



Agenda Report

2725 Judge Fran Jamieson
Way
Viera, FL 32940

Public Hearing

H.9.

5/7/2026

Subject:

Turtle Mound Ventures, LLC (Kim Rezanka) are requesting a zoning classification change from GML(I) and TR-1 to RVP. (26Z00007) (Tax Account 2316247, 2316452, 2316451, 2315413) (District 2) - **THE APPLICANT HAS REQUESTED THE APPLICATION BE TABLED TO THE JULY 09, 2026, ZONING MEETING.**

Fiscal Impact:

None

Dept/Office:

Planning and Development

Requested Action:

It is requested that the Board of County Commissioners conduct a public hearing to consider a change of zoning classification from GML(I) (Government Managed Lands - Institutional) and TR-1 (Single-Family Mobile Home) to RVP (Recreational Vehicle Park).

Summary Explanation and Background:

The applicant requests a change of zoning classification from GML(I) (Government Managed Lands - Institutional) and TR-1 (Single-family Mobile Home) to RVP (Recreational Vehicle Park) on 28.37 acres.

The eastern portion of the property is located within the Coastal High Hazard Area (CHHA) as defined by Florida Statute 163.3178(2)(h), and as shown on the CHHA Map. The Coastal Management Element of the Comprehensive Plan, Policy 6.1, designates Coastal High Hazard Areas to be those areas below the elevation of the Category 1 storm surge elevation as defined in Chapter 163, Florida Statute. Objective 7 of the Coastal Management Element aims to limit densities within the coastal high hazard area and direct development outside of this area. The eastern portion of the property is also located in FEMA Special Flood Hazard Area AE. Furthermore, the property is subject to other environmental constraints, such as hydric soils, and potential wetlands, which may limit development potential.

Additionally, the parcel is located on North Merritt Island (NMI), north of Hall Road. Section 62-3724(4) contains additional criteria including compensatory storage and written certification from the engineer of record that there will be no adverse flooding impacts upon properties resulting from the proposed development. The applicant is encouraged to contact NRM prior to any plan or permit submittal or prior to performing any land clearing activities.

The Board should consider the proposed point of ingress and egress in relation to the character of the surrounding area, as access from a local residential roadway may introduce compatibility concerns, whereas access from a higher-capacity arterial roadway may better accommodate the anticipated traffic and intensity

of the proposed use.

The subject property is comprised of four parcels which were combined under one deed on August 28, 2025, as recorded in ORB 10420, PG 1398. The property has access to south side of McGruder Road, at the intersection with North Tropical Trail, both county-maintained roads, and on the north side of North Courtenay Parkway.

TR-1 was established as the zoning classification on the northern parcel (Tax ID 2315413) through Resolution Z-3725 on August 8, 1974. The original zoning for this property upon adoption of the Brevard County Zoning Regulations on May 22, 1958, was TR-3.

The next parcel (Tax ID 2316451) was established as GML(I) through Resolution Z-1021b on March 9, 1999. The original zoning for this property upon adoption of the Brevard County Zoning Regulations on May 22, 1958, was AU.

The remaining parcels (Tax ID 2316452 and 2316247) were established as GML(I) through Resolution Z-10198e on January 28, 1999. The original zoning for these properties upon adoption of the Brevard County Zoning Regulations on May 22, 1958, was AU.

If rezoned to RVP, the subject property will exceed required minimum lot size of five (5) acres for that zoning classification.

Northwest of the subject property, across McGruder Road, are nineteen (19) properties, seventeen (17) of which are developed with single-family residences or mobile homes, and two (2) remain vacant. The largest of these lots is 0.92 acres. Eight (8) of these properties have RES 1 FLU designations and TR-1 zoning. The remaining eleven (11) properties have RES2_DIR FLU designations and a mix of GU, TR-1, and TR-2 zoning. South of the subject property, across North Tropical Trail, is a 0.8-acre property owned by Merritt Island Volunteer Fire Department, Inc. and a 0.39-acre property owned by Brevard County with PUB FLU designations and GML and GML (I) zoning. Next to that are a 0.22-acre property with AT&T utility equipment and a vacant 2.05-acre property with CC FLU designations and BU-1 zoning. Across North Courtenay Parkway are five (5) properties with RES 1 FLU designations. The first is a 1.35-acre church property with IN(L) zoning, next to a vacant 1.15-acre, RR-1 zoned property. The next three (3) properties are 6.91 acres, 2.25 acres, and 14.17 acres all zoned AU with residential and/or agricultural uses. To the east there are two (2) properties with RES 1 FLU designations. The first is a vacant, 0.71-acre property with SR zoning, and the second is an 11.99-acre, IN(L) zoned property developed with a church.

Please note that an addendum to the staff comments has been attached to this item. This addendum addresses the application of Policy 2.10 of the Future Land Use Element of the Brevard County Comprehensive Plan to this proposal, and the limitations on density this will have, particularly in relation to that portion of the development within the Coastal High Hazard Area (CHHA).

The Board should consider whether the proposed zoning request is consistent and compatible with the surrounding area including, but not limited to, the proposed points of ingress and egress.

The Board should also consider whether the request is consistent with the policies and objectives of the Brevard County Comprehensive Plan, particularly Objective 7 of the Coastal Management Element,

Administrative Policy 3, Administrative Policy 4, Administrative Policy 7, Policy 2.6, and Policy 2.10 of the Future Land Use Element.

On April 09, 2026, the North Merritt Island Dependent Special District Board heard the request and unanimously recommended denial.

On April 20, 2026, the Planning and Zoning Board heard the request and voted 10:1 to recommend denial.

Clerk to the Board Instructions:

Upon receipt of resolution, please execute and return a copy to Planning and Development.

ADMINISTRATIVE POLICIES OF THE FUTURE LAND USE ELEMENT

Administrative Policies in the Future Land Use Element establish the expertise of staff with regard to zoning land use issues and set forth criteria when considering a rezoning action or request for Conditional Use Permit, as follows:

Administrative Policy 1

The Brevard County zoning official, planners and the Director of the Planning and Development, however designated, are recognized as expert witnesses for the purposes of Comprehensive Plan amendments as well as zoning, conditional use, special exception, and variance applications.

Administrative Policy 2

Upon Board request, members of the Brevard County planning and zoning staff shall be required to present written analysis and a recommendation, which shall constitute an expert opinion, on all applications for zoning, conditional uses, comprehensive plan amendments, vested rights, or other applications for development approval that come before the Board of County Commissioners for quasi-judicial review and action. The Board may table an item if additional time is required to obtain the analysis requested or to hire an expert witness if the Board deems such action appropriate. Staff input may include the following:

Criteria:

- A. Staff shall analyze an application for consistency or compliance with comprehensive plan policies, zoning approval criteria and other applicable written standards.
- B. Staff shall conduct site visits of property which are the subject of analysis and recommendation. As part of the site visit, the staff shall take a videotape or photographs where helpful to the analysis and conduct an inventory of surrounding existing uses. Aerial photographs shall also be used where they would aid in an understanding of the issues of the case.
- C. In cases where staff analysis is required, both the applicant and the staff shall present proposed findings of fact for consideration by the Board.
- D. For development applications where a specific use has not been proposed, the worst case adverse impacts of potential uses available under the applicable land use classification shall be evaluated by the staff.

Administrative Policy 3

Compatibility with existing or proposed land uses shall be a factor in determining where a rezoning or any application involving a specific proposed use is being considered. Compatibility shall be evaluated by considering the following factors, at a minimum:

Criteria:

- A. Whether the proposed use(s) would have hours of operation, lighting, odor, noise levels, traffic, or site activity that would significantly diminish the enjoyment of, safety or quality of life in existing neighborhoods within the area which could foreseeably be affected by the proposed use.

- B. Whether the proposed use(s) would cause a material reduction (five percent or more) in the value of existing abutting lands or approved development.
- C. Whether the proposed use(s) is/are consistent with an emerging or existing pattern of surrounding development as determined through analysis of:
 - 1. historical land use patterns;
 - 2. actual development over the immediately preceding three years; and
 - 3. development approved within the past three years but not yet constructed.
- D. Whether the proposed use(s) would result in a material violation of relevant policies in any elements of the Comprehensive Plan.

Administrative Policy 4

Character of a neighborhood or area shall be a factor for consideration whenever a rezoning or any application involving a specific proposed use is reviewed. The character of the area must not be materially or adversely affected by the proposed rezoning or land use application. In evaluating the character of an area, the following factors shall be considered:

Criteria:

- A. The proposed use must not materially and adversely impact an established residential neighborhood by introducing types of intensity of traffic (including but not limited to volume, time of day of traffic activity, type of vehicles, et cetera), parking, trip generation, commercial activity or industrial activity that is not already present within the identified boundaries of the neighborhood.
- B. In determining whether an established residential neighborhood exists, the following factors must be present:
 - 1. The area must have clearly established boundaries, such as roads, open spaces, rivers, lakes, lagoons, or similar features.
 - 2. Sporadic or occasional neighborhood commercial uses shall not preclude the existence of an existing residential neighborhood, particularly if the commercial use is non-conforming or pre-dates the surrounding residential use.
 - 3. An area shall be presumed not to be primarily residential but shall be deemed transitional where multiple commercial, industrial or other non-residential uses have been applied for and approved during the previous five (5) years.

Administrative Policy 5

In addition to the factors specified in Administrative Policies 2, 3, and 4, in reviewing a rezoning, conditional use permit or other application for development approval, the impact of the proposed use or uses on transportation facilities either serving the site or impacted by the

use(s) shall be considered. In evaluating whether substantial and adverse transportation impacts are likely to result if an application is approved, the staff shall consider the following:

Criteria:

- A. Whether adopted levels of services will be compromised;
- B. Whether the physical quality of the existing road system that will serve the proposed use(s) is sufficient to support the use(s) without significant deterioration;
- C. Whether the surrounding existing road system is of sufficient width and construction quality to serve the proposed use(s) without the need for substantial public improvements;
- D. Whether the surrounding existing road system is of such width and construction quality that the proposed use(s) would realistically pose a potential for material danger to public safety in the surrounding area;
- E. Whether the proposed use(s) would be likely to result in such a material and adverse change in traffic capacity of a road or roads in the surrounding area such that either design capacities would be significantly exceeded or a de facto change in functional classification would result;
- F. Whether the proposed use(s) would cause such material and adverse changes in the types of traffic that would be generated on the surrounding road system, that physical deterioration of the surrounding road system would be likely;
- G. Whether projected traffic impacts of the proposed use(s) would materially and adversely impact the safety or welfare of residents in existing residential neighborhoods.

Administrative Policy 6

The use(s) proposed under the rezoning, conditional use or other application for development approval must be consistent with, (a), all written land development policies set forth in these administrative policies; and (b), the future land use element, coastal management element, conservation element, potable water element, sanitary sewer element, solid waste management element, capital improvements element, recreation and open space element, surface water element, and transportation elements of the comprehensive plan.

