Dear Manatee County Planning Commission & BOCC,

I am very concerned about the public hearings process in this time of Covid-19. I came out of quarantine on May 14th because the planning commissioners were discussing PLN1909-0066 (Pulte Manatee River Rd.), which I do not believe should be approved at a maximum density of 3 dwelling per acre without infractions in place. If I knew the public hearing was going to be such a sham, I would not have bothered breaking quarantine.

- The screens were set up so I could not see the presentation by the developer or staff.
- The instructions were to remove your mask when you came to the mic to speak. No directions about if you had material to present and there was no mic by the document camera so you had to walk over and remove the mic, then move back. Not a good, safe system for presenting and keeping the public safe.
- One staff member responded to questions with a mask on. The audience and commissioners had no idea what he said. His explanation was confusing and unclear.
- The Planning Commissioners use to be made up of people who strived to make new development the best they could be. They questioned and listened. This was the 1st Planning Commission meeting I’ve attended in a long time. I was severely disappointed to see no real conversations, and a rubber stamp approval to the developer with a project that will affect the Ft. Hamer congestion.
- Many people are still staying away from public meetings as the numbers in Manatee County have not gone down significantly with quarantine. Is the public hearing process really being affective right now?

Sincerely,
Karen Ciemniecki
Dear Manatee County Planning Board,

I was unable to print these pictures, but would like to have them entered into the record on the Pulte Manatee Homes. One of our major concerns is the flooding issue that will be compounded on our property and that of our neighbors, the Pikes, if Pulte Homes is allowed to take out the trees in the southeast corner and disrupt the flow of water from Grey Hawk Landing. Grey Hawks retention pond dumps water on the property lines which run historically along our property and through the Griffin/Logue property. The existing flow will back up on our properties if permitted as is.

The pictures show the water after a normal summer shower and you can see it flows down the property lines into the wetland/wooded area which I was told years ago was an old riverbed.

Thank you.
Sincerely,
Karen Ciemniecki
Dear Manatee County Planning Commission:

At this time, Pulte Upper Manatee should be denied for the following reasons. I do not agree with staff’s recommendations and do not believe it is in compliance with our comprehension plan. This is not the right time or place for a gross density of 3.0 (3.22net) for an in-fill project.

1. **Infrastructures** on UMRR are not in place. UMRR is a safety hazard with narrow roads, poorly maintained roads, no shoulders, no bike paths, and no continuous sidewalk system. The county has no money and no plans to do this in the near future. Pulte is asking for a maximum density in an area where taxpayers will eventually foot the bill for these improvements. This road can’t handle a 3.0 gross density which is not compatible with other development on this road. The entrance at GreyHawk is a major accident hotspot and turn lanes into Pulte won’t help the situation.

2. **UMRR corridor is a failing road.** The staff report states this develop is a negative aspect that will produce additional traffic. Are the commissioner’s going to continue to ignore the traffic congestion and public safety issues? The March 3rd Commissioner Work Session clearly demonstrated the lack of funding and ideas to solve this problem for years to come. If the county has no funds and no ideas to fix the problem now, adding another maximum density development at this time does not make sense!

   Upper Manatee River Road goes from State Road 64 to Rye Road. Look at the data and traffic studies. Listen to the residents who deal with this corridor daily, especially the issues that are compounded during Oct. to May when the road is in grid-lock.

3. There are **no recreational facilities** proposed and no connection to facilities. This is a serious negative aspect as residents compete with limited public facilities. With social distancing, more people than ever are outside. Pulte has no green space for residents to even walk a dog or for kids to go to. Retention ponds are not recreation areas and the county
must stop counting them as open space. Greyhawk Landing will become the recreational facility for this development. People do need space. Pulte is jamming 75 homes in with 5 ft. between houses and one of the lowest minimum lot size at 6,250 square feet. I’m not sure how staff came up with a positive aspect that Pulte is surrounded by PRD land with GreyHawk to the west and south. Is that inviting Pulte residents to utilize Greyhawk’s facilities since they have none? Manatee County needs quality development that enriches the resident’s life.

4. Wildlife corridor—The southeast corner of the proposed development is part of a continuous wildlife corridor that goes through Grey Hawk Landing and ends on the Griffin/Logue property. In 2001, when Sam Rodgers was developing Grey Hawk, these nature preserves were left untouched because the commission agreed that those wildlife connections were important to this area. Today deer, rabbits, raccoons, possums, owls, hawks, and a wide variety of water birds habitat these areas. Pulte should not be allowed to clear the section of wildlife corridor on their southern border with Greyhawk.

