

**MANATEE COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION
REGULAR MEETING
COUNTY ADMINISTRATION CENTER, HONORABLE PATRICIA M. GLASS CHAMBERS
1112 Manatee Avenue West
Bradenton, Florida
MAY 14, 2026**

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

Present were Members:

Matt Bower, First Vice-Chairman
Lorraine Prosser, Second Vice-Chairman
Robert Brown, Third Vice-Chairman
Anthony Sciallo
Bruce Stamm
Scott Ziegler

Absent were:

John DeLesline, Chairman
Michael Pendley (non-voting member representing the School Board)

Also present were:

Rachel Layton, Division Manager and Impact Fee Coordinator
Sarah Schenk, Chief Assistant County Attorney
Denise Greer, Deputy Director, Development Services
Marcy Krum Tinsley, Public Hearing Section Manager, Development Services
Vicki Tessmer, Board Records Supervisor, Deputy Clerk, Clerk of the Circuit Court



First Vice-Chairman Bower called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m.

All witnesses and staff giving testimony were duly sworn.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

First Vice-Chairman Bower, led the Pledge of Allegiance.

AGENDA

Agenda Update Memorandum (5/13/2026)

PC20260514DOC001

PC20260514DOC002

- Public Comment – Generic Public Comment added
- Item 1, Ordinance 26-16/PA-24-11, Parrish Lakes CPA Large-Scale Comprehensive Plan Map and Text amendment – Revised Environmental Narrative and additional public comments added
- Item 2, Ordinance 28-15/Parrish Lakes DRI #28 – Additional Public Comment
- Item 3, PDMU-16-16(G)(R3), Parrish Lakes GDP Amendment/FLM, Inc. – Revised Environmental Narrative and additional public comment
- Item 5, PDR-25-06(Z)(P)/Ivy Run/16th Drive Associates LLC/Craig Walter Purcell, James C. Drao and Heather D. Drao (Owners) – Requested a continuance, revised cover sheet to add request for continuance and revised motions in strikethrough/underline format and moved to presentations upon request
- Item 6, Ordinance 26-19/PA-25-03/Comprehensive Plan Rewrite County Initiated Comprehensive Plan Text Amendment – Revised Exhibits A-1, A-2, A-3, A-4, A-5, A-6 A-8, A-9, A-10, and A-11

MINUTES

A motion was made by Member Ziegler, seconded by Member Brown, and carried 6-0, with Chairman DeLesline absent, to approve the minutes of April 16, 2026.

CITIZEN COMMENTS (Future Agenda Items)

PC20260514DOC003



Mark VanDeRee requested the rules for public speaking and comments by citizens and requested clarification regarding legislative and quasi-judicial hearings.



Glen Gibellina stressed public safety is the number one priority for County leaders and stated any approvals for projects in District 1 should be delayed until there is Commissioner elected. He disagrees that Kimley-Horn should work on the Comprehensive Plan.

There being no further citizen comments, First Vice-Chairman Bower closed citizen comments.

ADVERTISED PUBLIC HEARINGS – QUASI-JUDICIAL (Presentations Upon Request)

1. **ORDINANCE/ZONING**



A duly advertised public hearing was held to consider recommending adoption of proposed Zoning Ordinance 26-16/PA-24-11/Parrish Lakes CPA Large-Scale Comprehensive Plan Map and Text Amendment.

and

2. **ORDINANCE/ZONING**

A duly advertised public hearing was held to consider recommending adoption of proposed Zoning Ordinance 26-15/Parrish Lakes DRI #28.

and

3. **ORDINANCE/ZONING**

A duly advertised public hearing was held to consider recommending adoption of proposed Zoning Ordinance PDMU-16-16(G)(R3)/Parrish Lakes General Development Plan (GDP) Amendment/FLM, Inc.

Sarah Schenk, Assistant County Attorney, noted all three hearings are being heard as quasi-judicial, and phone comments will be limited to the two ordinances, not the General Development Pla (GDP).

No ex-parte communications were disclosed.

A motion was made by Member Stamm to continue Items 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5 since the District 1 County Commission seat is vacant.

Ms. Schenk stated this motion should be a recommendation to the Board of County Commissioners. The Planning Commission is only an advisory board. There are no moratoriums on building.

