

## PLANNING AND ZONING BOARD MINUTES

The Brevard County Planning & Zoning Board met in regular session on **Monday, June 15, 2020**, at **3:00 p.m.**, in the Florida Room, Building C, Brevard County Government Center, 2725 Judge Fran Jamieson Way, Viera, Florida.

The meeting was called to order at 3:00 p.m.

Board members present were: Ron Bartcher; Brian Hodgers; Harry Carswell; Ben Glover; Mark Wadsworth, Chair; Peter Filiberto, Vice Chair; Bruce Moia; Joe Buchanan; and Dane Theodore.

Staff members present were: Jeffrey Ball, Planning and Zoning Manager; Jad Brewer, Assistant County Attorney; George Ritchie, Planner III; and Jennifer Jones, Special Projects Coordinator.

### **Approval of the April 6, 2020, Minutes**

Motion by Peter Filiberto, seconded by Joe Buchanan, to approve the minutes of April 6, 2020. The motion passed unanimously.

#### **Theodore Goodenow** (Chad Genoni / Kim Rezanka)

A Small Scale Comprehensive Plan Amendment (20S.02) to change the Future Land Use designation from PI (Planned Industrial) to RES 2 (Residential 2). The property is 4.85 acres, located on the east side of Hammock Road, approximately 650 feet south of Parrish Road. (1930 Hammock Road, Titusville) (20PZ00024) (Tax Account 2105262 – partial) (District 1)

#### **Theodore Goodenow** (Chad Genoni / Kim Rezanka)

A change of zoning classification from AU (Agricultural Residential) to RU-1-9 (Single-Family Residential), with a BDP (Binding Development Plan) limited to 62 units. The property is 31.43 acres, located on the west side of Hammock Road, approximately 650 feet south of Parrish Road. (1930 Hammock Road, Titusville) (19PZ00158) (Tax Account 2105262) (District 1)

Kim Rezanka, Cantwell & Goldman, representing the applicants, stated the requests are two matters to encompass all 31.43 acres of the subject property. The land use request is for the 4.84 acres on the east side of Hammock Road. [Ms. Rezanka presented handouts to the board that can be found in files 19PZ00158 and 20PZ00024, located in the Planning and Development Department]. The FLU (Future Land Use) is RES 2 on the west side of Hammock Road, and then PI (Planned Industrial) on the right side. There's not much in the way of PI on the east side of Hammock Road; there is single-family residential to the north of the proposal, then PIP (Planned Industrial Park) to the east. She continued, there is City of Titusville property belonging to SE Power, which is developed; there is the East Central Florida Railroad that has a substation in the far northeast corner; and there is a vacant parcel, which is also owned by SE Power. The SE Power plant in the City limits is where they keep their trucks and offices. SE Power is in the construction and maintenance of power lines and fiberoptic installation, so it's not a heavy industrial use. She stated there are 11 single-family homes directly across from SE Power; there are several single-family homes to the north. There is TR-2 zoning to the north of the comprehensive plan parcel allowing two units per acre, but half-acre lots are required. To the west of the complete parcel, including on the other side of Hammock Road, there is one unit per acre, and below that there is 72 acres of property within the City limits that is PUD (Planned Unit Development), at a density of two units per acre. She noted the area to the south of the subject property is the 71.99 acres of PUD also owned by Beachland Managers, that was approved by Titusville in 2019, allowing two units per acre, with a maximum of 143 units, and with houses anywhere from 6,000 square feet and larger. She stated Page 2 of the staff comments talks about Policy 3.5 of the FLU element that PI is intended to have light industrial and business uses; however, that's not applicable because there are no industrial uses in the area. Housing has existed in the area

since the 1980's before PI was assigned, and it's only industrial because of the SE Power property to the south. Future Land Use designation 1.1, Criteria B, states this land has had a PI land designation since 1988. Policy 1.18, Criteria A, says the subject parcel is not immediately adjacent to RES 2. She disagrees with staff because Hammock Road is the only dividing line.

