

# **Brevard County Board of County Commissioners**

*2725 Judge Fran Jamieson Way  
Viera, FL 32940*



## **Minutes**

**Thursday, April 3, 2025**

**5:00 PM**

**Zoning**

**Commission Chambers**

**A. CALL TO ORDER 5:00 PM**

**Present:** Commissioner District 1 Katie Delaney , Commissioner District 2 Tom Goodson, Commissioner District 3 Kim Adkinson, Commissioner District 4 Rob Feltner, and Commissioner District 5 Thad Altman

**B. ZONING STATEMENT**

The Board of County Commissioners acts as a Quasi-Judicial body when it hears requests for rezoning and Conditional Use Permits. Applicants must provide competent substantial evidence establishing facts, or expert witness opinion testimony showing that the request meets the Zoning Code and Comprehensive Plan criteria. Opponents must also testify as to facts, or provide expert testimony; whether they like, or dislike, a request is not competent evidence. The Board must then decide whether the evidence demonstrates consistency and compatibility with the Comprehensive Plan and the existing rules in the Zoning Ordinance, property adjacent to the property to be rezoned, and the actual development of the surrounding area. The Board cannot consider speculation, non-expert opinion testimony, or poll the audience by asking those in favor or opposed to stand up or raise their hands. If a Commissioner has had communications regarding a rezoning or Conditional Use Permit request before the Board, Commissioner must disclose the subject of the communication and the identity of the person, group, or entity, with whom the communication took place before the Board takes action on the request. Likewise, if a Commissioner has made a site visit, inspection, or investigation, the Commissioner must disclose that fact before the Board takes action on the request. Each applicant is allowed a total of 15 minutes to present their request unless the time is extended by a majority vote of the Board. The applicant may reserve any portion of the 15 minutes for rebuttal. Other speakers are allowed five minutes to speak. Speakers may not pass their time to someone else in order to give that person more time to speak.

**C. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

Commissioner Delaney led the assembly in the Pledge of Allegiance.

The Board approved for Commissioner Goodson to attend the Board meeting via telephone.

**Result:** Approved

**Mover:** Kim Adkinson

**Second:** Thad Altman

**Ayes:** Delaney, Goodson, Adkinson, Feltner, and Altman

**D. MINUTES FOR APPROVAL**

The Board approved the January 28, 2025, Regular Meeting and the February 6, 2025, Zoning Meeting Minutes.

**Result:** Approved

**Mover:** Thad Altman

**Second:** Katie Delaney

**Ayes:** Delaney, Goodson, Adkinson, Feltner, and Altman

**H.1. Public Hearing, Re: City Pointe Landfall LLC. (David Bassford) Requests a Small-Scale Comprehensive Plan Amendment (24S.11), to Change the Future Land Use Designation from Res 1, Res 2, Res 4, and NC to CC and Res 4 (24SS00009) (Tax Account 2411252)**

Chairman Feltner called for a public hearing to consider a Small Scale Plan Amendment (24S.11), to change the Future Land Use (FLU) designation from Res 1, Res 2, Res 4, and NC to CC and Res 4, as petitioned by City Pointe Landfall LLC.

Trina Gilliam, Planning and Zoning Manager, stated Items H.1. and H.2. are companion applications, which will be read into the record together, but they will need separate approval; City Pointe Landfall LLC, represented by Kimberly Rezanka, request a Small Scale Comprehensive Plan Amendment under 24S.11, to change the FLU designation from Res 1, Res 2, Res 4, and NC to CC and Res 4 under application 24SS00009, located in District 1; and H.2. is also City Pointe Landfall LLC, represented by Kimberly Rezanka, request a change in zoning classification from EU and RP with an existing Binding Development Plan (BDP) to Planned Unit Development (PUD) with the removal of the existing BDP under application 24PUD00003, located in District 1.