Member Stamm amended the motion to recommend the Board of County Commissioners continue all public hearings for projects in District 1 until there is a County Commissioner seated.

Ms. Schenk advised they cannot table the items on the agenda today.



Member Stamm withdrew his motion.

Discussion ensued regarding the Planning Commission has the ability to recommend approval, denial, or continue the hearing, the Planning Commission cannot institute a moratorium, and there are statutory requirements regarding when public hearings need to be held once an application has been submitted.

Caleb Grimes, representing the applicant, used a slide presentation to review amending Manatee County Ordinance 89-01, as amended (The Manatee County Comprehensive Plan), location of Parrish Lakes, stressed that there are two Commissioners representing the entire County including District 1, this is a Development of Regional Impact (DRI), with Mixed Use (MU) zoning, Land Use Equivalency Matrix (LUEM), plan is for a large area of mixed uses, the DRI had to meet 31 different points, that mitigate the impacts to surrounding areas, roads are in place, thoroughfare roadways are in place, Land Use Exchange Mechanism for the exchange of all uses that will not create more impacts to the area, no new impacts to the roads from this amendment, exchange commercial for residential, Road EE will no longer be classified as a thoroughfare, Road EE is built to thoroughfare specifications with no driveways, and taking it off the map allows more flexibility, the developer will not receive impact fee credits, Road EE is still a connector, the request includes space for a Charter School on site, and utilizing the provisions in the DRI to make changes to the uses.



Justin O'Brien, representing the applicant, reviewed a map of the area, metro lagoon, acreage for commercial, underpass at Carter Road that connects the east and west side, includes rental apartments, various home builders, everything from rentals to upscale residences, potential school site was originally planned for homes, infrastructure is in place, oversized ponds for stormwater, right-of-way dedicated to the County, and roundabouts at six locations.



Mr. Grimes continued the slides and explained the developer has worked with the County to ensure the roads are built to County specifications, when Carter Road is complete it will go all the way from Buckeye Road to Erie Road, developer waiting on County to get permits to cross the roadway to build the roundabouts on Erie Road, expanded ponds for stormwater treatment, outparcel planned for a private school, roundabout three is for access to the private school, main request is to do the land use exchange to ensure there are no impacts, reduction of commercial square footage is in part due to additional commercial being built in the surrounding area, townhomes are planned for the area to the east and there are provisions in the Land Development Code, for development to be built where there is already development, and by putting the townhomes in this area allows for different types of housing other than single-family detached offering more affordable options, DRIs allow changes to better serve the community, the original approval was reviewed by the Tampa Bay Regional Planning Council, then upon a Statute Change the mandate for affordable housing was removed, this amendment is a clean up to meet Statutory requirements, and ensuring there will be more affordable options, without asking for the affordable housing density incentives.



Discussion ensued regarding Statutory requirements for affordable housing needing to be met, wetland impacts have been minimal, Road EE is Grove Lagoon Road and is listed as a minor collector/thoroughfare, but wish it to not be labeled as a collector road, although it was built to thoroughfare standards, applicant is required to remove the thoroughfare classification, and once a DRI is approved it must meet changes to Florida Statutes.

Rachel Layton, Division Manager and Impact Fee Coordinator, stated the vesting runs with the Project, but they have the opportunity to change the project based on current Florida Statutes, commitments made during DRI process, increase of potable water usage will be an impact, increased demand to water supply, no increase to development due to affordable housing, LUME established to make exchanges

Steve Henry, representing the applicant, explained that the traffic analysis is based on AM and PM peak hours, and the school site approval is a separate process.

Discussion continued regarding the roundabout will be built to specific standards set by the County, traffic will be maintained through construction, permits will be issued by County to build the roundabout, not redoing the utilities in the area during construction, Sawgrass Road connection is complete, applicant is prepared to build the roads, Buffalo Canal is a system to move water, and empties into Frog Creek, the canal has been there for years, and has been maintained, difference between creek and canal and water flowing through both with additional commands, legally required to not put additional strain on existing water conveyance systems, diverted water will outflow to Buffalo Canal, Southwest Florida Water Management District (SWFWMD) permits were issued, and concern for residents downstream from the project.