Ms. Rezanka addressed the rezoning request for the entire 31.43 acres, and stated the property to the west of Hammock Road is RES 2, so RU-1-9 with a BDP is consistent, but if the board does not adopt the comprehensive plan amendment it would not be consistent with the parcel on the east side of Hammock Road. She stated the TR-1 zoning to the south of the subject parcel on the west side of Hammock Road requires 7,500 square-foot lots, and there are two that were built in 2003 and 2004; they could be smaller lots, and they are small houses. To the west of the parcel is RRMH-1, which is one-acre lots and there's a wide variety of types of homes of approximately 840 square feet, such as single-family and manufactured. The property immediately to the south is the PUD from 2019 that was adopted by Titusville. There are half-acre lots, and 7,500 square-foot lots all around both subject parcels. She stated RU-1-9 requires 6,600 square-foot lots with a minimum floor area of 900 square feet. The property to the south that was rezoned in 2019 has 143 units, and 2 units to the acre. The rezoning staff comments state there is no anticipated decrease in maximum acceptable volume to U.S. 1, there is also no school concurrency issue, and although the property does not have water and sewer, the BDP states the property will connect to City water and sewer. She said her client attempted to annex the property into the City for their services, but the City said it is not appropriate to annex.

Mark Wadsworth asked why Titusville said it was not appropriate to annex. Ms. Rezanka replied she believes they thought it was too far from the hook-ups, but they will be able to connect to water and sewer through the PUD to the south.

Ron Bartcher advised an Official from Titusville told him the City felt it would create an enclave, which is prohibited by State Statute.

Ms. Rezanka stated RU-1-9 zoning will allow flexibility in design, and the proposed BDP limits the density to two units per acre. She noted there's already a large retention pond on the parcel they will have to work around. The intent of rezoning both parcels is to have the drainage structures and amenities on the east side of the property, and if the board feels it necessary to put that in the BDP, or to limit the number of houses on the east side of Hammock Road, her client is willing to do that. The property has been owned by Mr. Goodenow since 1983; it has not been feasible to develop because of the water and sewer, but bringing in water and sewer will be an improvement over what could be there, which is septic tanks. She asked the board to approve the comprehensive plan amendment on the 4.8-acre parcel on the east side of Hammock Road and the entire 31.43 acres to RU-1-9, with a BDP.

Bruce Moia asked the sizes of the proposed lots. Ms. Rezanka replied they only have to be 7,500 square feet.

#### Public Comment:

Laurilee Thompson, 3550 Irwin Avenue, Mims, stated she is opposed to the change in land use because the proposed amendment to the FLU map will place RES 2 into an area of Planned Industrial, resulting in residential encroachment into a designated industrial area. The subject parcel

does not serve as a transition between land uses with a density greater than two units per acre, and areas with lesser density. It's surrounded by PI land use; immediately north of the subject parcel is TR-3 zoning, which are modular and mobile homes on half-acre and one-acre lots. She stated the subject parcel is not located adjacent to an incorporated area that would be considered a transition for RES 2; the Titusville boundary is approximately 200 feet south of the subject property where a developed parcel with heavy industrial zoning and an industrial Future Land Use currently exists. She said much of the property is mapped as being within AE and X floodplains as shown on the FEMA flood zone map. The AE designation indicates areas that are at high risk for flooding; and flood zone X is an area designated by FEMA as having a moderate or minimal risk of flooding. She noted she was on the Planning and Zoning Board 13 years ago and supported projects for the developer that had four houses per acre in Mims, and were within the core area of Mims, where there is water and sewer service. She said although the area between Jay Jay Road and Parrish Road doesn't fall within the boundaries of the Mims Small Area Study, it should be considered a transition to move from the higher densities of Titusville to the lower densities proposed in the Study. The Mims community created a shoreline preservation overlay zone along the shoreline and the near-shoreline area, and any type of development within that zone, except for multi-acre lots, should be discouraged. If the shoreline preservation zone overlay was extended south from Parrish Road, the east side of the subject property would be adjacent to the shoreline overlay. She stated allowing the change in land use and zoning will set a precedent along both sides of Hammock Road for others to develop in the future. She added, aside from Brooks Landing Phase 1 to the west, there is no pattern of higher density development. She said Hammock Road does not have existing housing close to the river similar to what the developer is proposing.

Terri LaPlante, 4052 Friar Tuck Lane, Melbourne, stated she is against the rezoning for Phase II of Brooks Landing as it lies too close to the Indian River Lagoon. She stated despite everything being done to restore the Lagoon, it is not enough and the growth of nearby development must be managed. She noted the Department of Environmental Protection Basin Management Plan mandates that since the North Indian River Lagoon is an impaired waterway that currently does not meet State water quality standards, new development in the basin cannot increase nutrient loads to the Lagoon. The DEP recommends low-impact development to minimize the impact of new developments. She urged the board to enforce compliance with the comprehensive plan to ensure the economic prosperity of the majority rather than a single business interest.