Kim Rezanka, representing City Pointe Landfall LLC, stated with her is Bruce Moia; they are here to request a continuance to the July 3, 2025, hearing date; at the Planning and Zoning (P&Z) board meeting they did get a recommendation of approval on both of these, but they said they must go meet with the residents, because they did not know the residents would be in such opposition; they just had the opportunity to meet with them on Tuesday, April 1, along with 59 attendees, including Commissioner Delaney, along with her Chief of Staff, Kristin Lortie; they listened to them, they advised the clients, and they do want to substantially revise this to make the residents happier; she does not know if they would ever be completely happy; but she thinks that they would be much happier with what they have in mind. She went on to say she cannot share it yet, because it is not designed, so they ask for a continuance of both Items.

Chairman Feltner asked at which point certain changes are made and have to go back to Local Planning and Zoning versus a continuance.

Morris Richardson, County Attorney, replied staff will know it when they see it; the Supreme Court describes obscenity as they will know it when they see it; he is only partly joking, the Planning and Development Director might have a better rule of thumb, but they would have to know what type of change; obviously, if it is something that would not fit within the requested land use and zoning classifications or requires a different land use or zoning classification, and that would be something substantial enough that it would have to go back through P&Z; and he asked the Planning and Development Director what types of other things would he look at before sending it back.

Billy Prasad, Interim Planning and Development Director, replied he would say if it would be considered a substantial change; if it was the County's existing PUD, then it would require it to go back to P&Z; his understanding of what is being looked at would meet that definition; but with that said, he still thinks staff can meet the July 3 Board meeting if Ms. Rezanka were able to get that application in by mid-May; and there is a P&Z meeting in June, so that does not necessarily mean that staff cannot meet the schedule.

Ms. Rezanka advised it is a reduction in units, it would be a reduction in density, so she does not see that to be a minor plan, but she knows that County staff would have to have the chance to review it, so the intent is to reduce the number of units.

Attorney Richardson commented that being it is a PUD, that is a good point, because it is a PUD and a plan is part of the PUD approval; almost any change within a PUD would likely trigger the requirement that it go back; but again, he would have to see what it is to say for certain; typically, if one is just reducing density or intensity, it would not be necessarily a requirement; and again, a PUD is a little unique because it is premised on that preliminary development plan.

Chairman Feltner asked if they come back within five or six weeks, would staff potentially have enough time to bring it to the local P&Z, or make that determination.

Mr. Prasad responded affirmatively; and he advised the next LPA meeting is June 16, so if staff received it by mid-May, they would be able to meet that.

Chairman Feltner asked if that seemed reasonable.

Ms. Rezanka advised yes, she thinks in the next two weeks because they also promised the residents another public meeting so they could see what has been changed.

Chairman Feltner stated for the public who is here tonight, it is just a matter of custom that the Board does allow one tabling of an Item, so for all of them who wanted to speak tonight, he apologizes; but the good news is they are going to go back and work on this; and maybe they will come up with a plan that the residents like better than the current one.

Commissioner Delaney asked if Attorney Richardson could explain the legal justification for this and why it is in the County's best interest to allow these proceedings to follow the typical, the way the County does it, allowing the continuance and not opening the County up to certain legal issues.

Attorney Richardson replied generally, just as a matter of fairness and due process, when an applicant requests a continuance and it is the first request, if there are reasonable grounds for it, the privilege has not been abused by repetitive requests or anything like that, he always recommends granting that request; he understands that sometimes the citizens turn out and want to speak to an Item; but if the County does it the wrong way, it could be charged with a violation of due process that could result in whatever the Board does, to be overturned, that is one issue; another issue is that if the Board has citizens speak to the Item tonight and the Item is changed in any material way between now and when it is ultimately decided by the Board, none of the testimony from tonight would be considered, and it would confuse the record, so his recommendation is, in a case like this, would be for the Board to grant the request for continuance; and it is not to say it is absolutely required, but it is certainly his legal advice and recommendation.