Administrative Policy 7

Proposed use(s) shall not cause or substantially aggravate any, (a), substantial drainage problem on surrounding properties; or (b), significant, adverse and unmitigatable impact on significant natural wetlands, water bodies or habitat for listed species.

Administrative Policy 8

These policies, the staff analysis based upon these policies, and the applicant's written analysis, if any, shall be incorporated into the record of every quasi-judicial review application for development approval presented to the Board including rezoning, conditional use permits, and vested rights determinations.

Section 62-1151(c) of the Code of Ordinances of Brevard County directs, "The planning and zoning board shall recommend to the board of county commissioners the denial or approval of each application for amendment to the official zoning maps based upon a consideration of the following factors:

- (1) The character of the land use of the property surrounding the property being considered.
- (2) The change in conditions of the land use of the property being considered and the surrounding property since the establishment of the current applicable zoning classification, special use or conditional use.
- (3) The impact of the proposed zoning classification or conditional use on available and projected traffic patterns, water and sewer systems, other public facilities and utilities and the established character of the surrounding property.
- (4) The compatibility of the proposed zoning classification or conditional use with existing land use plans for the affected area.
- (5) The appropriateness of the proposed zoning classification or conditional use based upon a consideration of the applicable provisions and conditions contained in this article and other applicable laws, ordinances and regulations relating to zoning and land use regulations and based upon a consideration of the public health, safety and welfare.

The minutes of the planning and zoning board shall specify the reasons for the recommendation of approval or denial of each application."

CONDITIONAL USE PERMITS (CUPs)

In addition to the specific requirements for each Conditional Use Permit (CUP), Section 62-1901 provides that the following approval procedure and general standards of review are to be applied to all CUP requests, as applicable.

- (b) Approval procedure. An application for a specific conditional use within the applicable zoning classification shall be submitted and considered in the same manner and according to the same procedure as an amendment to the official zoning map as specified in Section 62-1151. The approval of a conditional use shall authorize an additional use for the affected parcel of real property in addition to those permitted in the applicable zoning classification. The initial burden is on the applicant to demonstrate that all applicable standards and criteria are met. Applications which do not satisfy this burden cannot be approved. If the applicant meets its initial burden, then the Board has the burden to show, by substantial and competent evidence, that the applicant has failed to meet such standards and the request is adverse to the public interest. As part of the approval of the conditional use permit, the Board may prescribe appropriate and reasonable conditions and safeguards to reduce the impact of the proposed use on adjacent and nearby properties or the neighborhood. A nearby property, for the purpose of this section, is defined as any property which, because of the character of the proposed use, lies within the area which may be substantially and adversely impacted by such use. In stating grounds in

support of an application for a conditional use permit, it is necessary to show how the request fulfills both the general and specific standards for review. The applicant must show the effect the granting of the conditional use permit will have on adjacent and nearby properties, including, but not limited to traffic and pedestrian flow and safety, curb-cuts, off-street loading and parking, off-street pickup of passengers, odors, glare and noise, particulates, smoke, fumes, and other emissions, refuse and service areas, drainage, screening and buffering for protection of adjacent and nearby properties, and open space and economic impact on nearby properties. The applicant, at his discretion, may choose to present expert testimony where necessary to show the effect of granting the conditional use permit.

(c) General Standards of Review.

- (1) The planning and zoning board and the board of county commissioners shall base the denial or approval of each application for a conditional use based upon a consideration of the factors specified in Section 62-1151(c) plus a determination whether an application meets the intent of this section.
 - a. The proposed conditional use will not result in a substantial and adverse impact on adjacent and nearby properties due to: (1), the number of persons anticipated to be using, residing or working under the conditional use; (2), noise, odor, particulates, smoke, fumes and other emissions, or other nuisance activities generated by the conditional use; or (3), the increase of traffic within the vicinity caused by the proposed conditional use.
 - b. The proposed use will be compatible with the character of adjacent and nearby properties with regard to use, function, operation, hours of operation, type and amount of traffic generated, building size and setback, and parking availability.
 - c. The proposed use will not cause a substantial diminution in value of abutting residential property. A substantial diminution shall be irrebuttably presumed to have occurred if abutting property suffers a 15% reduction in value as a result of the proposed conditional use. A reduction of 10% of the value of abutting property shall create a rebuttable presumption that a substantial diminution has occurred. The Board of County Commissioners carries the burden to show, as evidenced by either testimony from or an appraisal conducted by an M A I certified appraiser, that a substantial diminution in value would occur. The applicant may rebut the findings with his own expert witnesses.
- (2) The following specific standards shall be considered, when applicable, in making a determination that the general standards specified in subsection (1) of this section are satisfied:

- a. Ingress and egress to the property and proposed structures thereon, with particular reference to automotive and pedestrian safety and convenience, traffic flow and control, and access in case of fire and catastrophe, shall be: (1), adequate to serve the proposed use without burdening adjacent and nearby uses, and (2), built to applicable county standards, if any. Burdening adjacent and nearby uses means increasing existing traffic on the closest collector or arterial road by more than 20%, or 10% if the new traffic is primarily comprised of heavy vehicles, except where the affected road is at Level of Service A or B. New traffic generated by the proposed use shall not cause the adopted level of service for transportation on applicable roadways, as determined by applicable Brevard County standards, to be exceeded. Where the design of a public road to be used by the proposed use is physically inadequate to handle the numbers, types or weights of vehicles expected to be generated by the proposed use without damage to the road, the conditional use permit cannot be approved without a commitment to improve the road to a standard adequate to handle the proposed traffic, or to maintain the road through a maintenance bond or other means as required by the Board of County Commissioners.
- b. The noise, glare, odor, particulates, smoke, fumes or other emissions from the conditional use shall not substantially interfere with the use or enjoyment of the adjacent and nearby property.
- c. Noise levels for a conditional use are governed by Section 62-2271.
- d. The proposed conditional use shall not cause the adopted level of service for solid waste disposal applicable to the property or area covered by such level of service, to be exceeded.
- e. The proposed conditional use shall not cause the adopted level of service for potable water or wastewater applicable to the property or the area covered by such level of service, to be exceeded by the proposed use.
- f. The proposed conditional use must have existing or proposed screening or buffering, with reference to type, dimensions and character to eliminate or reduce substantial, adverse nuisance, sight, or noise impacts on adjacent and nearby properties containing less intensive uses.
- g. Proposed signs and exterior lighting shall not cause unreasonable glare or hazard to traffic safety, or interference with the use or enjoyment of adjacent and nearby properties.
- h. Hours of operation of the proposed use shall be consistent with the use and enjoyment of the properties in the surrounding residential community, if any. For commercial and industrial uses adjacent to or near residential uses, the hours of operation shall not adversely affect the use and enjoyment of the residential character of the area.
- i. The height of the proposed use shall be compatible with the character of the area, and the maximum height of any habitable structure shall be not more than 35 feet higher than the highest residence within 1,000 feet of the property line.

- j. Off-street parking and loading areas, where required, shall not be created or maintained in a manner which adversely impacts or impairs the use and enjoyment of adjacent and nearby properties. For existing structures, the applicant shall provide competent, substantial evidence to demonstrate that actual or anticipated parking shall not be greater than that which is approved as part of the site plan under applicable county standards.

FACTORS TO CONSIDER FOR A REZONING REQUEST

Section 62-1151(c) sets forth factors to consider in connection with a rezoning request, as follows:

"The planning and zoning board shall recommend to the board of county commissioners the denial or approval of each application for amendment to the official zoning maps based upon a consideration of the following factors:

- (1) The character of the land use of the property surrounding the property being considered.
- (2) The change in conditions of the land use of the property being considered and the surrounding property since the establishment of the current applicable zoning classification, special use or conditional use.
- (3) The impact of the proposed zoning classification or conditional use on available and projected traffic patterns, water and sewer systems, other public facilities and utilities and the established character of the surrounding property.
- (4) The compatibility of the proposed zoning classification or conditional use with existing land use plans for the affected area.
- (5) The appropriateness of the proposed zoning classification or conditional use based upon a consideration of the applicable provisions and conditions contained in this article and other applicable laws, ordinances and regulations relating to zoning and land use regulations and based upon a consideration of the public health, safety and welfare."

These staff comments contain references to zoning classifications found in the Brevard County Zoning Regulations, Chapter 62, Article VI, Code of Ordinances of Brevard County. These references include brief summaries of some of the characteristics of that zoning classification. Reference to each zoning classification shall be deemed to incorporate the full text of the section or sections defining and regulating that classification into the Zoning file and Public Record for that item.

These staff comments contain references to sections of the Code of Ordinances of Brevard County. Reference to each code section shall be deemed to incorporate this section into the Zoning file and Public Record for that item.

These staff comments contain references to Policies of the Brevard County Comprehensive Plan. Reference to each Policy shall be deemed to incorporate the entire Policy into the Zoning file and Public Record for that item.

These staff comments refer to previous zoning actions which are part of the Public Records of Brevard County, Florida. These records will be referred to by reference to the file number. Reference to zoning files are intended to make the entire contents of the cited file a part of the Zoning file and Public Record for that item.

DEFINITIONS OF CONCURRENCY TERMS

Maximum Acceptable Volume (MAV): Maximum acceptable daily volume that a roadway can carry at the adopted Level of Service (LOS).

Current Volume: Building permit related trips added to the latest TPO (Transportation Planning Organization) traffic counts.

Volume with Development (VOL W/DEV): Equals Current Volume plus trip generation projected for the proposed development.

Volume/Maximum Acceptable Volume (VOL/MAV): Equals the ratio of current traffic volume to the maximum acceptable roadway volume.

Volume/Maximum Acceptable Volume with Development (VOL/MAV W/DEV): Ratio of volume with development to the Maximum Acceptable Volume.

Acceptable Level of Service (CURRENT LOS): The Level of Service at which a roadway is currently operating.

Level of Service with Development (LOS W/DEV): The Level of Service that a proposed development may generate on a roadway.



BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS

Planning and Development Department

2725 Judge Fran Jamieson Way
Building A, Room 114
Viera, Florida 32940
(321)633-2070 Phone / (321)633-2074 Fax
<https://www.brevardfl.gov/PlanningDev>

STAFF COMMENTS

26Z00007

Turtle Mound Ventures LLC (Kimberly Rezanka)

GML(I) (Government Managed Lands - Institutional) and TR-1 (Single-family Mobile Home) to RVP (Recreational Vehicle Park)

Tax Account Number: 2316247, 2316452, 2316451, and 2315413
Parcel I.D.: 23-36-22-00-12, 23-36-23-00-253, 23-36-23-00-252, and 23-36-14-00-511
Location: 6455 North Tropical Trail, at the intersection with, and south of McGruder Road (District 2)
Acreage: 28.37 acres

North Merritt Island Board: 04/09/2026
Planning and Zoning Board: 04/20/2026
Board of County Commissioners: 05/07/2026

Consistency with Land Use Regulations

- Current zoning can be considered under the Future Land Use Designation, Section 62-1255.
- The proposal can be considered under the Future Land Use Designation, Section 62-1255.
- The proposal would maintain acceptable Levels of Service (LOS) (XIII 1.6.C)

	CURRENT	PROPOSED
Zoning	GML(I) and TR-1	RVP**
Potential*	0	283 lots
Can be Considered under the Future Land Use Map	Yes PUB and RES 1 No RES 2-DIR	Yes CC

* Zoning potential for concurrency analysis purposes only, subject to applicable land development regulations. Application of these regulations may reduce development potential.