Kim Rezanka stated residential is viewed as less intense than industrial. Single-family homes are allowed in PIP zoning, and there are homes on the east side of Hammock Road. She said she doesn't believe this is introducing RES 2 to industrial, she believes it is an extension across Hammock Road and an existing RES 2. There are mostly wetlands on the property to the east of the land use request, so it's likely nothing will be built there and that's what the residents want, they don't want anything to be built there. The soils, floodplains, and wetlands are all site plan issues. Currently, even though the land use is industrial, the zoning is AU, so it's still going to have to be rezoned to something allowed in Planned Industrial, and that could be a junkyard, a hotel, or overnight commercial parking, versus several homes, a drainage pond, or amenities. She noted Brooks Landing Phase I will not be interconnected to the subject property. The residents did not want that and Mr. Genoni agreed not to combine Phase I with Phase II because of the traffic concerns on the road to the south. She stated as to other development along the Indian River, at least to the south there are several mobile home parks, so there is already development next to the river. As to Ms. LaPlante's concerns, the development will be connected to sewer as part of the binding development plan; if it's not connected to sewer then it cannot be built.

Mr. Wadsworth asked if the BDP stipulates the project to be connected to water. Ms. Rezanka replied yes, which will benefit both developments if approved.

Peter Filiberto stated he agrees PI is more impactful than residential; however, it does seem to be a high-impact development with 32 acres and 62 lots. Approximately 25% is subtracted for roads, utilities, et cetera, so he sees it as 47 houses and that's an impact in itself. He asked if the developer was unwavering on RU-1-9. Ms. Rezanka replied RU-1-9 is 6,600 square-foot lots, and noted she doesn't have authority from the developer to agree to anything less, but if the board wanted to limit it to larger lots, such as 7,500 square-foot lots, which is the size of the properties to the south, she doesn't think that would be a problem.

Joe Buchanan asked if the developer plans to put a landscape or buffer wall around the property. Ms. Rezanka replied he will have to comply with the landscape and buffering codes, and next to industrial it will probably be mandated, but she is not sure about the existing residential. Mr. Buchanan asked if there is a small percentage of wetlands on the property. Ms. Rezanka replied there are some wetlands on the east side of Hammock Road and some elevation problems that will likely be limited by compensatory storage.

Jeanne Allen, Natural Resources Management Department, stated the noteworthy issues are a portion wetlands and hydric soils on the west side, to the south, but she didn't any mapped on the east side. She said until she gets a full wetland report she won't know exactly know where the wetlands are.

Ron Bartcher stated the small area study stopped at Parrish Road because it was expected that the City would annex all the property up to Parrish Road. He said had it been included in the study, everything on the other side of Hammock Road would be Residential 1:25 or less, like it is the rest of the way north. He stated residential is better than industrial; however, RES 2 is not the right number, it should be RES 1:2.5.

Motion by Ron Bartcher to deny the Small Scale Comprehensive Plan Amendment to change the Future Land Use designation from PI to RES 2.

Jeffrey Ball stated the board could recommend a lower intensity land use it feels is more appropriate, such as RES 1.

Motion by Ron Bartcher, seconded by Joe Buchanan, to recommend approval of the Small Scale Plan Amendment from PI to RES 1:2.5.

Mr. Moia stated the board can make restrictions on the development in the BDP. He said the reason for the request to RES 2 is for the density on the overall piece, and by getting RES 2 on the 4.8 acres, they get nine units; at one unit per acre they get four units. He said he is not in favor of the motion but he would be in favor of more restrictions on the BDP during the zoning portion of the discussion because there are things the board can do and still give the developer the ability to develop the project.

Mr. Bartcher pointed out that the larger piece of property is already RES 2, so there is no need for a Future Land Use change on it, and by separating them, they are creating two separate issues. He said the board can focus on the issue of the 4.85 acres and keep it separate from the other.

Mr. Moia stated the board can limit development on that side of the road and the developer can still have his density count on the overall project.

Mr. Hodgers asked if the 4 acres on the east side would largely be for drainage. Ms. Rezanka replied it will be for drainage, stormwater, and possibly amenities. She noted Mr. Genoni is not sure he's going to put homes on the east side, but currently, in PIP, he could build one unit per acre.