Commissioner Delaney stated she just wanted that to be put out there for everybody; this whole process is so frustrating to her; she remembers sitting in those seats herself being frustrated for this same exact reason; she hates the fact that people have to come out time and time again for these issues, but unfortunately, that is how the law is written; the Board has to make sure it is protecting the interest of the County and the residents' tax dollars to make sure it is not opening itself up to things; and the judge could go against the County and pass something the residents do not really want, so while it is frustrating that everybody has to come back if they so choose, it is definitely the best thing for everybody in her opinion.

There being no further comments or objections, the Board continued the request by City Pointe Landfall LLC, requesting a Small Scale Plan Amendment (24S.11) to change the FLU

designation from Res 1, Res 2, Res 4, and NC to CC and Res 4, to the July 3, 2025, Zoning Meeting.

**Result:** Continued

**Mover:** Thad Altman

**Second:** Katie Delaney

**Ayes:** Delaney, Goodson, Adkinson, Feltner, and Altman

**H.2. Public Hearing, Re: City Pointe Landfall LLC. (David Bassford) Requests a Change in Zoning Classification from EU and RP with an Existing BDP to PUD with the Removal of Existing BDP (24PUD00003) (Tax Account 2411252)**

Chairman Feltner called for a public hearing to consider a request for a change in zoning classification from EU and RP with an existing BDP to PUD with the removal of existing BDP, as requested by City Pointe Landfall LLC.

There being no further comments or objections, the Board continued request of City Pointe Landfall LLC, for a change in zoning classification from EU and RP with an existing BDP to PUD with the removal of existing BDP, to the July 3, 2025, Zoning meeting.

**Result:** Continued

**Mover:** Katie Delaney

**Second:** Thad Altman

**Ayes:** Delaney, Goodson, Adkinson, Feltner, and Altman

Commissioner Delaney advised she will make sure she puts out something on her Facebook page when she hears something.

**H.3. Public Hearing, Re: Jay Sriambe LLC (Bruce Moia) Requests a Small-Scale Comprehensive Plan Amendment (24S.15), to Change the Future Land Use Designation from CC to RES 30 (24SS00015) (Tax Account 2426536)**

Chairman Feltner called for a public hearing to consider a request for a Small Scale Comprehensive Plan Amendment (24S.15), to change the Future Land Use (FLU) designation from CC to RES 30, as requested by Jay Sriambe LLC.

Trina Gilliam, Planning and Zoning Manager, stated H.3. and H.4. are companion applications; they will be read into the record together; however, they will need separate motions; Jay Sriambe LLC, represented by Bruce Moia, requests a Small Scale Comprehensive Plan Amendment (24S.15), to change the FLU designation from CC to RES 30 under application 24SS00015, located in District 2; and actually, this application was withdrawn, so the only Item that will be heard is H.4. She went on to say H.4. is Jay Sriambe LLC, represented by Bruce Moia, requests a change in zoning classification from BU-1 and BU-2 to RU-2-30, under application 24Z00066, located in District 2.

This Item was withdrawn by applicant.

**H.4. Public Hearing, Re: Jay Sriambe LLC. (Bruce Moia) Requests a Change in Zoning Classification from BU-1 and BU-2 to RU-2-30 (24Z00066) (Tax Account 2426536)**

Chairman Feltner called for a public hearing to consider a request by Jay Sciambe LLC for a change in zoning classification from BU-1 and BU-2 to RU-2-30.

Bruce Moia, MVB Engineering, representing the applicant, stated what they are proposing to do is on Merritt Island on State Road (SR) 50, there is an existing hotel that was built back in the '60s, it has been around a long time; what they have is a developer wants to go in there and refurbish it, do a complete renovation, and change it to multi-family residential; he is not sure exactly what is in the Board's packet; he thinks there was a brochure that kind of looks at pre, existing, and proposed, so the Board can see that it is going to be very well done; there is an existing development that this developer did in Winter Park that was very popular and very well-received; and he does not know if any of the Commissioners have been to the site, but it definitely needs to be redeveloped. He pointed out they had a unanimous approval by Merritt Island Redevelopment Agency (MIRA) and the Planning and Zoning board; and he asked without going into details, as most of the details were given to the Board, if the Board has any questions for him.