** Approval is pending approval of a companion request 26SS00001, which proposes to amend the Future Land Use designation from PUB, RES 1, and RES 2-DIR to all CC.

Background and Purpose of Request

The applicant requests a change of zoning classification from GML(I) (Government Managed Lands - Institutional) and TR-1 (Single-family Mobile Home) to RVP (Recreational Vehicle Park) on 28.37 acres to allow for the development of a recreational vehicle park at 10 spaces or lots per acre.

The eastern portion of the property is located within the Coastal High Hazard Area (CHHA) as defined by Florida Statute 163.3178(2)(h), and as shown on the CHHA Map. The Coastal Management Element of the Comprehensive Plan, Policy 6.1, designates Coastal High Hazard Areas to be those areas below the elevation of the Category 1 storm surge elevation as defined in Chapter 163, Florida Statute. Objective 7 of the Coastal Management Element aims to limit densities within the coastal high hazard area and direct development outside of this area. The eastern portion of the property is also located in FEMA Special Flood Hazard Area AE. Furthermore, the property is subject to other environmental constraints, such as hydric soils, and potential wetlands, which may limit development potential.

Additionally, the parcel is located on North Merritt Island (NMI), north of Hall Road. Section 62-3724(4) contains additional criteria including compensatory storage and written certification from the engineer of record that there will be no adverse flooding impacts upon properties resulting from the proposed development. The applicant is encouraged to contact NRM prior to any plan or permit submittal or prior to performing any land clearing activities.

The Board should consider the proposed point of ingress and egress in relation to the character of the surrounding area, as access from a local residential roadway may introduce compatibility concerns, whereas access from a higher-capacity arterial roadway may better accommodate the anticipated traffic and intensity of the proposed use.

The subject property is comprised of four parcels which were combined under one deed on August 28, 2025, as recorded in ORB 10420, PG 1398. The property has access to south side of McGruder Road, at the intersection with North Tropical Trail, both county-maintained roads, and on the north side of North Courtenay Parkway.

TR-1 was established as the zoning classification on the northern parcel (Tax ID 2315413) through Resolution Z-3725 on August 8, 1974. The original zoning for this property upon adoption of the Brevard County Zoning Regulations on May 22, 1958, was TR-3.

The next parcel (Tax ID 2316451) was established as GML(I) through Resolution Z-1021b on March 9, 1999. The original zoning for this property upon adoption of the Brevard County Zoning Regulations on May 22, 1958, was AU.

The remaining parcels (Tax ID 2316452 and 2316247) were established as GML(I) through Resolution Z-10198e on January 28, 1999. The original zoning for these properties upon adoption of the Brevard County Zoning Regulations on May 22, 1958, was AU.

RVP recreational vehicle park zoning classification encompasses lands devoted for recreation vehicle, tent, park trailer and cabin uses together with such ancillary structures as allowed to promote a recreational type atmosphere for both park owners and/or their guests. Minimum

park size shall be five acres. Recreational vehicle sites shall have a minimum area of 2,000 square feet, and shall have a minimum width of 30 feet and minimum depth of 60 feet.

The subject property is within the septic moratorium area. Any proposed development requiring a septic permit could be affected by this moratorium. For further information regarding the septic moratorium, the property owner would need to reach out to the Department of Environmental Health, which issues septic permits.

There are no current code enforcement complaints on the property.

Surrounding Area

	Existing Land Use	Zoning	Future Land Use
North	Road ROW, Single-Family Residences, and Vacant	GU, TR-1, TR-2, and GML(I)	RES 1 and RES2_DIR
South	Road ROW, Vacant, Single-Family Residences. Agricultural and a Church	GML, BU-1, IN(L), RR-1 and AU	PUB, CC, and RES 1
East	Single-Family Residences and a Church	SR and IN(L)	RES 1
West	Road ROW, Single-Family Residences, and Vacant	GU, TR-1, TR-2, and GML(I)	RES 1 and RES2_DIR

Northwest of the subject property, across McGruder Road, are nineteen (19) properties, seventeen (17) of which are developed with single-family residences or mobile homes, and two (2) remain vacant. The largest of these lots is 0.92 acres. Eight (8) of these properties have RES 1 FLU designations and TR-1 zoning. The remaining eleven (11) properties have RES2_DIR FLU designations and a mix of GU, TR-1, and TR-2 zoning.

South of the subject property, across North Tropical Trail, is a 0.8-acre property owned by Merritt Island Volunteer Fire Department, Inc. and a 0.39-acre property owned by Brevard County with PUB FLU designations and GML and GML (I) zoning. Next to that are a 0.22-acre property with AT&T utility equipment and a vacant 2.05-acre property with CC FLU designations and BU-1 zoning. Across North Courtenay Parkway are five (5) properties with RES 1 FLU designations. The first is a 1.35-acre church property with IN(L) zoning, next to a vacant 1.15-acre, RR-1 zoned property. The next three (3) properties are 6.91 acres, 2.25 acres, and 14.17 acres all zoned AU with residential and/or agricultural uses.

To the east there are two (2) properties with RES 1 FLU designations. The first is a vacant, 0.71-acre property with SR zoning, and the second is an 11.99-acre, IN(L) zoned property developed with a church.

GU classification is a holding category, that encompasses rural single-family residential development or unimproved lands for which there is no definite current proposal for development or land in areas lacking specific development trends on five acre lots with a minimum width and depth of 300 feet. The minimum house size in GU is 750 square feet.

TR-1 is a single family residential mobile home zoning classification which permits mobile homes or residences of standard construction on lots of 7,500 square feet (minimum) with lot width of 65 feet and lot depth of 100 feet.

TR-2 is a single family residential mobile home zoning classification which permits mobile homes or residences of standard construction on one-half acre lots.

The GML zoning classification encompasses government managed lands to recognize the presence of lands and facilities which are managed by federal, state and local government, special districts, nongovernmental organizations (NGOs) providing economic, environmental and/or quality of life benefits to the county, electric, natural gas, water and wastewater utilities that are either publicly owned or regulated by the Public Service Commission, and related entities. GML(I) zoning classification permits office and institutional uses.

BU-1 classification allows retail commercial land uses on minimum 7,500 square foot lots. The BU-1 classification does not permit warehousing or wholesaling.

IN(L) is an Institutional (Light) zoning classification, intended to promote low impact private, nonprofit, or religious institutional uses to service the needs of the public for facilities of an educational religious, health or cultural nature.

RR-1 classification encompasses lands devoted to single-family residential development of spacious character, together with such accessory uses as may be necessary or are normally compatible with residential surroundings on a minimum one-acre lot, with a minimum lot width and depth of 125 feet. The RR-1 classification permits horses, barns and horticulture as accessory uses to a single-family residence. The minimum house size is 1,200 square feet. Keeping of horses and agricultural uses are accessory to a principle residence within the RR-1 zoning district.

AU zoning classification encompasses lands devoted to agricultural pursuits and single-family residential development of spacious character on 2.5-acre lots, with a minimum lot width and depth of 150 feet. The minimum house size in AU is 750 square feet. The AU classification also permits the raising/grazing of animals, fowl, beekeeping, plant nurseries, and the packing and processing of commodities raised on site. Conditional uses in AU include hog farms, zoological parks, and land alteration.

SR classification encompasses lands devoted to single-family residential development of relatively spacious character, together with such accessory uses as may be necessary or are

normally compatible with residential surroundings on minimum half acre lots, with a minimum width of 100 feet and a depth of 150 feet. The minimum house size in SR is 1,300 square feet.

Future Land Use

The subject property's GML(I) zoning classification can be considered consistent with the PUB Future Land Use designation, but not with the RES 2-DIR (Residential 2-Directive) Future Land Use designation provided on the FLUM series contained within Chapter XI – Future Land Use Element of Brevard County's Comprehensive Plan. The subject property's TR-1 zoning classification can be considered consistent with the RES 1 FLU designation.

The proposed RVP zoning classification can be considered consistent with the proposed CC FLU designation.

Applicable Land Use Policies

The Board should evaluate the compatibility of this application within the context of Administrative Policies 2 – 8 of the Future Land Use Element.

Analysis of Administrative Policy #3 - Compatibility between this site and the existing or proposed land uses in the area.

Compatibility shall be evaluated by considering the following factors, at a minimum:

Criteria:

- A. Whether the proposed use(s) would have hours of operation, lighting, odor, noise levels, traffic, or site activity that would significantly diminish the enjoyment of, safety or quality of life in existing neighborhoods within the area which could foreseeably be affected by the proposed use;

The proposed RV park could be considered a higher-intensity residential use compared to the prevailing development pattern in the area. Although the presence of non-residential and corridor-oriented uses suggests the area is not strictly homogeneous, those uses (e.g., church, fire station, utilities) are generally lower intensity in terms of daily operational impacts compared to an RV park. However, its compatibility may be influenced by factors such as location relative to major roadways, buffering, site design, and scale. Any proposed commercial use will be subject to compliance with all performance standards in Sections 62-2251 through 62-2272 during site plan review.

The Board should consider the proposed point(s) of ingress and egress for the recreational vehicle park in evaluating compatibility with the surrounding area. McGruder Road is a two-lane local roadway that primarily serves adjacent residential properties, whereas North Courtenay Parkway functions as a higher-capacity arterial corridor. Directing access to North Courtenay Parkway, rather

than McGruder Road, may be more appropriate given the anticipated traffic generation and operational characteristics of an RV park, and would minimize potential impacts to the established residential character served by the local road network.

Traffic from the proposed development will increase the percentage of MAV utilization by 0.75%. The corridor is anticipated to operate at 47.67% of capacity daily. Specific concurrency issues will be addressed at the time of site plan review.

- B. Whether the proposed use(s) would cause a material reduction (five percent or more) in the value of existing abutting lands or approved development.

Only a certified MAI (Member Appraisal Institute) appraisal can determine if material reduction has or will occur due to the proposed request.

- C. Whether the proposed use(s) is/are consistent with an emerging or existing pattern of surrounding development as determined through an analysis of:

1. historical land use patterns;

There are seven (7) FLU designations within a 0.5-mile radius of the subject property: Residential 1:2.5 (RES 1:2.5), Residential 1 (RES 1), Residential 2 (RES 2), Residential 2-Directive (Res 2-DIR), Community Commercial (CC), Neighborhood Commercial (NC), and Public Conservation (PUB-CON). The predominant FLU designation in the area is RES 1. The predominant commercial FLU in the area is CC. There have been no FLU amendments within 0.5 miles of the subject property in the past three years.