Mr. Hodgers stated if RES 2 is on the larger parcel, the board could stipulate the east side be for drainage or amenities. He said he'd be in favor of that rather than try to combine them together and denying the whole request because of the east side.

Mr. Barcher said he would be willing to put that into the BDP, that development be severely restricted to less than one unit per two and a half acres.

Mr. Ball clarified the board is discussing the land use request only, which is RES 2, and then the board can move onto the zoning action and BDP.

Motion by Ron Barcher, seconded by Joe Buchanan, to recommend approval of RES 1:25.

Mr. Hodgers asked staff if the developer can do what he is proposing at RES 1:2.5 on the east side with drainage or amenities and not build houses on that side. Mr. Ritchie replied when a property is divided by a public road right-of-way and the lot is big enough to meet the zoning criteria, it is considered two lots. He said for the requested RU-1-9 there could be multiple lots on the 4-acre piece of property, so it's big enough to stand on its own. He stated if they want to transfer units, they would have to make a new request to transfer units off of that tract to the other piece of property.

Mr. Moia asked if the developer could do a unity of title to have it considered one piece of property. Mr. Ritchie stated where a property meets the requirements on both sides of the road it is considered two different lots. He stated if the developer wanted RES 4, they would need to amend both of them and it would be considered two applications. Mr. Moia asked if the zoning could be considered under one lot. Mr. Ritchie replied it would be the binding development plan that would limit development on the total property. He stated if it was kept it as RES 2 and the developer wanted to transfer units, there would still need to be a development rights application, but if they want to keep developable units on the both the east and west sides, that would be part of the zoning application.

Mr. Moia asked how many units per acre could they get under PI on the east side. Mr. Ritchie replied if the use for a single-family residence is a permitted with conditions use, it is not a permitted right. If the property was recorded before 2004, the owner could build one house on the entire acreage.

Ms. Rezanka stated PIP is one unit per acre. Mr. Ritchie stated the zoning would be inconsistent with the comprehensive plan; the comprehensive plan is looked at first, and when the designation is PIP, there is a minimum lot size and there is a minimum PIP tract size. The compatible PIP zoning is where there could be one single-family residence on the property to be vested for one residential unit. There is another provision in the permitted with conditions for PIP that says either the property be owned before 2004, or deed restrictions in place before 2004 to allow residential use.

Ms. Rezanka stated Mr. Goodenow purchased the property in 1983, so it existed prior to 2004. Under 62-1542, it's a conditional use that allows one unit per acre which she believes would be sufficient and it would be hard for the County to deny a conditional use when there is a single-family home on a

half-acre to the north. She said her client doesn't have the density to transfer, so it wouldn't have made sense to apply.

Mark Wadsworth called for a vote on the motion as stated and it failed 8:1, with Moia, Glover, Hodgson, Wadsworth, Carswell, Buchanan, and Theodore voting nay.

Motion by Bruce Moia, seconded by Ben Glover, to approve the request for a Small Scale Comprehensive Plan Amendment (20S.02) to change the Future Land Use designation from PI to RES 2. The vote passed 8:1, with Ron Bartcher voting nay.

Mr. Moia said for the rezoning, his only concern is the lot size because it would be unusual to have 6,600 square-foot lots in the area. There is residential development in the area, but for the most part they are half-acre lots. He stated at 31 acres, even if every lot was a half-acre, the developer could probably not get full capacity because of the other infrastructure. The board would need a realistic lot size for the west side and a separate one for the east side, because the east side should be more restrictive. Right now, it's a grove, and that's one of the worst land use categories for polluting the river because it's untreated, direct discharge.

Ms. Rezanka stated without the engineering, there is no way to know how large the lots can be. She said she doesn't have a problem with one-acre lots on the east side, but she doesn't have the authority to make decisions on the west side. She suggested the board can table the request and Mr. Genoni could be present at the next meeting.

Motion by Bruce Moia, seconded by Peter Filiberto, to table the request for a change of zoning classification from AU to RU-1-9, with a BDP limited to 62 units, to the July 6, 2020, Planning and Zoning Board meeting. The motion passed unanimously.