There being no further comments or objections, the Board approved the request for a change of zoning classification from BU-1 and BU-2 to RU-2-30, as requested by Jay Sciambe LLC.

**Result:** Approved

**Mover:** Tom Goodson

**Second:** Kim Adkinson

**Ayes:** Delaney, Goodson, Adkinson, Feltner, and Altman

**H.5. Public Hearing, Re: Isabela Zimmerman and Mikke Seppala Request a Change in Zoning Classification from GU to AGR (24Z00065) (Tax Account 2005717)**

Chairman Feltner called for a public hearing to consider request by Isabela Zimmerman and Mikke Seppala for a change in zoning classification from GU to AGR.

Trina Gilliam, Planning and Zoning Manager, stated H.5. is Isabela Zimmerman and Mikke Seppala requesting a change in zoning classification from GU to AGR under application 24Z00065, Tax Account 2005717, and it is located in District 1.

Isabela Zimmerman commented they are here to get the zoning changed from General Use to Agriculture in order to build a family home, raise some goats, have a small nursery, potentially, and have a couple of animals as well; they have already passed their variances, as well as local agency meeting; and this is the last step.

There being no further comments or objections, the Board approved request of Isabela Zimmerman and Mikke Seppala for a change of zoning classification from GU to AGR.

**Result:** Approved

**Mover:** Katie Delaney

**Second:** Thad Altman

**Ayes:** Delaney, Goodson, Adkinson, Feltner, and Altman

**H.6. Public Hearing, Re: Nicholas Duffy Requests a Change in Zoning Classification from BU-1 to BU-2 (24Z00071) (Tax Account 3006387)**

Chairman Feltner called for a public hearing to consider a request by Nicholas Duffy for a change in zoning classification from BU-1 to BU-2.

Trina Gilliam, Planning and Zoning Manager, stated H.6., Nicholas Duffy requests a change in zoning classification from BU-1 to BU-2 under application 24Z00071, Tax Account 3006387, and it is located in District 3.

Nicholas Duffy advised he purchased a commercial property; right now it is zoned for BU-1; he is trying to get it to BU-2; they are trying to do boat and RV storage; and basically, they will do an enclosed storage up front and then a little outdoor storage in the back.

Chairman Feltner pointed out he thinks there is a Binding Development Plan (BDP), as well; and he asked if Mr. Duffy agreed to that.

Mr. Duffy replied affirmatively.

There being no further comments or objections, the Board approved a change of zoning classification from BU-1 to BU-2 with an existing Binding Development Plan (BDP), retaining all BU-1 uses and restricting the BU-2 use to outdoor boat and RV storage, as requested by Nicholas Duffy.

**Result:** Approved

**Mover:** Kim Adkinson

**Second:** Katie Delaney

**Ayes:** Delaney, Goodson, Adkinson, Feltner, and Altman

Chairman Feltner stated the BDP is similar to everything around it; and he asked if that is right.

Billy Prasad, Interim Planning and Development Director, advised his understanding is that the BDP would be for all BU-1 uses, and using a single BU-2 use of RV and boat storage.

**H.7. Public Hearing, Re: The Lila Songer Trust (Thomas Songer) Request a Small-Scale Comprehensive Plan Amendment (24S.20), to Change the Future Land Use Designation from Agric to RES 1 (24SS00020) (Tax Account 3037863 and a Portion of 2002415)**

Chairman Feltner called for a public hearing to consider a request for a Small Scale Plan Comprehensive Plan Amendment (24S.20), to change the Future Land Use (FLU) designation from Agric to RES 1, as requested by The Lila Songer Trust.