Ryan McCather, Environmental Engineer, explained the project was permitted north and south of Buffalo Canal, and subject to certification by SWFWMD, parcel C2, C5, and part of C1, are all part of the floodplain compensation area, designed to allow for the expansion of Buffalo Canal to handle heavy rain events

Mr. Grimes clarified that the DRI was approved in 2017, and even with the additional homes the project was designed for the impervious area.

Discussion continued regarding the Charter School is not planned, requesting it as an added potential use, 342 additional homes added to the development, there will be school age children living in the project, school capacity, impact of traffic from 342 new houses to the surrounding roadways,



Mr. Henry stated trip rates are calculated and the trade from commercial to townhomes shows there will be no additional impact on external roads. The LUME only looks at external trips, and the exchange cannot exceed the original number of trips. Single-family homes generate more trips than townhomes.



Discussion continued regarding the applicant requested changing residential units from 3,300 to 3,400 and increasing the building heights in 2024.

Mr. Grimes explained market demand has changed and the previous request for increases in residential, and currently, townhomes makes more sense for the market. This project meets the needs of area, and they are adjusting the mix.

Mr. O'Brien noted construction began in the north, and moved south, this is the last residential phase. Everything else is committed.

Mr. Henry responded to questions that the calculations regarding trips related to townhomes are based on the national average, and his company performed many studies.

The rate of trips for townhomes is lower in Florida.

Discussion ensued that the exchanges come from commercial uses, and townhomes typically have less children living in them.



Mr. Grimes explained the school report has ample capacity. Student busing information is currently not available.

RECESS/RECONVENE: 10:40 a.m. – 10:50 a.m. All Members were present except Chairman DeLesline.



Mr. Grimes stated the LUME is related to traffic, and the capacity is available for the water and sewer.

There were no ex parte communications.



CJ Mills, Planner II, used a slide presentation to review the site location, Future Land Use Category (FLUC), history of the project, Comprehensive Plan Amendment, DRI and GDP requests, aligning Phase I and II buildout dates to 2036, school analysis is 36 additional students due to the change, Local Development Agreement will be executed, neighborhood workshop concerns, consistency with the Comprehensive Plan, Provision D.5.9 and Policy 2.14.1.9 coincide with density, positive and negative aspects and mitigating measures, site plan must be submitted for any school, conditions of approval, traffic studies required, 0.4 acres of wetland impacts were previously approved, with no additional wetland impacts, when utilities are analyzed, there is an increase in water usage, but the deletion of commercial usage makes up for the residential usage, and net-zero increase in traffic.



Denise Greer, Deputy Director, Development Services, displayed a map and described the flow of Buffalo Canal, and noted there is funding in the budget for upgrades to Erie Road, but the timing has not been set. Erie Road from Martha Road are planned for the next two years. She is not aware of issues with drainage, and the post development outflow is decreased by 50 percent. Road EE is a public road to be maintained by the County. The thoroughfare designation was not needed since it is a short road to two other roads. The County used the same traffic qualifications as the developer.

Ms. Schenk noted affordable housing is not a requirement and unenforceable.

Discussion ensued regarding vested rights cannot be taken away, and connectivity between projects.

Daniel Uribe, Traffic, provided further information regarding Road EE not being categorized as a thoroughfare road. Road EE only connects two roads, and if there was more connectivity, it would make more sense to keep it as a thoroughfare.



Mr. Mills continued to address the exchange for traffic generation related to the exchange of commercial for residential. There was a 30,000 square foot decrease in commercial. Final Site Plans (FSP) are reviewed to ensure they are within the limits of what was originally approved. It is unknown what type of commercial uses were planned.

The threshold originally approved will still be met regarding monitoring water usage. This is reviewed more with the FSP. Mr. Mills provided a brief explanation of the approval process from GDP to FSP.

Ms. Layton explained the project has an approved Level of Service (LOS) and at this time, the applicant is only required to submit a GDP. Concurrency is reviewed at the beginning, and the Local Development Agreement (LDA) will go before the Board next month for consideration. They must stay within the parameters of the original approval.

 Ken Piper expressed concern regarding the difference between quasi-judicial and legislative hearings, amendments to the project, due process, public notice, and requested denial of the requests.

 Mark VanDeRee questioned if citizens can call in regarding the Comprehensive Plan amendment, and expressed concern with road conditions, and no representation for District 1.