**James and Mary Murray (Dan Quattrocchi)**

A change of zoning classification from AU (Agricultural Residential) to EU (Estate Use Residential). The property is 0.57 +/- acres, located on the east side of South Tropical Trail, approximately 850 feet north of Old Settlement Road. (3720 South Tropical Trail, Merritt Island) (20PZ00015) (Tax Account 2511451) (District 2)

Dan Quattrocchi, 3056 Skyline Drive, Cocoa, stated the owners broke out a 2-acre piece of their property in November 2019 that left them with a half-acre parcel that he is trying legitimize because it doesn't meet the minimum lot size.

No public comment.

Motion by Peter Filiberto, seconded by Bruce Moia, to recommend approval of the change of zoning classification from AU to EU. The motion passed unanimously.

**4090 U.S. 1, LLC (Scott Lamb)**

A Small Scale Comprehensive Plan Amendment to change the Future Land Use designation from RES 15 (Residential 15) and NC (Neighborhood Commercial) to CC (Community Commercial). The property is 0.68 acres, located on the west side of U.S. Highway 1, approximately 430 feet north of Post Road. (No assigned address. In the Melbourne area.) (20PZ00031) (Tax Account 2611636 – portion of) (District 4)

**4090 U.S. 1, LLC (Scott Lamb)**

A change of zoning classification from RU-1-7 (Single-Family Residential), RU-2-10 (Medium Density Multi-Family Residential), and BU-1 (General Retail Commercial) to all BU-1. The property is 0.92 acres, located on the west side U.S. Highway 1, approximately 400 feet north of Post Road. (No assigned address. In the Melbourne area.) (20PZ00032) (Tax Account 2611636) (District 4)

Scott Lamb, 4251 Carewood Drive, Melbourne, stated the north half of the property was BU-1 on the front and a previous property owner rezoned it to RU-2-10, splitting the zoning into the three zonings. In 2005 the County changed the land use along the new right-of-way of U.S. 1 from Residential 15 to commercial, with the goal to keep the corridor commercial and establish commercial land use. He said BU-1 is on the north and south side of the property.

Ben Glover asked if there are plans to develop the property. Mr. Lamb replied there has been some interest in a home-based business, or small office, but until the zoning is changed there are no plans.

**Public Comment:**

Bert Radbury, 4075 North Harbor City Boulevard, Melbourne, stated he owns property across from the subject property. He said 90% of the surrounding property is residential; therefore, he is opposed. The subject property drains to his property and into the Indian River Lagoon.

Ben Glover stated if developed, they would have to retain the water, so it would benefit the Lagoon.

Bruce Moia stated because the property is on a state road they are going to be held to a higher standard of treatment and will have to meet the requirements for a 100-year storm.

Mr. Lamb stated site planning will handle the drainage. The east side of U.S. 1 is different and he would never request a zoning change fronting the river, but there is a 7-Eleven 500 feet to the south, a VFW, an abandoned dog kennel to the north, and a used car lot.

Motion by Bruce Moia, seconded by Ben Glover, to recommend approval of the Small Scale Comprehensive Plan Amendment to change the Future Land Use designation from RES 15 and NC to CC. The motion passed unanimously.

Motion by Bruce Moia, seconded by Joe Buchanan, to recommend approval of the change of zoning classification from RU-1-7, RU-2-10, and BU-1 to all BU-1. The motion passed unanimously.

**Ruth E. Friddle and David Eitel**

A change of zoning classification from GU (General Use) to RRMH-1 (Rural Residential Mobile Home). The property is 1 acre, located on the southeast corner of Satellite Boulevard and Dyson Avenue. (2221 Satellite Boulevard, Cocoa) (20PZ00035) (Tax Account 2406126) (District 1)

Ruth E. Friddle, 6676 Burning Tree Drive, Cocoa, stated they would like a mobile home on the property.

Bruce Moia asked if there would just be one residence, and if they are rezoning it because it is not compatible. Ms. Friddle replied yes.

No public comment.

Motion by Ben Glover, seconded by Brian Hodgers, to recommend approval of the change of zoning classification from GU to RRMH-1. The motion passed unanimously.

**Ziffer Investments, LLC** (Mark Kipp)

A CUP (Conditional Use Permit) for Alcoholic Beverages (full liquor) for On-Premises Consumption in conjunction with a private club, in a BU-1 (General Retail Commercial) zoning classification. The property is 2.79 acres, located on the north side of Micco Road, approximately 0.37 mile west of U.S. Highway 1. (No assigned address. In the Micco area.) (20PZ00040) (Tax Account 3006387) (District 3)

Bruce Moia abstained from voting, as the applicant for the request is employed by his company.

