Road.


 Lyle Martin agreed with Ms. Archdemon, and expressed concern regarding four story buildings and the plans for a road.


 Harry Williams, McKinley Oaks resident, opposed the proposed road and displayed aerial maps to discuss the location of the road in relation to his property.


 Bruce Stolan expressed concern regarding no direct access from the 15-acre site so access would be on Mulholland Road which would impact traffic and school capacity.


 Todd Kleperis suggested the applicant consider the impact of apartments on the area and the benefits of commercial development.

 Lianna Litwin, Cross Creek resident, displayed photographs of area traffic and proposed site plans to discuss safety of students and all day traffic jams.


 David Owens, McKinley Oaks, expressed concern with ingress and egress, delay of the ladder fire truck since it comes from Lakewood Ranch, conservation area and wildlife, and traffic on Fort Hamer Road.

 Ralph Delaney, Gamble Creek resident, echoed previous comments and asked for consideration of the vision for the area including impacts from the Fort Hamer Road extension.


 Michael Cannon, Chelsea Oaks resident, echoed previous comments regarding traffic congestion, safety of students, and the schools and watershed are overburdened.

 Gail VanAime, Cross Creek resident, displayed documents of buildings from Watercolor place, which would be visually impaired by the proposed project.


There being no further public comment, Chairman Conerly closed public comment.


 Mr. O'Shea noted access to Mulholland Road was approved with the original approval and could be built today and maintenance of existing facilities is between residents and the applicant, access to Cross Creek parkway is a public road, and clarified that amenities are existing and used for the development as a whole.

Upon request, Mr. O'Shea read the School Report comments and review of response time.

 Courtney De Pol, Development Services Director, communicated with Fire Chief and confirmed they do not have a ladder truck and there is an agreement with East Manatee. They plan to purchase a ladder truck next year.

Mr. O'Shea addressed concern with traffic counts decreasing due to multifamily units.


 Mr. Rudacille rebutted on how the easement between Chelsea Oaks and McKinley Oaks is not shown on the plan and would not be built as a road (displayed submitted GDP from slide presentation), the multi-family would have it is own amenity center and there are reviews from the Fire District and School Board.

 Based upon the staff report, evidence presented, comments made at the public hearing, and finding the request to be consistent with the Manatee County Comprehensive Plan and the Manatee County LDC, as conditioned herein, Member Rutledge moved to recommend approval of Manatee County Zoning Ordinance PDMU-11-13(G)(R); Approval of a General Development Plan with Stipulations A.1 – A.8, B.1 – B.4 C.1 – C.5, D.1, E.1 – E.11, F.1 – F.2, G.1 and H.1; Adoption of the Findings for Specific Approval; and Granting Specific Approval of an alternatives to LDC Sections: (1) 403.12.D.5.a. to modify the roadway buffer plantings standards for the NCO; (2) 403.12.D.6.a. to modify the perimeter buffer width and landscape standards for the uninstalled buffers; (3) 403.12.D.6.a. to modify the perimeter buffer width and landscape standards for the buffer at the southern boundary of Annie Lucy Williams Elementary School; (4) 403.12.D.3 to modify landscape planting design of the NCO District; (5) 401.5.A.2 to delete the solid fence requirement between developments of three stories or more abutting a single-family residential zoning district; (6) 401.5.B.4 (Building Height Compatibility – Through Special Permit or Planned Development) to orient the front of the buildings internally; (7) 1005.3 (Off-Street Parking – Number of Vehicular Parking Spaces) to reduce the multi-family parking ratio to 1.8 spaces per dwelling unit including guest parking; (8) 403.12.D.3.l to eliminate the additional NCO height setback for multi-story buildings; (9) 1001.4.D.2 to delete the previously approved inter-neighborhood tie from Phase 2B into Chelsea Oaks; (10) 1001.4.D.2 (Cul-de-Sacs, Dead-End Streets and Stub Streets) to allow a cul-de-sac street to exceed 800 feet; and (11) Public Works Manual, Part 3, Section 3.1.3.B.6, to reduce the private cul-de-sac street south of the school site from a required a minimum right-of-way width of 50 feet to 40 feet. The motion was seconded by Member Kebba, and carried 5-0 with Chairman Conerly abstaining and Member Roth absent.

PC20220414DOC007

RECESS/RECONVENE: 11:55 a.m. to 1:00 p.m. All Members were present except Member Roth.

6. **ORDINANCE/DRI**


 A duly advertised public hearing was held to consider recommending adoption of proposed Ordinance 21-38, Heritage Harbour DRI 24.


and

7. **ORDINANCE/ZONING**


A duly advertised public hearing was held to consider recommending adoption of proposed Zoning Ordinance PDMU-98-08(G)(R11), Heritage Harbour DRI 24 (fka Heritage Sound).


No ex-parte communications were disclosed.

 Kyle Grimes, Attorney for Heritage Harbour Golf Holdings LLC, used a slide presentation to review the boundary map, property, Map H, General Development Plan, and current golf course conditions.

 Mark Bruce, applicant, purchased the property in 2018, and approval of the request would allow him to make improvements.

Mr. Grimes agreed with the staff report and its findings, and the request is consistent with the LDC and Comprehensive Plan.


 Discussion took place on how the residential component would address and maintain the golf course, what would make this golf course a desired destination (location), this is a fun golf course, and whether or not it is a public or private course.


 Marshall Robinson, Principal Planner, mentioned parcels 36 and 37 are additional and not part of the Land Use Exchange Matrix.

Member Rutledge asked about the build out of the original 500 homes.