Trina Gilliam, Planning and Zoning Manager, stated H.7. and H.8. are companion applications; she will read them into the record together, however, they will need a separate motion; The Lila Songer Trust, represented by Thomas Songer, requests a Small Scale Comprehensive Plan Amendment under 24S.20, to change the FLU designation from Agricultural to Res 1 under application 24SS00020, Tax Account 3037863 and a portion of 2002415, and it is located in District 1; and the Lila Songer Trust, represented by Thomas Songer, requests a change in zoning classification from AU and RRMH1 to RRMH1, under application 24Z00070, and it is located in District 1.

Thomas Songer commented his mother owns the property and has been on the property for 48 years now; they are requesting a change in zoning in order for, he is her son, him to move near her, and that is his brother-in-law, Tony Cook; and that is it in a nutshell.

Commissioner Delaney asked why they decided this route rather than doing a guest house or something like that.

Mr. Songer replied he wants to move there with his wife; they want their own home; they are going to stay there; unfortunately, both he and his mother have cancer, so they want to be close to each other; that is primarily the reason; and he loves his mom and wants to be near her.

Commissioner Delaney mentioned the thing she is struggling within this ask is this area is coveted and the people have fought for this area to stay agricultural; she is nervous if the County keeps chopping these up into tiny lots that it is going to turn into Canaveral Groves; she lives in Canaveral Groves and loves it; but Hog Valley is not Canaveral Groves, and the people out there do not want it to become Canaveral Groves; and she did not know if there is any possibility of working with some other options, because they have so much land to work with.

Mr. Songer explained part of that land is wetlands, and that sort of thing; from what he is reading with the comments, which he read through with several examples, there is very little development; they are only asking for 1.13 acres; and he has seen several examples that are in the comments, so he just has to ask the Board.

Commissioner Delaney stated she is not sure if he is willing to compromise with her; there is another zoning that is possible, it is RRMH-2.5, and that would follow the Mims Small Area Study for the lots out there to be two and one-half acres; and she asked if that is something they are willing to look at.

Mr. Songer noted they have already had the survey done, and all of this being quite expensive, in order to be able to accomplish these things; there is also the time, as it is kind of time sensitive for them; and he has example of where the same things have happened, so he does not see himself as any different than those folks.

Commissioner Delaney explained that she does not necessarily believe that those other homes should have had that opportunity; when she was campaigning, the people who elected her, she ran on keeping that area rural; and the more the land is chopped up, the easier it is for someone else to do it.

Mr. Songer remarked if he moved there then he will vote for Commissioner Delaney.

Commissioner Delaney asked if there are any kind of protections, she does not know if the staff can help her with this, but are there any kind of protection, or any consideration the Board can give to this family due to their circumstances of, if they were to agree with it, waiving fees for surveying, for some of this stuff to get it to the two and one-half acres, or any of that.

Billy Prasad, Interim Planning and Development Director, noted fees are one thing, but the actual requirements for things like surveys are another; he would think the County would need to, at least, meet the basic requirements with the zoning application, that is contained in the Code; he thinks certainly, the Board could choose to waive fees; but he thinks it is different when actually changing the requirements of the underlying application, what is included in that.

Commissioner Delaney asked what kind of time frame the County is looking at with that.

Tad Calkins, Interim Assistant County Manager, replied he thinks it would depend on what the applicant could get back to staff, because part of the challenge would be when staff looks at the zoning, they are looking at a specific, geographic area; that would be changing if they go larger; and that would require, he believes, a re-advertisement and things to follow suit, so it would put staff back into a new cycle of application.

Mr. Songer pointed out there are also boundaries there that preclude anyone from developing anywhere near where he is asking due to the wetland delineation; there is also something else he was looking at on the GIS maps that were in that package, there are a couple of properties already, and the proposed property, is already, looks like to him, half is already designed as

RRMH-1 according to the map, so it would just be the other half of it that he needs to get approved, as half of it already there; and that would be on this map.