5. Drainage – In 2001, Greyhawk Landing was allowed by SWFWMD to dump their retention pond overflow onto our southern property line because SWFWMD said this was the historic flow of water. The excess water flows west through our neighbors, the Pike’s property, and then onto the Griffin property. This flow is essential during the rainy season. Pulte should not be allowed to put a retention pond in that will disrupt the natural flow of water. Our properties will suffer the consequences.

6. Buffers- The proposed 15 foot buffer is not enough on the eastern property line. The Pikes have cattle and for the safety of their animals, the buffer needs to be bigger.

The Planning Commission needs to consider all of the facts before approving any new development that will adversely affect the UMRR corridor until solutions are in place. Right time, right place matters.

Sincerely,
Karen Ciemniecki
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROJECT</th>
<th>LOTS/UNITS</th>
<th>DENSITY</th>
<th>MINIMUM LOT SIZE (SQUARE FEET)</th>
<th>APPROVED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Greyhawk Landing</td>
<td>789</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>7,500</td>
<td>2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greyhawk Landing West</td>
<td>501</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>7,200</td>
<td>2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country Meadows</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>15,200</td>
<td>2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mill Creek IV</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>18,000</td>
<td>1998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mill Creek VII</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>18,200</td>
<td>2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hidden Oaks</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>19,200</td>
<td>1988</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waterlefe Golf &amp; River Club</td>
<td>623</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>7,020</td>
<td>2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenfield Plantation</td>
<td>616</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>5,200</td>
<td>1995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gates Creek</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>2.30</td>
<td>6,600</td>
<td>1995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilderness Crossings</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>14,000</td>
<td>2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raven Crest</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>7,800</td>
<td>2013</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Pulte Homes**

**POSITIVE ASPECTS**

- The project already has PDR (Planned Development Residential) zoning and is surrounded by PDR zoned property, with Greyhawk Landing property to the west and south of this site.

**NEGATIVE ASPECTS**

- The development may produce additional traffic on Upper Manatee River Road.
- There are no recreational facilities proposed with the development.

**MITIGATING MEASURES**

- Necessary Improvements to mitigate the impacts by the project to surrounding road network will be required as conditions of the Certificate of Level of Service which the developer will be required to obtain prior to construction of the project.
I just received the notice for Application #PLN1909-0066 Pulte Upper Manatee River Road, and I am furious that this 75 homes on 25 acres are even being considered at this time on Upper Manatee River Road.

In case you haven’t noticed, we have wall to wall, bumper to bumper traffic jams due to the poor planning of the Manatee County Commission and their lack of foresight in road planning. Upper Manatee River Road, where we live is a sub-par, two laned, pot-hole ridden road with no shoulder and bike traffic. They are proposing 75 minimum setback homes to pack in as many as possible. I already have put in calls to SWFWMD about the flooding that occurs on that property and the historical waterflow from Mill Creek that flows through the back of our property via Grey Hawk Landing, then runs across our neighbors, flowing back through to Grey Hawk and then out to Gates Creek. They are proposing .49 wetland migration to a flood area that impacts the whole neighborhood.

While we are on the subject, the commissioners who approved Raven Crest, which is also an “infill” development on our road, should lose their jobs. This development was allowed to not put in sidewalks on Upper Manatee River Rd., dump their stormwater run-off into ditches on Upper Manatee River Road, have no turn lane into the development, and pack too many houses into an area with no green space. Where do the kids play? Dogs walk? Where are cars parked?

I’ve very concerned that Manatee County no longer has interconnecting ties through developments for traffic. We have no outlets to get to State Road 64 when the road is blocked because of all these gated entrances. Grey Hawk’s back entrance tells you to go to State Rd. 64 to enter the development. Really?

All developments, no matter what the size, must have a turn line into the development to get traffic off the road.

And while we are on the subject of traffic. All development in this area should not be approved until the county has solved the Ft. Hamer Bridge crisis. The
Heritage Harbour Parkway Extension will not solve our problems. The road is completed—open it!!!!!! When will the light go in on Upper Manatee River Road for this road? Unless you put the light in, be prepared for many more traffic issues. The light into Greenfield Plantation and the new signal for the school crossing is equally important. Extend the turn lanes at the Ft. Hamer Bridge light. They are way too short. Fix the 3 lanes merging into one off St. Rd. 64 & UMMR. Your to do list is very long and I’m tired of hearing you have no money. Figure out how to make money for roads. Putting in more houses does not solve your traffic issues. You should of made the Fort Hamer Bridge a toll bridge when you had the chance.

Believe me, you will hear from me concerning the proposed Pulte Upper Manatee housing development plans.

Karen Ciemniecki