The proposed use would be located in a transitional area with residential uses zoned TR-1, TR-2 and GU to the north. East is a church in IN(L) zoning. To the south is an agricultural area with AU and RR-1, and also commercial development with BU-1, BU-2, and IN(L) zoning along the North Courtenay Parkway corridor.

The area includes a mix of small-lot single-family residences and mobile homes, as well as larger residential and agricultural parcels, reflecting varying residential densities. Institutional uses, such as places of worship and public facilities, along with utility infrastructure and commercially designated properties, are present along nearby corridors, contributing to a more diverse land use pattern. Overall, the area does not exhibit a uniform character but instead reflects a blend of residential, institutional, and limited non-residential uses influenced by its proximity to major roadways.

2. actual development over the immediately preceding three years; and

Development within the preceding three years includes:

- **A permit for a new single-family residence was approved in 2024 on a 26.84 acre property, 0.77 miles south of the subject property in AU zoning.**
- **25Z00033: In December 2025, a conditional use permit for a private heliport was approved for a 26.84 acre property, 0.77 miles south of the subject property.**
- **25Z00057: A conditional use permit was approved on 37.5 acres for the expansion of land excavation activities at an existing mining site 1.14 miles northeast of the subject property in 2026.**

3. development approved within the past three years but not yet constructed.

In 2024, a site plan for a Dollar General was approved at the corner of North Tropical Trail and North Courtenay Parkway. The site has CC FLU and BU-1 zoning. It appears that construction began, but the subsequent building permits have now expired.

D. Whether the proposed use(s) would result in a material violation of relevant policies in any elements of the Comprehensive Plan.

Only a certified MAI (Member Appraisal Institute) appraisal can determine if material reduction has or will occur due to the proposed request.

Analysis of Administrative Policy #4 - Character of a neighborhood or area.

Character of a neighborhood or area shall be a factor for consideration whenever a rezoning or any application involving a specific proposed use is reviewed. The character of the area must not be materially or adversely affected by the proposed rezoning or land use application. In evaluating the character of an area, the following factors shall be considered:

Criteria:

- A. The proposed use must not materially and adversely impact an established residential neighborhood by introducing types or intensity of traffic, parking, trip generation, commercial activity or industrial activity that is not already present within the identified boundaries of the neighborhood.

The character of the surrounding area reflects a transitional pattern consisting of predominantly low-density residential development interspersed with institutional, utility, and limited commercial uses. The proposed use will introduce commercial activity not already present within the immediate area. However, a preliminary concurrency evaluation did not indicate that the proposal has the potential to cause a deficiency in the transportation adopted level of service.

B. In determining whether an established residential neighborhood exists, the following factors must be present:

1. The area must have clearly established boundaries, such as roads, open spaces, rivers, lakes, lagoons, or similar features.

The area has clearly established boundaries including roads and open spaces.

2. Sporadic or occasional neighborhood commercial uses shall not preclude the existence of an existing residential neighborhood, particularly if the commercial use is non-conforming or pre-dates the surrounding residential use.

Sporadic neighborhood commercial uses are present in the area along North Courtenay Parkway.

3. An area shall be presumed not to be primarily residential but shall be deemed transitional where multiple commercial, industrial or other non-residential uses have been applied for and approved during the previous five (5) years.

The area is transitional. Within the previous five years, there have been three (3) commercial, industrial, or non-residential uses applied for and approved during the previous five (5) years:

- **21Z00009: Rezoning from BU-1 to BU-2 with a Binding Development Plan (BDP) on 1.02 acres. 0.71 miles south of the subject property.**
- **25Z00033: Conditional use permit on 26.84 acres for a private heliport was approved in AU zoning, 0.77 miles south of the subject property.**
- **25Z00057: Conditional use permit on 37.5 acres for the expansion of land excavation activities at an existing mining site in Planned Industrial Park (PIP) zoning, 1.14 miles northeast of the subject property.**

FLUE Administrative Policy 7

Proposed use(s) shall not cause or substantially aggravate any (a) substantial drainage problem on surrounding properties; or (b) significant, adverse and unmitigable impact on significant natural wetlands, water bodies or habitat for listed species.

Approximately 2/3 of this property is located within the Coastal High Hazard Area (CHHA) as defined by Florida Statute 163.3178(2)(h), and as shown on the CHHA Map. The Coastal Management Element of the Comprehensive Plan, Policy 6.1, designates Coastal High Hazard Areas to be those areas below the elevation of the Category 1 storm surge elevation as defined in Chapter 163, Florida Statute. Objective 7 of the Coastal Management Element aims to limit densities within the coastal high hazard area and direct development outside of this area.

A portion of the subject parcel contains mapped hydric which are indicators that wetlands may be present on the property. A wetland assessment/delineation will be required prior to any land clearing activities, site plan design, or building permit submittal. The wetland assessment/delineation shall be verified at time of site plan submittal.

This property is located within an area mapped as FEMA Special Flood Hazard Area (SFHA) AE, as identified by the Federal Emergency Management Agency, and as shown on the FEMA Flood Map. The parcel is subject to the development criteria in Conservation Element Objective 4, its subsequent policies, and the Floodplain Ordinance, including compensatory storage. Chapter 62, Article X, Division 6 states, "No site alteration shall adversely affect the existing surface water flow pattern." Chapter 62, Article X, Division 5, Section 62-3723 (2) states, "Development within floodplain areas shall not have adverse impacts upon adjoining properties."

Federally and/or state protected species may be present on the property. A portion of the property is located within a large area of mapped Florida Scrub Jay habitat / occupancy.

Additionally, the parcel is located on North Merritt Island (NMI), north of Hall Road. Section 62-3724(4) contains additional criteria including compensatory storage and written certification from the engineer of record that there will be no adverse flooding impacts upon properties resulting from the proposed development. The applicant is encouraged to contact NRM prior to any plan or permit submittal or prior to performing any land clearing activities.

Please refer to all comments provided by the Natural Resource Management Department at the end of this report.

Preliminary Concurrency

The closest concurrency management segment to the subject property is North Courtenay Parkway, between Hall Road and North Tropical Trail, which has a Maximum Acceptable Volume (MAV) of 39,170 trips per day, a Level of Service (LOS) of D, and currently operates at 46.92% of capacity daily. The proposed rezoning increases the percentage of MAV utilization by 0.75%. The corridor is anticipated to operate at 47.67% of capacity daily.

The concurrency management segment for North Tropical Trail, between Crisafulli Road and North Courtenay Parkway was also analyzed. This segment has a Maximum Acceptable Volume (MAV) of 22,400 trips per day, a Level of Service (LOS) of E, and currently operates at 8.17% of capacity daily. The proposed rezoning increases the percentage of MAV utilization by 1.31%. The corridor is anticipated to operate at 9.48% of capacity daily.

The maximum development potential of the proposal is not anticipated to create a deficiency in LOS. Specific concurrency issues will be addressed at the time of site plan review. This is

only a preliminary review and is subject to change. The concurrency analysis was based on a recreational vehicle park with 283 lots.

No school concurrency information has been provided as the development proposal is for commercial and not residential use.

The subject property is within access to centralized sanitary sewer from Brevard County Merritt Island Utilities and centralized water from the City of Cocoa.

Environmental Constraints

Summary of Mapped Resources and Noteworthy Land Use Issues:

- Coastal High Hazard Area (CHHA)
- Hydric Soils
- Floodplain Protection in North Merritt Island
- Indian River Lagoon Nitrogen Reduction Septic Overlay
- Protected and Specimen Trees
- Protected Species

Please refer to all comments provided by the Natural Resource Management Department at the end of this report.

For Board Consideration

The Board should consider whether the proposed zoning request is consistent and compatible with the surrounding area. The Board should also consider whether the request is consistent policies and objectives of the Brevard County Comprehensive Plan.

The Board should consider the proposed point(s) of ingress and egress for the recreational vehicle park in evaluating compatibility with the surrounding area.

**NATURAL RESOURCES MANAGEMENT DEPARTMENT
Zoning Review & Summary
Item No. 26Z00007**

Applicant: Kimberly Rezanka (Owner: Turtle Mound Ventures LLC)

Zoning Request: GML(I) and TR-1 to RVP

Note: To create a recreational vehicle park

NMI Advisory: 04/09/2026; **Zoning Hearing:** 04/20/2026; **BCC Hearing:** 05/07/2026

Tax ID No.(s): 2316452, 2315413, 2316247, and 2316451

- This is a preliminary review based on best available data maps reviewed by the Natural Resources Management Department (NRM) and does not include a site inspection to verify the accuracy of the mapped information.
- In that the rezoning process is not the appropriate venue for site plan review, specific site designs submitted with the rezoning request will be deemed conceptual. Board comments relative to specific site design do not provide vested rights or waivers from Federal, State or County regulations.
- **This review does not guarantee whether or not the proposed use, specific site design, or development of the property can be permitted under current Federal, State, or County Regulations.**

Summary of Mapped Resources and Noteworthy Land Use Issues:

- Coastal High Hazard Area (CHHA)
- Hydric Soils
- Floodplain Protection in North Merritt Island
- Indian River Lagoon Nitrogen Reduction Septic Overlay
- Protected and Specimen Trees
- Protected Species

Land Use Comments:

Coastal High Hazard Area

Approximately 2/3 of this property is located within the Coastal High Hazard Area (CHHA) as defined by Florida Statute 163.3178(2)(h), and as shown on the CHHA Map. The Coastal Management Element of the Comprehensive Plan, Policy 6.1, designates Coastal High Hazard Areas to be those areas below the elevation of the Category 1 storm surge elevation as defined in Chapter 163, Florida Statute. Objective 7 of the Coastal Management Element aims to limit densities within the coastal high hazard area and direct development outside of this area.

Hydric Soils

A portion of the subject parcel contains mapped hydric soils (Wabasso sand, 0 to 2 percent slopes; Copeland-Bradenton-Wabasso complex, limestone substratum; and Bradenton fine sand, limestone substratum); indicators that wetlands may be present on the property. **A wetland assessment/delineation will be required prior to any land clearing activities, site**

plan design, or building permit submittal. The wetland assessment/delineation shall be verified at time of site plan submittal.

Section 62-3694(c)(3)(b) has allowances for wetland impacts for commercial uses along "Mitigation Qualified Roadways" (MQRs). N. Courtenay Parkway is an MQR at this location. If wetlands are found, the applicant shall complete High Function and Landscape Level wetlands assessments prior to the allowance of any impacts. Board approval may be required for impacts. Any permitted wetland impacts must meet the requirements of Section 62-3694(e), including avoidance of impacts, and will require no net loss mitigation in Brevard County in accordance with Section 62-3696.

Section 62-3694(c)(3)b also provides that for a project encompassing multiple properties assembled under one site plan development order, wetland impacts for those properties without direct frontage on the mitigation qualified roadway may be permitted only if the properties are combined so that any proposed wetland impact is contained within a property with direct frontage on the mitigation qualified roadway. The assemblage shall be deed restricted for commercial or industrial use.