Elizabeth Arnold questioned how many dwelling units have been approved and not built, and expressed concern with traffic, flooding, school capacity, and no representation for District 1.

 Leonard Arnold requested denial of the request due to additional residential units and traffic.

There being no further citizen comments, First Vice-Chairman Bower closed citizen comments.

 Mr. Mills noted the application was submitted prior to District 1 not having representation. He explained the previous exchange was related to the GDP for a reduction of multifamily and increase in residential. There are a total of 3,578 residential units, and commercial is 211,750 square feet.

 Mr. Grimes reiterated this project does not violate Senate Bill 180, which does not relate to the timing on hearings, corrected slide regarding Road EE being built to thoroughfare standards, and can be used to take care of Buffalo Creek, and they have a contractual obligation to build roads to County requirements. Land Uses are not being changed, the LUME ensures there are no additional trips from what is already approved, and there is capacity for water and sewer. The developer is ensuring everything is being built to County specifications, including reducing the stormwater flow by 50 percent. Infrastructure is in place, and there is a market demand for townhomes. The request makes sense for the area, and he requested approval.

Ms. Schenk explained the County met the burden for public notice. There is an Affidavit of Publication.

 Ms. Layton noted Staff followed all requirements for posting and advertising.

 Mr. Grimes noted his office followed all the rules for mailing and posting property by the County regulations. Due process allows more rights when hearings are quasi-judicial.

Citizens were given ample opportunity to speak and comment.

Marshall Robinson confirmed proof of the mailings and postings were provided to County staff.

Discussion ensued regarding the Planning Commission was going to allow call in comments on the Comprehensive Plan amendments, DRI process requires multiple agencies review projects, commitments made in 2017 still hold today, Statute was changed that Counties are no longer allowed to collaborate with the State regarding land use items, do not agree with how the numbers are calculated with traffic, this is an exchange of uses, and there no additional impacts.



Ordinance 26-16 - Deny

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, not in accordance with the review criteria for Comprehensive Plan Map Amendments in Section 340 of the Land Development Code and the applicable portions of Chapter 163, Part II, Florida Statutes, Community Planning Act, Member Ziegler moved to recommend denial of Manatee County Ordinance 26-16 / PA-24-11. The motion was seconded by Member Stamm.

Discussion ensued regarding the modifications are neutral regarding traffic, but uncertain regarding water and sewer, emphasis on making improvements to Erie Road, no commitment from the County except on paper to improve roads, the Capital Improvement Plan can be changed, project effects the entire area, five schools in the immediate area, no public benefit to increase residential, denial of this request is not changing the traffic, the roads are complete now, cannot add trips than what is already approved, roundabout is not part of the approval.

The motion carried 4-2, with Members Bower and Sciallo voting nay, and Chairman DeLesline absent.

PC20260514DOC004

Ordinance 26-15 - Denied

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 not in compliance with the applicable standards for review in the Land Development Code, Member Stamm moved to recommend denial of Manatee County Ordinance 26-15 (fka 17-36). The motion was seconded by Member Ziegler, and carried 4-2, with Members Bower and Sciallo voting nay and Chairman DeLesline absent.

PC20260514DOC005

PDMU-16-16(G)(R3) - Denied

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 not in compliance with the applicable review standards in the Manatee County Land Development Code, Member Ziegler moved to recommend denial of Manatee County Zoning Ordinance Number PDMU-16-16(G)(R3); and denial of the General Development Plan amendment. The motion was seconded by Member Stamm, and carried 4-0, with Members Bower and Sciallo voting nay, and Chairman DeLesline absent.

PC20260514DOC006

5. **ORDINANCE/ZONING**

 A duly advertised public hearing was opened to consider recommending adoption of proposed Zoning Ordinance PDR-25-06(Z)(P)/Ivy Run/16th Drive Associates LLC; Craig Walter Purcell; James C. Drao and Heather D. Drao (Owners). The applicant requested a continuance.

Caleb Grimes, attorney for the applicant, requested a continuance pursuant to a letter submitted.

No ex-parte communications were disclosed.

 A motion was made by Member Prosser, seconded by Member Sciallo, and carried 6-0, with Chairman DeLesline absent, to continue the hearing for PDR-25-06(Z)(P) to June 11, 2026, at 9:00 a.m., or as soon thereafter as same may be heard at the Manatee County Administration Building, 1112 Manatee Avenue West, 1st Floor, Patricia M. Glass Chambers.