Rebecca Grohol, MBV Engineering, 1835 U.S. Highway 1, Vero Beach, stated the request is for a permit for alcoholic beverages for the Fraternal Order of Eagles, which is a private club whose primary function is philanthropic programs. It would be a relocation from the existing site on U.S. 1. The existing license transfer would be an 11 series, which is exclusively for the use of private clubs.

Pam Jordan, 468 Egrets Circle, Barefoot Bay, asked how large the building will be, and if there will be adequate parking.

Ms. Grohol stated they are applying for site plan approval, but as it is planned as a 10,000 square-foot building on 2.5 acres, so there is room for parking. Currently, there is 56 paved parking spaces, with the ability to add additional parking through a stabilized surface.

Mark Kipp, 12736 79<sup>th</sup> Avenue, Sebastian, stated the proposed building is 10,000 square feet, but the bar/restaurant area is going to be about 6,000 square feet, and there will be a hall for events.

Peter Filiberto stated staff recommends 108 parking spaces. Mr. Kipp replied that is for bars and lounges, and that's for the square footage of the building, but the proposed restaurant/bar area is only going to be 6,000 square feet. He noted they are proposing an overflow parking area.

Dane Theodore asked if the overflow parking plan is in place.

Jeffrey Ball stated during the site plan process staff will be able to evaluate in more detail based on the floor plans and parking will be addressed based on that review.

Motion by Peter Filiberto, seconded by Brian Hodgers, to recommend approval of the CUP for Alcoholic Beverages (full liquor) for On-Premises Consumption in conjunction with a private club, in a BU-1 zoning classification. The motion passed unanimously with Bruce Moia abstaining.

**Matthew Wilson and Erin Leray Coris**

A change of zoning classification from AU (Agricultural Residential) to EU (Estate Use Residential). The property is 1.20 acres, located on the north side of Mclver Lane, approximately 215 feet west of Rockledge Drive. (120 Mclver Lane, Rockledge) (20PZ00042) (Tax Account 2511208) (District 4)

Matthew Coris stated they purchased the property with a home on it two years ago and began plans to build a home in front of it and then remove the existing home. He said it was discovered in permitting that the property is still zoned agricultural, which is what it was many years ago for orange



groves. It has been broken up into sections over the years, leaving only the 1.2 acres that they purchased.

Ron Bartcher asked if they will have the advanced septic tanks. Mr. Coris replied yes, he is in the permitting process for the advanced septic, as well as swales and tracts for drainage.

No public comment.

Motion by Brian Hodggers, seconded by Joe Buchanan, to recommend approval of the change of zoning classification from AU to EU. The motion passed unanimously.

**Roundabout Partners, LLC (Eric Romero)**

A CUP (Conditional Use Permit) for Alcoholic Beverages (full liquor) for On-Premises Consumption in conjunction with a restaurant in a PUD (Planned Unit Development) zoning classification. The property is 2.19 acres, located on the southeast corner of Viera Boulevard and Star Rush Drive. (No assigned address. In the Viera area.) (20Z00002) (Tax Account 3021659) (District 4)

Eric Romero, 3115 Marshall Drive, Melbourne, stated the request is for a liquor license at a new Texas Roadhouse restaurant. The building is over 7,000 square feet, and capacity is 300.

No public comment.

Motion by Brian Hodggers, seconded by Peter Filiberto, to recommend approval of the CUP for Alcoholic Beverages (full liquor) for On-Premises Consumption in conjunction with a restaurant in a PUD zoning classification. The motion passed unanimously.

**Bud and Mary Carol Crisafulli**

A change of zoning classification from GU (General Use) to SEU (Suburban Estate Use Residential). The property is 2.23 acres, located on the west side of Country Lane, approximately 162 feet south of Kings Way. (5305 Country Lane, Merritt Island) (20PZ00017) (Tax Account 2316832) (District 2)

Bud Crisafulli, 5525 North Courtenay Parkway, Merritt Island, stated the property is a small parcel that was part of the overall 15 or 20 acres that had some multi-use zoning on it, but was changed to GU many years ago, and he has turned it into an experimental nursery for citrus. He said the request is housekeeping so there isn't GU in the middle of the homestead.

No public comment.

Motion by Ben Glover, seconded by Brian Hodggers, to recommend approval of the change of zoning classification from GU to SEU. The motion passed unanimously.

Upon consensus, the meeting adjourned at 4:50 p.m.