Floodplain Protection in North Merritt Island

This property is located within an area mapped as FEMA Special Flood Hazard Area (SFHA) AE, as identified by the Federal Emergency Management Agency, and as shown on the FEMA Flood Map. The parcel is subject to the development criteria in Conservation Element Objective 4, its subsequent policies, and the Floodplain Ordinance, including compensatory storage. Chapter 62, Article X, Division 6 states, "No site alteration shall adversely affect the existing surface water flow pattern." Chapter 62, Article X, Division 5, Section 62-3723 (2) states, "Development within floodplain areas shall not have adverse impacts upon adjoining properties."

Additionally, the parcel is located on North Merritt Island (NMI), north of Hall Road. Section 62-3724(4) contains additional criteria including compensatory storage and written certification from the engineer of record that there will be no adverse flooding impacts upon properties resulting from the proposed development. **The applicant is encouraged to contact NRM prior to any plan or permit submittal or prior to performing any land clearing activities.**

Indian River Lagoon Nitrogen Reduction Septic Overlay

The entire property is mapped within the Indian River Lagoon Nitrogen Reduction Overlay. Per Chapter 46, Article II, Division IV - Nitrogen Reduction Overlay, if adequate sewer for the development is not available, then the use of an alternative septic system, designed to provide at least 65% total nitrogen reduction through multi-stage treatment processes, shall be required. NRM requires a Septic Maintenance Notice be filed with the Brevard Clerk of Courts.

Protected and Specimen Trees

Protected and Specimen trees may exist on the parcel. The applicant shall perform a tree survey prior to any site plan design in order to incorporate valuable vegetative communities or robust trees into the design. Per Article XIII, Division 2, entitled Land Clearing, Landscaping,

and Tree Protection, Section 62-4341(18), Specimen and Protected Trees shall be preserved or relocated on site to the Greatest Extent Feasible. Greatest Extent Feasible shall include, but not be limited to, relocation of roads, buildings, ponds, increasing building height to reduce building footprint or reducing Vehicular Use Areas. The applicant is advised to refer to Article XIII, Division 2, entitled Land Clearing, Landscaping, and Tree Protection, for specific requirements for preservation and canopy coverage requirements and buffer requirements. **Applicant should contact NRM at 321-633-2016 prior to performing any land clearing activities.**

Protected Species

Information available to NRM indicates that federally and/or state protected species may be present on the property. A portion of the property is located within a large area of mapped Florida Scrub Jay habitat / occupancy. Prior to any plan, permit submittal, or development activity, including land clearing, the applicant should obtain any necessary permits or clearance letters from the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (Florida Ecological Services State Office: 352-448-9151; or email: FW4FLESRegs@fws.gov).



BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS

Planning and Development Department

2725 Judge Fran Jamieson Way

Building A, Room

114 Viera,

Florida 32940

(321)633-2070 Phone / (321)633-2074 Fax

<https://www.brevardfl.gov/PlanningDev>

April 26, 2026

Addendum Number 1 – 26Z00007 Turtle Mound Ventures, LLC

Subsequent to the issuance of the staff report, the County conducted further analysis with respect to applicable regulatory constraints on the subject property. Specifically, the County reviewed the interplay of the applicant's requested zoning classification (Recreational Vehicle Park, RVP) and the requested land use designation (Community Commercial, CC) based on site-specific considerations, especially as it relates to the potential density allowed on the property.

As with all properties, the maximum density of a particular property must be evaluated in conjunction with the applicable Future Land Use (FLU) designation(s); potential environmental constraints, including, but not limited to, limitations associated with the Coastal High Hazard Area (CHHA) and Special Flood Hazard Area; and, Brevard County Comprehensive Plan policies and land development regulations.

Based on Section 62-1255, Brevard County Code, the requested land use of CC and zoning of RVP are considered consistent, but only to the extent that the density limits conform to Policy 2.10 of the Future Land Use Element of the Comprehensive Plan. Policy 2.10 provides as follows:

Residential Development in Neighborhood Commercial and Community Commercial
Land Use Designations – Policy 2.10:

Residential development or the integration of residential development with commercial development shall be permitted in the Neighborhood Commercial and Community Commercial land use designations, provided that the scale and intensity of the residential/mixed use development is compatible with abutting residential development and areas designated for residential use on the Future Land Use Map. Residential development is permissible in these commercial land use designations at density of up to one category higher than the closest residentially designated area on the Future Land Use Map (FLUM) which is on the same side of the street. *Increases in density beyond this allowance may be considered through a public hearing. In the CHHA, however, residential development is strictly limited to the density of the closest residentially designated area on the FLUM that is on the same side of the street.* [emphasis added]

The Code specifically points to Policy 2.10, and its associated density calculation, to establish the density of RVP-zoned properties. In accordance with Policy 2.10, the closest residential designation is RES-1; therefore:

- The upland portion generally may be considered consistent with RES-2 (2 units per acre) based on the applicable bonus. The upland portion (9.5 acres) yields approximately 19 units, with the Board having the option to increase density to a maximum yield of 95 in this portion.
- The CHHA portion of the subject property is limited to RES-1 (1 unit per acre) and is not eligible for any density increase. This cap also complies with Objective 7 of the Coastal Management Element of the Comprehensive Plan ("Limit Densities within the coastal

high hazard area and direct development outside of this area.”). The CHHA portion (18.9 acres) yields approximately 18 units (there is no provision in the Comprehensive Plan for the Board to increase density in this portion).

Based on this analysis, the estimated development potential is approximately thirty-seven (37) RV sites, subject to site design, environmental constraints, and compliance with all applicable land development regulations. However, if the Board so determines at a public hearing, Policy 2.10 allows for the density of the uplands portion of the subject property to be increased beyond the allowance of one category higher than the closest residentially designated area on the Future Land Use Map on the same side of the street. This increased amount could reach a maximum potential density of ten (10) RV spaces per acre pursuant to Section 62-1406, Brevard County Code, and the recreational vehicle park definition found in the Glossary of the Comprehensive Plan, which caps the density of recreational vehicle parks at ten (10) units per acre. Such a determination would yield a total development potential to be as high as one hundred thirteen (113) RV spaces for the subject property.

This clarification reflects a refined application of existing Comprehensive Plan policies and land development regulations. As previously noted, zoning potential noted on the staff report is provided for planning and concurrency analysis purposes only and does not constitute a guarantee of development yield. Final density may be further adjusted based on site-specific conditions, including, but not limited to, wetland impacts, CHHA, infrastructure requirements, and overall site design.

[illegible]

	SURVEY FOR: EMTMAN
	DRAWING NUMBER: 6737

LOCATION MAP

Turtle Mound Ventures, LLC

26Z00007



1:24,000 or 1 inch = 2,000 feet

Buffer Distance: 500 feet

This map was compiled from recorded documents and does not reflect an actual survey. The Brevard County Board of County Commissioners does not assume responsibility for errors or omissions hereon.

Produced by BoCC - GIS Date: 3/31/2026

— Buffer

— Subject Property

ZONING MAP

Turtle Mound Ventures, LLC

26Z00007



1:4,800 or 1 inch = 400 feet

This map was compiled from recorded documents and does not reflect an actual survey. The Brevard County Board of County Commissioners does not assume responsibility for errors or omissions hereon.

Produced by BoCC - GIS Date: 3/31/2026


Subject Property

Parcels

Zoning

FUTURE LAND USE MAP

Turtle Mound Ventures, LLC
26Z00007



1:4,800 or 1 inch = 400 feet

— Subject Property
□ Parcels

This map was compiled from recorded documents and does not reflect an actual survey. The Brevard County Board of County Commissioners does not assume responsibility for errors or omissions hereon.

Produced by BoCC - GIS Date: 3/31/2026

AERIAL MAP

Turtle Mound Ventures, LLC

26Z00007



1:4,800 or 1 inch = 400 feet

PHOTO YEAR: 2025

This map was compiled from recorded documents and does not reflect an actual survey. The Brevard County Board of County Commissioners does not assume responsibility for errors or omissions hereon.

Produced by BoCC - GIS Date: 3/31/2026


 Subject Property

 Parcels

NWI WETLANDS MAP

Turtle Mound Ventures, LLC

26Z00007



1:4,800 or 1 inch = 400 feet

This map was compiled from recorded documents and does not reflect an actual survey. The Brevard County Board of County Commissioners does not assume responsibility for errors or omissions hereon.

Produced by BoCC - GIS Date: 3/31/2026

National Wetlands Inventory (NWI)

Estuarine and Marine Deepwater	Freshwater Pond
Estuarine and Marine Wetland	Lake
Freshwater Emergent Wetland	Other
Freshwater Forested/Shrub Wetland	Riverine
Subject Property	
Parcels	

SJRWMD FLUCCS WETLANDS - 6000 Series MAP

Turtle Mound Ventures, LLC

26Z00007



1:4,800 or 1 inch = 400 feet

This map was compiled from recorded documents and does not reflect an actual survey. The Brevard County Board of County Commissioners does not assume responsibility for errors or omissions hereon.

Produced by BoCC - GIS Date: 3/31/2026

SJRWMD FLUCCS WETLANDS

- Wetland Hardwood Forests - Series 6100
- Wetland Coniferous Forest - Series 6200
- Wetland Forested Mixed - Series 6300
- Vegetated Non-Forested Wetlands - Series 6400
- Non-Vegetated Wetland - Series 6500


Subject Property

Parcels

USDA SCSSS SOILS MAP

Turtle Mound Ventures, LLC

26Z00007



1:4,800 or 1 inch = 400 feet

This map was compiled from recorded documents and does not reflect an actual survey. The Brevard County Board of County Commissioners does not assume responsibility for errors or omissions hereon.

Produced by BoCC - GIS Date: 3/31/2026

USDA SCSSS Soils


- Aquifer and Hydric
- Aquifer
- Hydric
- None

- Subject Property
- Parcels

FEMA FLOOD ZONES MAP

Turtle Mound Ventures, LLC

26Z00007



1:4,800 or 1 inch = 400 feet

This map was compiled from recorded documents and does not reflect an actual survey. The Brevard County Board of County Commissioners does not assume responsibility for errors or omissions hereon.

Produced by BoCC - GIS Date: 3/31/2026

FEMA Flood Zones

A	AO	X
AE	Open Water	
AH	VE	
Subject Property	Parcels	

COASTAL HIGH HAZARD AREA MAP

Turtle Mound Ventures, LLC
26Z00007



1:4,800 or 1 inch = 400 feet

This map was compiled from recorded documents and does not reflect an actual survey. The Brevard County Board of County Commissioners does not assume responsibility for errors or omissions hereon.


Produced by BoCC - GIS Date: 3/31/2026

- Subject Property
- Parcels
- Coastal High Hazard Area**
- SurgeZoneCat1

INDIAN RIVER LAGOON SEPTIC OVERLAY MAP

Turtle Mound Ventures, LLC

26Z00007



1:4,800 or 1 inch = 400 feet

This map was compiled from recorded documents and does not reflect an actual survey. The Brevard County Board of County Commissioners does not assume responsibility for errors or omissions hereon.