Mark VanDeRee requested the item be continued to after June 11, 2026, to allow more time to research the project.

Mr. Grimes will reach out to Mr. VanDeRee regarding traffic and intersections.

There being no further citizen comments, First Vice-Chairman Bower closed citizen comments.

 Sarah Schenk, Assistant County Attorney, noted the applicant is the only one who can request a different continuance date. The item could be continued at the June meeting.

 The motion carried 6-0, with Chairman DeLesline absent.

PC20260514DOC007

RECESS/CONVENE: 12:33 p.m. – 1:30 p.m. All Members present, except Chairman DeLesline.

 Pamela D'Agostino, County Attorney, advised the legal ramifications of continuing any hearings due to a vacancy on the Board in District 1. She reviewed several laws that would be violated if all the public hearings for District 1 were continued. She advised against this. There is no case law to support the continuances.

ADVERTISED PUBLIC HEARINGS – QUASI-JUDICIAL (Presentations Scheduled)

4. **ORDINANCE/ZONING**

 A duly advertised public hearing was opened to consider recommending adoption of proposed Zoning Ordinance PDC-25-21(Z)(P)/Palmetto Grocery/Carol Gore and Charles J Elmore; Michael Gardner; and James and Rebecca Hester (Owners).

No ex-parte communications were disclosed.

 Scott Rudacille, attorney representing the applicant, used a slide presentation to review the request for a rezone of approximately 57,064 square feet of Retail/Commercial Shopping Center, generally located in the northeast quadrant of the intersection of Moccasin Wallow Road and Bud Rhoden Road (Manatee County), providing for a rezone of approximately 9.97 acres from (Agricultural Suburban (A-1) (2.54 acres) and Neighborhood Commercial –

Medium (NC-M) (7.43 acres) to Planned Development Commercial (PDC) Zoning District., the project location, Future Land Use, zoning, NC-M, limits commercial square footage, development trends in the area west of the Interstate, site plan, access points, future connection to the east for potential commercial in the area, project details, below the Floor Area Ratio requirement, exceeding buffers and open space requirements, there is a low quality wetland due to the area being former farm land, and there is a need for a grocery store in this area, especially west of the Interstate. He responded to questions and described the proposed access to the east.

Jennifer Laserdo, Engineer for the applicant, displayed the landscape plan in the agenda package, and stated there is a 15-foot landscape buffer and fences around the retention ponds. The border to the north is landscape buffering, due to a retaining wall between the building and buffer. The proposed liquor store is not independently owned.



Drew Sanders, Environment Engineer, responded to questions and noted the best option for mitigation is mitigation bank credits since there are regionally significant. The wetland is highly degraded with ditches and non-native plants. They prefer mitigation credits as close to the site as possible. Mitigation would take place in Manatee County, and the basins may overlap. The property was a citrus grove, then used as pasture. The wetland does not provide typical wetland functions.

Discussion ensued to protect wetlands, incorporate the wetland into the stormwater design, wetland functions are irreplaceable especially within basins.

Ms. Laserdo displayed the site plan and reviewed the stormwater requirements. The larger pond on the northeast corner will be a wet pond, and habitat will be created. The other two ponds are dry ponds, and discharge will occur in an existing ditch to the north. They are required to decrease current runoff conditions by 50 percent.

Mr. Rudacille addressed the schoolhouse and noted the building was offered to the County Historical Commission, but the applicant has no objection to an entity taking the schoolhouse off the property.

Ms. Laserdo responded to questions and explained there will be fill added to the property, the finished floor will be approximately 40 feet, and the parking area would come up about a foot, the existing level is approximately 37 feet. The process is early and she does not have the volume of the ponds. Fencing the pond is for public safety, due to the depth of the pond. They are required to reduce flow by 50 percent, and dry ponds allow for infiltration. The design meets floodplain compensation requirements. The project is a benefit to the community. All SWFWMD requirements will be met. There are several invasive species in the current wetland, and they will add native species to the stormwater facilities.

Mr. Rudacille stated many landowners in the area are trying to sell their property.

Jacob Mossholder, representing the applicant, discussed the benefits of the project to nearby residents.