Mr. Grimes stated the golf course has been in existence for many years.

Public Comment

 Mark Godlewski, River Strand resident, supported the request.


 Tom Bakalar supported the request, because the golf course is an asset to the community and property values.

 Mike Zeiner, Stoneybrook resident, supported the request and frequents the golf course.

There being no additional public comment, Chairman Conerly closed public comment.


There were no staff or applicant closing comments.

Motion - Ordinance 21-38

 Based upon the staff report, evidence presented, comments made at the public hearing, and finding the request to be consistent with the Manatee County Comprehensive Plan, the Manatee County LDC, and Section 380.06, Florida Statutes, subject to the conditions of approval established in the Development Order, Member Rahn moved to recommend approval of DRI 24 and Adoption of Manatee County Ordinance 21-38. The motion was seconded by Member DeLesline and carried 6-0, with Member Roth absent.

PC20220414DOC008


Motion -Zoning Ordinance


 Based upon the staff report, evidence presented, comments made at the public hearing, and finding the request to be consistent with the Manatee County Comprehensive Plan and the Manatee County LDC, as conditioned herein, Member Rahn moved to recommend adoption of Manatee County Zoning Ordinance PDMU-98-08(G)(R11) with Stipulations and approval of the revised General Development Plan. The motion was seconded by Member Kebba and carried 6-0, with Member Roth absent.


PC20220414DOC009

(Depart Member DeLesline and Sarah Schenk; enter Camilo Soto)


8. **ORDINANCE/COMPREHENSIVE PLAN**


 A duly advertised public hearing was held to consider recommending transmittal of proposed Large Scale Comprehensive Plan Map Amendment PA-21-01/Ordinance 22-27, SR 64 North Property (Private-Initiated).

 Edward Vogler made opening comments and noted this property is under contract for purchase by Neal Communities of SW FL.


 Kate LaBarr, Planner for the applicant, utilized a slide presentation to review the general location map, existing and proposed FLUC map, Comprehensive Plan consistency, and page 3 of the staff report. The applicant agrees with the findings of the staff report and the request is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan.


Chairman Conerly asked if the Watershed overlay is not being modified with this amendment.

 Member Rutledge sought clarification on the modification.

 Ms. LaBarr explained the land on the north side has a Res-1, and portions were sold in the past and modified to Mixed Use. The goal is to eliminate the multiple uses and have one cohesive zoning district, with a density of three units per acre.


Member Kebba questioned density bonuses.

 Ms. LaBarr stated the applicant is not pursuing affordable housing; therefore the density bonus will not be given, at this time.

 Charles Andrews, Senior Planner, used a slide presentation to review the request, existing FLUC map and overlay districts, recent approvals, surrounding development, negative aspects, and mitigating factors.


There being no public comment, Chairman Conerly closed public comment.

There were no applicant or staff closing comments.

 Based upon the staff report, evidence presented, and finding the request to be consistent with the Manatee County Comprehensive Plan and the applicable portions of Chapter 163, Part II, Florida Statutes, Member Rahn moved to recommend transmittal of Comprehensive Plan Amendment PA-21-01/Ordinance 22-27. The motion was seconded by Member Rutledge and carried 5-0, with Members DeLesline and Roth absent.

PC20220414DOC010


9. **ORDINANCE/COMPREHENSIVE PLAN**

 A duly advertised public hearing was held to consider recommending transmittal of proposed Comprehensive Plan Map Amendment PA-22-04/Ordinance 22-30, Northeast Quadrant (Privately-Initiated).


and

10. **ORDINANCE/COMPREHENSIVE PLAN**

A duly advertised public hearing was held to consider recommending transmittal of proposed Comprehensive Plan Text Amendment PA-22-05/Ordinance 22-40, Northeast Quadrant (Privately-Initiated). The Northeast Quadrant is generally located east of Lorraine Road with Bournside Boulevard serving as the eastern boundary, the northern boundary being approximately 2,200 feet north of S.R. 64 East, and the Masters Avenue to the south. The 202 acre parcel to be removed is generally located on the north side of S.R. 64 East, south and west of Waterline/Dam Road, and east of 172nd Street East.

 Edward Vogler, Attorney for the applicant, explained Items 9 and 10 are conforming amendments.


Discussion took place on the movement of the FDAB.

 Charles Andrews, Senior Planner, used a slide presentation to review the request, the map amendment, the current boundary and with the change, existing FLUC proposed boundary, text amendment, history, and conclusion.

There being no public comment, Chairman Conerly closed public comment.

There were no applicant or staff closing comments.

Motion – PA-22-04/Ordinance 22-30

 Based upon the staff report, evidence presented, and finding the request to be consistent with the Manatee County Comprehensive Plan and the applicable portions of Chapter 163, Part II, Florida Statutes, Member Rahn moved to recommend transmittal of Comprehensive Plan Amendment PA-22-04 / Ordinance 22-30. The motion was seconded by Member Smock and carried 5-0, with Members DeLesline and Roth absent.

PC20220414DOC011

Motion – PA-22-05/Ordinance 22-40

Based upon the staff report, evidence presented, and finding the request to be consistent with the Manatee County Comprehensive Plan and the applicable portions of Chapter 163, Part II, Florida Statutes, Member Rahn moved to recommend transmittal of Comprehensive Plan Amendment PA-22-05/Ordinance 22-40. The motion was seconded by Member Smock and carried 5-0, with Members DeLesline and Roth absent.

PC20220414DOC012

ADJOURN

There being no further business, Chairman Conerly adjourned the meeting at 2:08 p.m.

Minutes Approved: May 11, 2023