Produced by BoCC - GIS Date: 3/31/2026

— Subject Property

□ Parcels

Septic Overlay

■ 40 Meters


■ 60 Meters

■ All Distances

EAGLE NESTS MAP

Turtle Mound Ventures, LLC

26Z00007



1:4,800 or 1 inch = 400 feet

This map was compiled from recorded documents and does not reflect an actual survey. The Brevard County Board of County Commissioners does not assume responsibility for errors or omissions hereon.

Produced by BoCC - GIS Date: 3/31/2026

 Subject Property

 Parcels



Eagle Nests
FWS

SCRUB JAY OCCUPANCY MAP

Turtle Mound Ventures, LLC

26Z00007



1:4,800 or 1 inch = 400 feet

This map was compiled from recorded documents and does not reflect an actual survey. The Brevard County Board of County Commissioners does not assume responsibility for errors or omissions hereon.

Produced by BoCC - GIS Date: 3/31/2026

— Subject Property


□ Parcels

▨ Scrub Jay Occupancy

SJRWMD FLUCCS UPLAND FORESTS - 4000 Series MAP

Turtle Mound Ventures, LLC

26Z00007



1:4,800 or 1 inch = 400 feet

This map was compiled from recorded documents and does not reflect an actual survey. The Brevard County Board of County Commissioners does not assume responsibility for errors or omissions hereon.

Produced by BoCC - GIS Date: 3/31/2026

SJRWMD FLUCCS Upland Forests


- Upland Coniferous Forest - 4100 Series
- Upland Hardwood Forest - 4200 Series
- Upland Mixed Forest - 4300 Series
- Tree Plantations - 4400 Series

Subject Property

Parcels

RADIUS MAP

Turtle Mound Ventures, LLC
26Z00007



1:4,800 or 1 inch = 400 feet

Buffer Distance: 500 feet

This map was compiled from recorded documents and does not reflect an actual survey. The Brevard County Board of County Commissioners does not assume responsibility for errors or omissions hereon.

Produced by BoCC - GIS Date: 3/31/2026

- Buffer
- Subject Property
- Notify Property
- Parcels

26200007

Brevard County Official Planning & Development Map



Legend

- Subject Property
- Twp/Rng. Lines
- Sections
- Parcels
- Streets
- Zoning Easements
- Zoning Actions
- Municipality

DISCLAIMER AND TERMS OF USE:

The official version of the Brevard County Zoning Map and Future Land Use Map can be viewed during regular business hours at the Brevard County Planning and Development Department, 121-613-2070, 2715 Judge Frank Johnson Way, Bldg. 6-114, Vero Beach, FL 32980.

Data is provided "as is" without any warranty or representation that the data is accurate, timely or complete. The County makes no warranty, express or implied, that the data, graphics, and maps provided are suitable for use in any other application or for any purpose other than the official planning and development purposes for which they were created. The County is not responsible for any errors or omissions in the data, graphics, and maps, and is not a constant state of maintenance, current and update.

Though the map depicts the data property within the same expected area of Brevard County, the County does not warrant or represent that the map has been updated to show properties that may have been changed or included within the boundaries of one or more municipalities.


The map is for display and informational purposes only. The viewer should consult the official Brevard County Zoning Map and Future Land Use Map for the most current information. The County is not responsible for any errors or omissions in the data, graphics, and maps, and is not a constant state of maintenance, current and update.

MAPS MAY NOT BE RESOLD: Data maps or digital files are prepared by employees of Brevard County and may not be resold without prior approval from the Brevard County Board of Commissioners.

0 205 410 820 Feet

1 Inch = 400 Feet

Produced by Information Technology Department - GIS
Date: 3/31/2026



Kimberly Rezanka
6013 Farcenda Pl
Melbourne, FL 32940

ACKERMANN, SUSAN
6500 WHALEY ROAD
MERRITT ISLAND FL 32953-

ALCANTER, ROBERT R
6467 COLONY PARK DR
MERRITT ISLAND FL 32953-

B&T WORLD LLC
4550 ALAN SHEPARD AVE
COCOA FL 32926-3878

BAHR, PATRICIA A
6560 BLOSSOM RD
MERRITT ISLAND FL 32953-6819

BAKER, ROGER
6492 COLONY PARK DR
MERRITT ISLAND FL 32953-6851

BANANA RIVER BAPTIST CHURCH INC
6250 N COURTENAY PKWY
MERRITT ISLAND FL 32953-7007

BARKLOW, DIANE
335 SAINT PIERRE CT
MERRITT ISLAND FL 32953-6848

BARKLOW, DIANE M
335 SAINT PIERRE CT
MERRITT ISLAND FL 32953-6848

BELLSOUTH TELECOMMUNICATIONS INC
D/B/A A T & T FLORIDA
1010 PINE ST, # 9E-L-01
ATTN PROPERTY TAX DEPT
SAINT LOUIS MO 63101-2015

BELTRAN, JULIE Y
JACK, DUSTIN L
6360 N TROPICAL TRL
MERRITT ISLAND FL 32953-7217

BIEBEL, ROBERT L
6570 WHALEY RD
MERRITT ISLAND FL 32953-6801

BREVARD REALTY INC
2507 N COCOA BLVD
COCOA FL 32922-7067

BRUNER, RICHARD K
BRUNER, GLORILEE JEAN
6550 WHALEY RD
MERRITT ISLAND FL 32953-6801

CANNON, LARRY MACK, JR
CANNON, MICHELLE LEE
6488 COLONY PARK DR
MERRITT ISLAND FL 32953-6851

CHANDLEE, JESSE
6545 MCGRUDER RD
MERRITT ISLAND FL 32953-7026

CHANDLEE, JESSE
419 POINSETTIA AVE
TITUSVILLE FL 32796-3722

COFFEY, ZAKARY
GUERTLER, MELANIE
6525 BLOSSOM RD
MERRITT ISLAND FL 32953-6820

COFFEY, ZAKARY
GUERTLER, MELANIE
6525 BLOSSOM RD
MERRITT ISLAND FL 32953-6820

COLEMAN, PATRICIA ANN
6595 MCGRUDER RD
MERRITT ISLAND FL 32953-7026

COLONY MHP LLC
PO BOX 249
ENGLEWOOD NJ 07631-0249

CONCEPT DEVELOPMENT INC
1449 SW 74TH DR, STE 200
GAINESVILLE FL 32607-0013

CONCEPT DG INVESTMENT LLC
1449 SW 74TH DR, STE 200
GAINESVILLE FL 32607-0013

CORNAIRE, STACIE
WHITE, ROSS
6370 N TROPICAL TRL
MERRITT ISLAND FL 32953-7217

CRISAFULLI, ESTELLE K TRUSTEE
2045 S TROPICAL TRAIL
MERRITT ISLAND FL 32952-

CRISAFULLI, SHELLY
6270 N COURTENAY PKWY
MERRITT ISLAND FL 32953-7007

CUSMANO, PERRY
CUSMANO, KATHLEEN
6490 MCGRUDER RD
MERRITT ISLAND FL 32953-7023

DAVIS, ROBERT
227 HEAVENLY STREET
MERRITT ISLAND FL 32953-

DAVIS, ROBERT PATRICK
6635 MCGRUDER RD
MERRITT ISLAND FL 32953-7028

DIAMOND, CLAY
3992 TRADEWINDS TRL
MERRITT ISLAND FL 32953-

DOMINGUE, PRESTON
516 EL SHADDAI DR
LAFAYETTE LA 70508-7429

DYE, HARLAND T
BARTALL-DYE, RHONDA ANN
6512 COLONY PARK DR
MERRITT ISLAND FL 32953-

EDWARDS, VICKI LYNN COOK
COOK, BRIAN EUGENE
6504 COLONY PARK DR
MERRITT ISLAND FL 32953-6851

EQUITY TRUST COMPANY C/F/B/O
ACCOUNT #Z144828 IRA
PO BOX 540291
MERRITT ISLAND FL 32954-0291

EQUITY TRUST COMPANY C/F/B/O
ACCOUNT Z144828 IRA
PO BOX 540291
MERRITT ISLAND FL 32954-0291

EQUITY TRUST COMPANY CUST
F/B/O #200351962
120 VENETIAN WAY, STE 25
MERRITT ISLAND FL 32953-4174

EQUITY TRUST COMPANY F/B/O
#200351962
120 VENETIAN WAY, STE 25
MERRITT ISLAND FL 32953-4174

ERNST, RICHARD A
10584 WILDHORSE LN
LITTLETON CO 80125-7965

ESTELLE CRISAFULLI LIVING TRUST
WAYNE FRANK CRISAFULLI & SONJA
ANETTE CRISAFULLI LIVING TRUST
6270 N COURTENAY PKWY
MERRITT ISLAND FL 32953-7007