Discussion ensued regarding the amount of traffic produced by a grocery store.

Lindsey Craig, Planner, used a slide presentation to review the site location, details of the request, site plan, Future Land Use and zoning district, FLU, PDC for a range of commercial uses, Specific Approval, relief from the six-foot wide drive aisle, neighborhood workshop concerns, floodplain, stormwater conditions, Transportation Link Capacity Analysis, positive and negative aspects and mitigating measures, conditions of approval.

Rachel Layton explained Staff worked with the applicant on the conditions of approval.

Discussion ensued regarding the LOS for Moccasin Wallow Road, will change from C to F.

 Daniel Urbie, Traffic, explained Moccasin Wallow is four lanes in this segment, and construction six-lanes is in the 2045 plan. The F level of service is without the project, which would be the case with the project as well. Each segment of Moccasin Wallow has its own LOS.

Denise Greer, Deputy Director, Development Services, explained each link on Moccasin Wallow has its own score. Once everything is built out, there will be more traffic. When the four lanes were built, the design is for six lanes, and they have the land and stormwater to build the additional lanes, when funding is available.

Kathleen Davis, Development Services, responded to questions regarding an eco-system management plan, which is to be done for each individual project. The applicant is tasked with obtaining the wetland acreage, the impacts, type of mitigation, buffers, and ensuring the wetland structure is set back 15 feet. The work is being done by SWFWMD.

Discussion ensued regarding no net loss to the wetlands.

 Elizabeth Arnold expressed concern regarding the loss of wetlands, saltwater intrusion, grocery store habits when a store is not nearby.

There being no further citizen comments, First Vice-Chairman Bower closed citizen comments.

Ms. Craig stated the applicant is allowed 30,000 square feet of commercial under the current zoning.

 Mr. Rudacille noted this is going to be a large intersection, and the applicant feels a grocery store on this site is appropriate.

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 compliance with the applicable review standards in the Manatee County Land Development Code, as stipulated herein, Member Sciullo move to recommend adoption of Manatee County Zoning Ordinance PDC-25-21(Z)(P), approval of the Preliminary Site Plan with Conditions A.1-A.4; B.1-B.4; C.1; D.1-D.3; and, E.1-E.6, adoption of the Findings for Specific Approval and GRANTING Specific Approval for an alternative to Land Development Code Section 1005.3.A. Table 10-2, Note 10., eliminating the 6-foot-wide drive aisles for grocery stores over 20,000 square feet directly adjacent to the commercial buildings. The motion was seconded by Member Ziegler.

Member Brown stated the County needs to look to the future regarding wetland impacts and the basins.



Member Bower suggested the Board rescind Ordinance 23-66 regarding wetland protection.

Discussion ensued regarding needing a grocery store in this area, focus on stormwater and roads, failing LOS, AI (Artificial Intelligence) does not always have the correct information, and issues are being overcome due to the need for a grocery store.

The motion carried 6-0, with Chairman DeLesline absent.

PC20260514DOC008

RECESS/RECONVENE: 2:51 p.m. - 3:00 p.m. All Members present except Chairman DeLesline.

ADVERTISED PUBLIC HEARINGS – LEGISLATIVE (Presentations Scheduled)

6. **ORDINANCE/ZONING**



A duly advertised public hearing was held to consider recommending adoption of proposed Zoning Ordinance 26-19/PA-25-03 Comprehensive Plan Rewrite County-Initiated Comprehensive Plan Text Amendment.

Rachel Layton, Division Manager and Impact Fee Coordinator, used a slide presentation to review amending Manatee County Ordinance 89-01, as amended (The Manatee County Comprehensive Plan); Providing a purpose and intent; Providing findings; Amending and restating the following eleven elements; Element 1, Definitions; Element 2, Future Land Use; Element 3, Conservation; Element 4, Coastal Management; Element 5, Transportation; Element 6, Housing; Element 7, Historic and Cultural; Element 8, Recreation and Open Space; Element 9, Public facilities; Element 11, Intergovernmental coordination; amending other supportive material as deemed necessary in order to maintain internal consistency; providing for adoption of amendments; providing for effect on other ordinances and regulations; providing for codification, providing for applicability. Policy 9.3.1.3 was distributed to the Planning Commission.