Commissioner Delaney advised she has that. She asked for the future, say someone down the street from there wants to do the same thing without some of these circumstances, would she still have the availability to vote no.

Morris Richardson, County Attorney, responded certainly, if they need a land use change, absolutely; with regard to zoning, it gets more difficult when an area starts to take on a certain character to say something is not consistent and compatible; but it is not necessarily the case that just because Commissioner Delaney approves one that she must approve every other.

Chairman Feltner asked if there are any other questions; the Board does not have any other cards; and he does not know if it would be meaningful, if Commissioner Delaney wants to hear from Tony and Lila.

Tony Cook stated he lived on the property right adjacent to the one he is getting ready . . .

Chairman Feltner asked if he is a neighbor.

Mr. Cook replied yes, sir, he lives on that property, too.

Chairman Feltner stated okay, all right; and he asked if that helped Commissioner Delaney.

Mr. Cook stated they have lived out there for about 35 years, so this is only . . .

Chairman Feltner asked Mr. Cook to tell the Board this on the microphone, just for the record, if he does not mind to say that one more time for the Board, and he thinks that would be helpful.

Mr. Cook stated they have lived out there about 35 years on the one acre in the corner; when his mother-in-law and father-in-law bought the property back in 1970s, 1980s, this was their dream to have both of their kids to live on that property; lives change and things happen over time; Thomas moved away; they got the opportunity when his father-in-law died to move out and help his mother-in-law with it; now, they have come along and have the opportunity to have his brother-in-law, his wife's brother, live there with them; they are not going to change the rest of that property; his kids are not going to want to come out there; and like Thomas said, they have the wetland survey, and they cannot do any more than what they have.

Chairman Feltner asked how long Ms. Songer has lived out there.

Lila Songer replied when she bought this property it was listed as two parcels, two five-acre parcels, and she asked for both of them because she wanted the ability to live and see the wildlife that is there, to have privacy, and to have her children be able to come whenever the time came for them to have a place there; all of her grandchildren were raised on that property; one is a doctor, in the Navy, and in the Air Force, so they have gone their way; but they still like to come back to home; and she would like to keep that land where they can enjoy just nature, and keep it all together. She noted she will not develop it.

Chairman Feltner stated he envies Ms. Songer; if he lives well in life, some day he will be able to do the same thing; and he asked if there are any other questions.

Commissioner Delaney asked what it would look like for this property to have another guest house, what would be the options for that, and what would that look like for them.

Ms. Gilliam replied they would need a Conditional Use Permit (CUP), so a new application would come before the Board; however, they do not have the density to have guest house with a kitchen; and the maximum size would be about 700 square feet.

Chairman Feltner stated as part of the prior Board, he was part of this motion before; what is being talked about is Accessory Dwelling Unit (ADU); he asked if they would not be able to split the parcel; and he asked if it would fit under that.

Ms. Gilliam responded it would not fit under the ADU.

Commissioner Delaney mentioned she thought that when she and staff had spoken before, they said that there are two different things, a guest house and an ACU; and she asked if a guest house still cannot have a kitchen.

Ms. Gilliam replied correct because of the density; and they could have the guest house but not the kitchen.

Commissioner Delaney asked what if it was attached to the house but separate, like a mother-in-law suite almost; and could they have their own kitchen and space at that point.

Chairman Feltner stated that is what the Property Appraiser calls a granny flat.

Ms. Gilliam advised as a single-family residential second kitchen facility under Section 62-1947, they would be able to have a kitchen facility, it would have to be integrated architecturally and have both internal and external access.

Commissioner Delaney asked so yes.

Ms. Gilliam replied yes.

Commissioner Delaney stated obviously, they can see that this is an extremely difficult position for her.