FRIEDMANN, THOMAS
MOSER, SUSAN
6690 MC GRUDER RD
MERRITT ISLAND FL 32953-

GALLACHER, KARLA A MCDONALD
6469 COLONY PARK DR
MERRITT ISLAND FL 32953-6822

GASSER, THOMAS J
GASSER, NANCY
10639 BISHOP RD
SAINT CHARLES MI 48655-9616

HARDMAN, JAMES F
310 SAINT PIERRE CT
MERRITT ISLAND FL 32953-6848

HARLOW, ALAINA N
HARLOW, MATTHEW T
6760 MCGRUDER RD
MERRITT ISLAND FL 32953-7029

HARLOW, MATTHEW
HARLOW, ALAINA N
6760 MCGRUDER RD
MERRITT ISLAND FL 32953-7029

HINTON, JANET M
HINTON, LILLIE M
1811 HIGH RD
TALLAHASSEE FL 32303-4407

HOFFMEISTER, DAVID JOHN
6480 COLONY PARK DR
MERRITT ISLAND FL 32953-6821

JACK, DUSTIN L
BELTRAN, JULIE Y
6360 N TROPICAL TRL
MERRITT ISLAND FL 32953-7217

JOHNSON, KYLE
JOHNSON, CLAIRE
6502 COLONY PARK DR
MERRITT ISLAND FL 32953-6851

JOHNSON, WAYNE
JOHNSON, PAMELA
6510 WHALEY RD
MERRITT ISLAND FL 32953-6801

KING, LINDA P
6491 COLONY PARK DR
MERRITT ISLAND FL 32953-

KOLODGIE, DAVID F
6605 MCGRUDER RD
MERRITT ISLAND FL 32953-7028

KUNKEL, MATTHEW
6720 MCGRUDER RD
MERRITT ISLAND FL 32953-7029

LATORRE, GLORIA
ROMAN, DONATO
6560 WHALEY RD
MERRITT ISLAND FL 32953-6801

MCCARVER, ISAAC JOSEPH WILLIAM
MCCARVER, KATHERINE NICOLE
2275 N TROPICAL TRL
MERRITT ISLAND FL 32953-4249

MERRITT ISLAND VOLUNTEER FIRE
DEPT INC
PO BOX 540263
MERRITT ISLAND FL 32954-0263

MERRITT LAND COMPANY
5525 N COURTENAY PKWY
MERRITT ISLAND FL 32953-7250

MERRITT LAND COMPANY LLC
5525 N COURTENAY PKWY
MERRITT ISLAND FL 32953-7248

26Z00007
Page3

MISENTA, PABLO A
BRACAMONTE, MYRIAM T
913 VILLAGE PL
DAVENPORT FL 33896-5239

NGUYENHO, ELIZABETH
6477 COLONY PARK DR
MERRITT ISLAND FL 32953-6822

OBRIEN, SHERRY
OBRIEN, SEAN
6481 COLONY PARK DR
MERRITT ISLAND FL 32953-6822

OSBORN, JENNIFER KAY
6540 WHALEY RD
MERRITT ISLAND FL 32953-6801

OSBORNE, JOHN R
320 SAINT PIERRE CT
MERRITT ISLAND FL 32953-6848

QUICKSELL, TIMOTHY
QUICKSELL, CHRISTINE
475 SUNDORO CT
MERRITT ISLAND FL 32953-3240

RCB FAMILY TRUST
ESTELLE CRISAFULLI LIVING TRUST
6270 N COURTENAY PKWY
MERRITT ISLAND FL 32953-7007

RONALD E DIMENNA FAMILY TRUST
3850 S BANANA RIVER BLVD
COCOA BEACH FL 32931-3481

ROSE, VICKI
419 POINSETTIA AVE
TITUSVILLE FL 32796-3722

SAVOIE, LINDA SOSA
6487 COLONY PARK DR
MERRITT ISLAND FL 32953-6853

SEED OF ABRAHAM MINISTRIES INC
2105 ROCKLEDGE DR
ROCKLEDGE FL 32955-5401

STEWART, ARTHUR
340 SAINT PIERRE CT
MERRITT ISLAND FL 32953-6848

SWICKERT, DONALD
6530 WHALEY RD
MERRITT ISLAND FL 32953-

TEAMSOSAFINANCIAL 1.0 LLC
4230 MOUNT VERNON AVE, APT 101
TITUSVILLE FL 32780-6694

TEEN MISSIONS INTERNATIONAL INC
885 E HALL RD
MERRITT ISLAND FL 32953-8418

TEEN MISSIONS INTERNATIONAL INC
885 EAST HALL RD
MERRITT ISLAND FL 32953-

TEEN MISSIONS INTERNATIONAL INC
885 EAST HALL ROAD
MERRITT ISLAND FL 32953-

TEEN MISSIONS INTERNATIONAL INC
885 E HALL RD
MERRITT ISLAND FL 32953-

TESTER, ROCHELLE A
6476 COLONY PARK DR
MERRITT ISLAND FL 32953-6821

THOMAS D STRICKLAND & CHERYL
R STRICKLAND REVOCABLE TRUST
1778 ANGEL AVE
MERRITT ISLAND FL 32952-2707

THORNTON, LINDA MICHELLE
6479 COLONY PARK DR
MERRITT ISLAND FL 32953-6822

TONY'S COOLING & HEAT INC
PO BOX 100987
PALM BAY FL 32910-0987

TRETT, DUSTIN LEE
TRETT, ERA JEAN
6730 MCGRUDER RD
MERRITT ISLAND FL 32953-7029

TURTLE MOUND VENTURES LLC
1275 SOUTH PATRICK DR, # 90
SATELLITE BEACH FL 32937-3963

VERNOTZY, TIMOTHY A
320 LAROCHE COURT
MERRITT ISLAND FL 32953-6833

WALRATH, CARA
6535 BLOSSOM RD
MERRITT ISLAND FL 32953-6820

WALRATH, JOEL
WALRATH, CARA
6545 BLOSSOM RD
MERRITT ISLAND FL 32953-6820

WAYNE FRANK CRISAFULLI & SONJA
ANETTE CRISAFULLI LIVING TRUST
6270 N COURTENAY PKWY
MERRITT ISLAND FL 32953-7007

WILLIAM HERBERT BOGGS III
& PATTI SIZEMORE BOGGS REVOCABLE LIVING
1671 HARBOR DR
MERRITT ISLAND FL 32952-5669

26Z00007
Page4

WILSON, TORI L
RENIER, TONI D
3675 SHELLIE CT
COCOA FL 32926-4479

WRIGHT, GEORGE
WRIGHT, ELAINE
6498 COLONY PARK DR
MERRITT ISLAND FL 32953-6851

ZINGER FAMILY TRUST
6465 COLONY PARK DR
MERRITT ISLAND FL 32953-6822







Parcel Property

Parcels

1:9.028

0	0.075	0.15	0.3 mi
0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1
0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2
0.3	0.3	0.3	0.3
0.4	0.4	0.4	0.4
0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5
0.6	0.6	0.6	0.6
0.7	0.7	0.7	0.7
0.8	0.8	0.8	0.8
0.9	0.9	0.9	0.9
1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0

0 0.1 0.2 0.4 km

Brevard County Property Appraiser Office
Source: Esri, Vantor, Earthstar Geographics, and the GIS User Community

4/20/2026 11:53:55 AM
 State of Florida - VENDOR | Est. Community-Mark Communications | FRFP @ Onyx Strategies | Merrill Felt | Tim Yon | Garmin | SalesGraph | GeoTechnology | ArcGIS Web Assembler

North Merritt Island Dependent Special District Board

The North Merritt Island Dependent Special District Board met on Thursday, April 09, 2026, at 6:00 p.m., at the Merritt Island Service Complex, 2575 N. Courtenay Pkwy., Second Floor, Merritt Island, Florida.

The meeting was called to order at 6:00 p.m.

Board members present: Mary Hillberg, Chris Cook, Gina Lindhorst, and Jim Carbonneau.

Staff members present: Trina Gilliam, Planning and Zoning Manager; Tania Ramos, Planner; and Alice Randall, Operations Support Specialist.

Item H.1. Turtle Mound Ventures (Kim Rezanka) are requesting a Small-Scale Comprehensive Plan Amendment (26S.01) to change the Future Land Use designation from PUB, RES-1, and RES-2-DIR to CC. (26SS00001) (Tax Account 2315413, 2316247, 2316451, and 2316452) (District 2)

Item H.2. Turtle Mount Ventures (Kim Rezanka) are requesting a zoning classification change from GML(I) and TR-1 to RVP. (26Z00007) (Tax Account 2315413, 2316247, 2316451, and 2316452) (District 2)

Trina Gilliam read both applications into the record as they are companion applications but will need separate motions.

Jake Wise spoke to the application. He explained he is the civil engineer for the project. Nathan Wise is also present to take notes. We don't have a site plan; we are proposing a land use change and rezoning. We just want to hear the feedback and go through the process. And if approved we would later come back with a site plan. We think it is a good project for the area. And we just want to hear your feedback. We're asking for the Community Commercial underlying land use and the RVP zoning. Our intent is to do a high-end rental RV park. RV park is considered commercial not residential so density and things like that don't apply with commercial projects. We know we are adding trips to the roads, more people going across the bridge, and we know that's always a concern in North Merritt Island. I have some photos to give you an idea of what they're trying to do. This property used to be owned by the school board. They decided they didn't need it for educational purposes, so our client purchased it. RVP is specific to a recreational vehicle park; the zoning code has some very strict guidelines. No one can be there for more than 180 days. The maximum is 10 sites per acre. Normally we're much less than that with the RV parks we've designed in the past. We would do an environmental assessment. If there are any wetlands we would work around them. The county has very strict regulations about not impacting wetlands. We preserve the wetlands and provide an average 25-foot upland buffer around them. We provide nice amenities such as a swimming pool, pickle ball courts, and things like that for the residents of the RV park. We would also like to have some commercial type of accessory that would be open to the public like a convenience store, laundromat, nail salon, things like that that are community type benefits. Access would be off Courtenay and not off any of the residential roads. We would tie it into utilities, water and sewer. No septic systems. We plan a nice buffer along the northern edge for the residential off McGruder. Anything that would be public or commercial would have Courtenay frontage and would be in the southeast corner, furthest away from the single-family houses. To the east we have a canal and an

existing church. The code limits anyone to staying a maximum of 180 days; these are not year-round residents. We expect more launches so we believe this RV park would be very good for that type of tourist coming and seasonal residents. We are very comfortable and used to coastal high hazard zones. Flood zone AE and flood zone X are both on the property. We are comfortable and used to working through those requirements. We also know about the compensatory storage requirements, and we will comply with those.

Mary Hillberg inquired about the type of drainage that is proposed for the project. Are you going to have cement pads?

Mr. Wise responded as you can see in the pictures we'll do the driveways in asphalt, typically the campsites are concrete. Each will have a pad for a table or something like that. Some have awnings that come out of them. So, a percentage will be the RV park, the other will be the amenities, also the storm water compensatory storage. The base flood elevation is AE3, which means everything must be an elevation of 3 or higher. We'll make sure we're out of that coastal high hazard area, which is 12" above elevation 3 for this site.

Ms. Hillberg stated the picture looks like everything is cemented.

Mr. Wise states the pictures are from a project that is out of state and doesn't represent what we do. See the mountains? That's definitely not Florida.

Ms. Hillberg continued I see that, but what I'm saying is that it wouldn't be this hard.

Mr. Wise responded no, it couldn't be. And we don't want that. We want to make sure there are a lot of amenities, green, wetland preservation, upland buffers, stormwater treatment, and that's a big part of it. We'll mostly use those to be buffers to the north.

Ms. Hillberg inquired about a plan for how they plan to arrange it.

Mr. Wise responded we haven't taken it as far as the site plan because we're not at the point where we have zoning and land use. We're just not there yet because of the process we have to go through.

Ms. Hillberg inquired how many they wanted there.

Mr. Wise responded we don't have a number because we don't have a site plan. Code doesn't allow more than 10 per acre, but we're going to be much less than that. Other RV parks we've done in the past are usually around 4 or 5 sites per acre. I think this one will be even less because of some of the green preservation things I mentioned earlier.

Ms. Hillberg inquired if they would leave some of the vegetation.

Mr. Wise responded absolutely. They make the best buffers. There are trees that have been there for hundreds of years. We want it to look and feel mature the day we open.

Gina Lindhorst stated it looks more than 10 per acre based on the picture here.

Mr. Wise responded I believe this is a site in the state of Washington. They don't have stormwater rules, it was an open valley, there were no trees. This was just to give you the flavor of trying to be a high-end RV park.

Jim Carbonneau stated you're looking at approximately 1/4-acre size lots. You said 4 to 5 per acre.

Mr. Wise responded we usually get about that with a site of this size, with the green space being presented as well. It's 28 acres total. It will be a mix of the RV park, preservation, buffers, stormwater, and some of the commercial.

Mr. Carbonneau stated that you're looking at 9 acres of the 28 acres.

Mr. Wise responded no.

Chris Cook states 9 acres is what's out of the coastal high hazard zone.

Mr. Carbonneau inquired if these are rental spaces and not for purchase.

Mr. Wise responded correct, rental only.