Kelley Klepper, Kimley-Horn, representing the applicant, used a slide presentation to review the Comprehensive Plan 2050 Update, definition of a Comprehensive Plan, looking at alternative language to address certain State policies, Live Local, Senate Bill 180, existing Plan Analysis, public engagement, updated goals, objectives and policies, coordinate analysis of transportation, land use, and infrastructure, key opportunity to create and implement the vision, creates the framework for LDC updates, developed in a public process, this is a generational document, core community vision, primary goals that foster (re)development, Community Planning Act requires local Comprehensive Plan be grounded in data and analysis, updating existing elements, Comprehensive Plan references, accompanying modification summary, comply with Florida Statutes, process started prior to SB180, reorganization of Future Land Use Element, new mixed-use future land use category, proposed affordable housing density incentives, and context classification in the transportation element.

Mr. Klepper continued to review the slides regarding updated transportation modeling and map reviews, transportation policy updates, , Chapter 1 definitions, Chapter 2 Future Land Use key updates, nodal development, livability (Objective 2.1.3), affordability incentives, revised policies for SeaPort Manatee, warehouse use, and removed school criteria, Chapter 2

Future Land Use Policy 2.1.1.4, affordability, public/semi-public, agricultural markets, mixed-use Community Serving, potential density/intensity for mixed-use, Chapter 3 Conservation key updates, Chapter 4 – Coastal Management, manatee protection plan, Chapter 5-Transportation key updates, new safety approach, complete streets expansion, Tables 5-1 and 5-2 added, Policy 5.14.1.4, Airport Master Plan and Transportation Plan year references updated, context classification for roads, Chapter 6 – Housing key updates, and Chapter 7 – Historical.

Mr. Klepper responded to questions regarding Chapter 6, Housing Key Updates, and Policy 6.1.1.5, and noted Lakewood Ranch and North River Ranch would not be affected, since they were already approved. The Stewardship District has its own requirements. This policy would affect only new developments. If there is a provision under the Future Area Development Boundary (FDAB), and this would offer additional options beyond Policy 2.2.2.8. Adoption would not supersede any previous policies. If development is in sync with the agricultural enclave, it would not be affected by the Comprehensive Plan.

Mr. Klepper continued the slides to review Chapter 8 – Recreation and Open Space, key updates including Objective 8.1.1, and Policy 8.1.1.2(b), new park location criteria, “sports courts” based on that portion of the community, universal design, and Chapter 9 – Public Facilities, key updates, Policy 3.2.4.8 onsite sewage treatment.

Mr. Klepper reviewed engagement overview, mix of in-person and virtual engagement, community wide outreach, outreach summaries included water protection, housing options and affordability, congestion/traffic, retain and expand parks and open space, and development review, all hand-written comments were kept, timeline, and the tentative adoption hearing is August 4, 2026.

Ms. Layton noted the constraints of SB 180 were challenging, but the changes that have been proposed will be helpful. This is a large clean-up effort, and the format is going to be more user friendly. They will be able to add in elements once they are able.

 Thomas Gerstenberger, Public Works, noted the 2024 Hurricane season greatly affected Manatee County, and how SB 740, was implemented in the County vs. how it was implemented through the State. Staff needs to review NOAA Atlas 14 and implement elements available to use. This is a step forward. A stormwater presentation will be made to the Board in the future.

Discussion ensued regarding the last time there was an update to the Comprehensive Plan this large was in 2018, why is the rewrite happening now in such a large capacity, these same issues were problems in the early 2000s, need more regarding redevelopment, transportation is always a huge discussion, Conservation element, there are ground water problems, start focusing on water issues, FDAB, the vote requires a full Board, especially since District 1 is the most effected, promises for redevelopment in 2000 did not happen, wait until after the election to vote on this, and incentives for redevelopment as a whole need to be addressed.

Ms. Layton explained staff is acting on a timeline set forth by the Board of County Commissioners. The U.S. 41 project is being led by Public Works, and a different consultant.

 Discussion continued regarding infrastructure is already in place for areas that can be redeveloped, there will always be Board turnover, so now is the time to not fall into a cycle of delays, hurdles that a local government has to go through to get things done, framework must be put in place, need for staff to meet their objectives, the work product is ready as soon as this task is complete, and incorporating form-based code changes with the next amendment.