Ms. Songer explained she hopes the Board can realize that all of the things Commissioner Delaney may be suggesting would be out of reach to them; she does not work, they both have cancer, her son works still, but they do not know how long he will be able to do that; her property is paid for; they are fine the way they are; and her son just needs a place to live.

Commissioner Altman asked maybe staff can help, as he just wants to recap here, so basically they have about a 1.13 acre flag lot, and the applicant desires to build two structures on this site.

Commissioner Adkinson advised no.

Mr. Prasad replied no, Commissioner, it would be splitting off, so it would only be one on the 1.3 acres, one unit on 1.13 acres.

Commissioner Altman stated just one unit on the 1.3 acres.

Mr. Prasad noted that is the request.

Commissioner Altman asked if it violates any land use planning.

Mr. Prasad replied the request the applicant is making, no, sir; and if the Board were to approve it, it would not be a violation.

Commissioner Delaney pointed out the Future Land Use (FLU) is agricultural, which is one house per five acres, so that is what the dilemma is; and she has a really hard time being the one responsible for continuing to chop up this land.

Commissioner Adkinson stated perhaps she can help Commissioner Delaney with that, as she can make the motion to approve.

There being no further comments or objections, the Board adopted Ordinance No. 25-04, amending Article III, Chapter 62, of The Code of Ordinances of Brevard County, entitled "The 1988 Comprehensive Plan", setting forth the Sixth Small Scale Plan Amendment of 2025, 24S.20 to the Future Land Use Map of the Comprehensive Plan; specifically amending Section 62-501, Part XVI(E), the Future Land Use Appendix; and provisions which require amendment to maintain internal consistency with these amendments; providing legal status; providing a severability clause; and providing an effective date.

**Result:** Adopted

**Mover:** Kim Adkinson

**Second:** Tom Goodson

**Ayes:** Goodson, Adkinson, Feltner, and Altman

**Nay:** Delaney

**H.8. Public Hearing, Re: The Lila Songer Trust (Thomas Songer) Request a Change in Zoning Classification from AU and RRMH-1 to RRMH-1 (24Z00070) (Tax Account 3037863 and a Portion of 2002415)**

Chairman Feltner called for a public hearing to consider a request by The Lila Songer Trust for a change in zoning classification from AU and RRMH-1 to RRMH-1; and he asked staff to read that into the record again just to clarify things.

Trina Gilliam, Planning and Zoning Manager, stated H.8. is The Lila Songer Trust, represented by Thomas Songer, requests a change in zoning classification from AU and RRMH-1 to RRMH-1 under application 24Z00070, located in District 1.

There being no further comments or objections, the Board approved a change in zoning classification from AU and RRMH-1 to RRMH-1, as requested by The Lila Songer Trust.

**Result:** Approved

**Mover:** Kim Adkinson

**Second:** Tom Goodson

**Ayes:** Goodson, Adkinson, Feltner, and Altman

**Nay:** Delaney

**L.7. Reports, Re: Rob Feltner, Commissioner District 4, Chairman**


Chairman Feltner stated Tallahassee is continuing talks with Orlando Health, so the County will continue to wait and see; but there is a lot of community pressure on them; and he asked everyone to just stay tuned.

Upon consensus of the Board, the meeting adjourned at 5:45 p.m.

ATTEST:



  
\_\_\_\_\_  
RACHEL M. SADOFF, CLERK

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
ROB FELTNER, CHAIRMAN  
BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS  
BREVARD COUNTY, FLORIDA

As approved by the Board on May 6, 2025.

**Board Meeting Date**

4-3-25

Item Number: DS

Motion By: #12 TA

Second By: KP

Nay By: \_\_\_\_\_

Commissioner	DISTRICT	AYE	NAY
Commissioner Delaney	1	✓	
Vice Chair Goodson	2	✓	
Commissioner Adkinson	3	✓	
Commissioner Altman	5	✓	
Chairman Feltner	4	✓	