 Mr. Klepper explained they are not looking at a complete overlap to share facilities with the School District of Manatee County. He provided a quick overview of the affordable housing element. They need to get to a financial level for annual median income that works for everyone.

 Discussion ensued regarding new roads east of the FDAB, there are only a handful of changes to update the plan, and Map 5-H shows Rangeland and 44th Avenue East going to Verna Bethany.

 Elizabeth Shulman, Planner, stated the Map 5-1 series is a separate element, that will go before the Board in June.

Mr. Klepper stated the only new designation is Mixed-Use Community Serving. Staff has the tools they need to move forward.

 Discussion ensued regarding giving staff the ability to make changes that need to occur to improve the County, and Map 5-C was adopted in 2023, and shows the roads east of the FDAB.

Ken Piper addressed the changes and a difference in pages numbers, the need for public hearings and written comments, communication programs, and evaluations of the Comprehensive Plan should take place every seven years. He does not agree there was public participation.

 Mark VanDeRee stated public concerns were not addressed, suggested not sending the Plan for transmittal, citizens are very concerned with stormwater management and potable water needs, wetland protection, and the need to make meaningful changes to protect the wetlands.

 Elizabeth Arnold expressed concern regarding Rangeland Parkway and 44th Avenue East going beyond C.R. 675 and feels that the update to the Comprehensive Plan is too robust for the citizens to review the changes.

 Larry Arnold explained District 1 residents will be upset that this Plan is being pushed through without a Commissioner in District 1. There is no benefit to moving this forward too quickly.

 Heidi Miniinkeim requested the rewrite be delayed.

 Glen Gibellina read a statement opposing the rewrite and expressed concern regarding Kimley-Horn not conferring with the Affordable Housing Advisory Committee regarding the affordable housing element.

 Cynthia Keong stated the rewrite does not meet the needs of Manatee County residents, who need more protection.

 There being no further citizen comments, First Vice-Chairman Bower closed citizen comments.

 Ms. Layton explained the map amendment will be heard by the Board of County Commissioners on June 4. The entire report is an attachment to the agenda package. The changes were identified resulting in a larger document. The Comprehensive Plan is over 1,000 pages, but each element was broken out.

 Ms. Shulman stated there is nothing in the rewrite that is loosening the current requirements, although there are incentives added for development in the Urban Core. Nothing is taking away current prohibitions. There are no detrimental changes, or pro-development changes.

 Discussion continued that the process can take time, but given what the County is trying to accomplish, there is no need to delay, no need to rush this, the Planning Commission can deny transmittal, staff has clearly been devoted to this work, there are no substantive changes, do not push out more than 180 days, build citizen trust, updates were needed, and the report was posted on County the website on April 17, 2026.

 Ms. Layton stated due process was followed, and the hearings were posted and advertised on time. There is no specific timeline for how long a Comprehensive Plan rewrite needs to be available for the public.

Ms. Greer stated the June 4 hearing is for Transmittal and goes before the Board in August for approval. Several workshops were held.

Motion - Denied

Based upon the staff report, evidence presented, comments made at the Public Hearing, the technical support documents, and finding the request to be inconsistent with the Manatee County Comprehensive Plan, not in compliance with the applicable provisions of Section 340 of the Land Development Code and the applicable portions of Chapter 163, Part II, Florida Statutes, Community Planning Act, Member Stamm moved recommend not transmitting Manatee County Ordinance 26-19 / PA-25-03. The motion was seconded by Member Brown.

Discussion ensued regarding could the motion be amended to read the transmittal not be done for 90 days.

Sarah Schenk, Assistant County Attorney, noted there could be a motion adding a review period prior to transmittal.

Motion - Failed

The motion failed 2-4, with Members Bower, Prosser, Sciullo, and Ziegler voting nay and with Chairman DeLesline absent.



A motion was made by Member Sciullo and seconded by Member Stamm to recommend transmittal hearing for Ordinance 26-19 be held after July 17, 2026, to allow public comment.

The motion carried 6-0 with Chairman DeLesline absent.

COMMISSIONER COMMENTS

Member Brown questioned when the Stormwater work session will take place.

ADJOURN

There being no further business, First Vice-Chairman Bower adjourned the meeting at 5:42 p.m.

Minutes Approved: June 11, 2025