Mr. Carbonneau stated the typical RV can be very long. Especially the class A motor homes that are towing boats, other trailers. The roads around this area, McGruder, North Tropical, especially that turn coming off Pine Island are very tight. Will there be road improvement and at who's cost will they be.

Mr. Wise responded we don't have any plans to have access to anything but Courtenay. We don't plan to access McGruder or North Tropical Trail at all. So, we wouldn't have any RV's going on those roads, unless they got lost.

Ms. Lindhorst stated you're trying to get it to community commercial zoning classification; it isn't limited to anything in particular.

Mr. Wise responded that the future land use does not, but the zoning does. And, if we try to do anything different at all, we'll be right back before you. The owner of the property is from the state of Washington and that's why he sent me photos from that area.

Ms. Lindhorst stated it looks like it's all covered in concrete and pavement to me. Wouldn't work out well with wetlands.

Mr. Wise responded we work around all that. Plus, the stormwater treatment, compensatory storage, coastal high hazard, we would work around all of those.

Mr. Cook stated state road 3 is a divided highway. So, with these big RV's coming in, where are they going to turn around?

Mr. Wise responded that it's a DOT road and we will work with DOT to provide a long-left turn lane, median cut. And that would be part of our site plan process.

Mr. Cook stated you are bringing sewer up there. The sewer line's not that far up.

Mr. Wise responded there's a moratorium, so we couldn't do septic even if we wanted to. We don't want to. Yes, it will definitely be water and sewer. No septic at all.

Mr. Cook inquired where it stops right now.

Mr. Wise responded he didn't bring the map with him. It's not that far up. We have to extend it. Which will be a benefit to that whole area, to extend the sewer up there.

Mr. Cook stated this says it's a rental RV park. Would that be RV's or cabins, or anything like that that would be located on there that people could just come up and rent?

Mr. Wise responded they could do tents and cabins per the zoning, but the intent is just to do the RV's.

Mr. Cook continued one of the problems with these RV parks is they become de facto Air BnB's, which is not allowed in North Merritt Island, unless you're in a resort area.

Ms. Gilliam stated multi-family. It can't about single-family.

Mr. Wise started there's not Air BnB.

Mr. Carbonneau stated that's a what-if situation. Is the 180 days limited to the trailer or vehicle specific or the occupants of the vehicle?

Mr. Wise responded it's the rental. You can only rent for 180 days and then you can't rent any longer than that. That's in the zoning code.

Ms. Hillberg stated if you rent for 180 days, left and took a ride, came back.....

Mr. Wise responded maybe they switch sites.....it's a rental park where we expect people to be there a short period of time.

Mr. Carbonneau inquired about what you do with a derelict trailer.

Mr. Wise responded that's a process. There is a process we must go through. That doesn't have a limitation of 180 days. You must go through the police department. Maybe work with the family.

Mr. Carbonneau inquired to prevent that piece of property from becoming derelict who maintains the trailer as you go through that process.

Mr. Wise responded that the owners of the RV park. Normally you find a family member that can come to help with it. It's unusual, but it happens.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Rose Plummer stated based on the review by the North Merritt Island Homeowners Association she is here to speak in opposition to the requested small-scale comprehensive plan amendment. It is clear that the request to allow for an RV park does not meet the requirements for a small-scale comprehensive plan amendment. North Courtenay Parkway is not designated as a major multi-transportation corridor. For these reasons the site does not meet the locational criteria of policy 2.8.F with respect to interstate accessibility or corridor designation. For these reasons we respectfully ask that you deny the request.

Brian Bussin stated he is here at the request of a client that has an approved subdivision in the area. I haven't seen any aerial or anything that shows me where this parcel is and how close it is to the 164 unit upper-end subdivision. My client has strong concerns about this type of use that is close to a new subdivision that's high-end.

Ms. Hillberg inquired if the subdivision is to the south of this piece of property.

Mr. Bussin responded it is to the west on North Tropical Trail. The lots are a minimum half-acre in size, 164 units. Known as the Outback Reserve. So, I just want to express my client's concern about this type of use so close....

John Hopengarten stated if he heard the gentleman correctly, he said they were going to put in a convenience store on his property. There was one that was started just across North Tropical Trail on the corner of Courtenay and North Tropical Trail, a Dollar General, I don't know if it's going to proceed or not, but it's there. One of my main concerns, since I live in that area, is flooding. You're putting a lot of impervious surfaces there and we already have a flooding problem up in that area. I'd like them to consider looking at that and see how they're going to handle it. This is a major route to go to the space center and I'm wondering if they can put a buffer along Courtenay so that we wouldn't see RV's, which would be quite unsightly to see from the road. Regarding access, how are they going to make a left turn to go into that sight? The only way to do it is at Pine Island Road if they're using Courtenay as their entrance. That will cause a real problem. The church doesn't have a left turn lane when you're going north, so Pine Island is the only way. Unless they're going to pay for a curb cut through the median. And, are they going to have on-site management of this property?

Joel Walrath inquired how many total RV spots will be on the whole section. McGruder Road has a ditch that is used as a junkyard. There's a lot of waste pouring into it. So, what's the plan for managing that? It's a big concern for us because we're having to deal with it on our road.

END PUBLIC COMMENT

Mr. Wise stated the convenience store would be accessory for the residents and for the public. We know flooding is a concern. We've been working on that here for decades to try and help with that. We not only have to meet the compensatory storage requirement, which is anything north of Hall Road, we must meet the flood zone, the compensatory storage, the high hazard. We have an AE flood zone on about half of the property. By state statute and Brevard County code we cannot impact our neighbors. We must reduce any discharge that goes off the site, so anything we do would only be positive when it comes to stormwater treatment, storage, anything like that. We want to do that, and we're required to. I promise you we will be held with our feet to the fire with all those agencies. We can only make it better; we can't make things worse. The buffer along North Courtenay is a great idea. Tree preservation, we try to maximize around the perimeter. Typically, we must raise the elevation of our sites. We want to look and feel like a mature site the day we open. Access would be only off Courtenay. We will not go on Tropical Trail or McGruder. We will work with DOT to make a median cut and a left turn lane; that is part of our plan. We are just in zoning and land use right now, so those are details that we'll work out down the road. Onsite management would be the case. We're not far enough along to know how many units we'll have. And, anything we can do to help clean up the area; we want our RV park and the people that rent there to want to be there. It will only be successful if it's cleaned up.

Ms. Lindhorst stated the FEMA flood zone map says AE is covering more than half the property. And, you say you're not going to build on the AE section.

Mr. Wise responded it is AE with a base flood elevation of 3. The AE means we have to build above elevation 3 and the coastal high hazard requires to be elevation 3 as well.

Ms. Lindhorst stated the coastal high hazard area is again almost exactly the same as AE. You're limited in building there. It's more than half the property.

Mr. Wise responded we still can build on it, we just have to meet all those requirements and restrictions. That's how we provide compensatory storage, storm water storage, and we want to bring it up out of the base flood elevation, so there won't be any flooding concerns on site or off site.

Ms. Lindhorst continued with concerns about buffers around the residential housing in the area. That's a lot of buffering to do.

Mr. Wise responded with "like I said, we want to make the site feel mature the day it opens, so we would have a preservation area with the trees that are out there. It's a very heavily wooded site, so a great opportunity for preservation especially around the perimeter."

Mr. Cook stated under the FLU policy 2.8.C it says community commercial clusters up to 10 acres in size should be spaced at least 2 miles apart. And, community commercial clusters up to 40 acres in size should be spaced at least 5 miles apart. So, according to you it says on the east side you have a CC is 0.1 mile away.

Ms. Gilliam responded with I believe the CC you're referring to is less than 10 acres.

Mr. Cook continued with if they're less than 10 acres they don't have to be 5 miles apart. I'm focusing on the CC right now.

Ms. Gilliam responded that it would be something for the board to consider. You have these community commercial clusters so close together, so that's a great question and something for them to consider whether the use is appropriate.

Mr. Carbonneau stated if you look at the use of those 2 CC properties to the south they're totally different.

Mr. Cook continued with the CC you have a density of 10 per acre. That's too high a density for this area. They get the CC then decide they don't want to build an RV park, they want to build a high-density multi-family housing...

Ms. Gilliam responded they'd have to come back before the board, as he stated, and request a different zoning.

Mr. Cook or they could say we're not going to do 10, we're only going to do 5, so it will be better. My other concern is we have over 40 RV parks in the county, and they're supposed to be close to the interstate or a major intra-county road not inter-county, and it doesn't meet that criteria as well.

Ms. Gilliam responded it's about 24 miles from 528.

Mr. Cook continued if you look at where all the RV parks are clustered they're up in Titusville, on the interchange. That's where they're located. And, of course on the beach. Near a resort area, this is not a resort area. It's a rural, agricultural area and it's in transition to residential. I don't think an RV park there is the proper use at this point in time. The other thing is what a lot of people do is rent these spaces in the RV parks and then list them on Air BnB and you end up having big parties and people there. And the county does not have the resources to police that.

Ms. Hillberg stated there are homes along there with a rural, quiet environment.

Mr. Cook stated it goes to the character of the neighborhood.

Motion to recommend denial of Item H.1. by Chris Cook, seconded by Gina Lindhorst. Motion passed 3:1.

Motion to recommend denial of Item H.2. by Jim Carbonneau, seconded by Gina Lindhorst. Motion passed unanimously.

The meeting adjourned at 7:00 p.m.

PLANNING AND ZONING BOARD/LOCAL PLANNING AGENCY MINUTES

The Brevard County Planning & Zoning Board met in regular session on **Monday, April 20, 2026**, at **3:30 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 3:30 p.m.

Board members present were Mark Wadsworth, Chair (D4); Henry Minneboo, Vice-Chair (D2); John Hopengarten (D1); Ruth Amato (D1); Ron Bartcher (D2); Robert Wise (D2); Neal Johnson (D4); Ana Saunders (D5); Erika Orriss (D3); Robert Brothers (D5); and Melissa Jackson (D5).

Staff members present were Trina Gilliam, Planning and Zoning Manager; Paul Body, Planner; Alex Esseeesse, Deputy County Attorney; and Alice Randall, Operations Support Specialist.

EXCERPT OF COMPLETE AGENDA

H.3. Turtle Mound Ventures, LLC (Kim Rezanka) are requesting a Small-Scale Comprehensive Plan Amendment (26S.01) to change the Future Land Use designation from PUB (Public Facilities), RES-1 (Residential 1), and RES-2-DIR (Residential 2-Directive) to CC (Community Commercial). (26SS00001) (Tax Accounts 2316247, 2316452, 2316451, and 2315413) (District 2)

H.4. Turtle Mound Ventures, LLC (Kim Rezanka) are requesting a zoning classification change from GML(I) (Government Managed Lands - Institutional) and TR-1 (Single-Family Mobile Home) to RVP (Recreational Vehicle Park). (26Z00005) (Tax Accounts 2316247, 2316452, 2316451, and 2315413) (District 1)

Trina Gilliam read both item H.3. and H.4. into the record as they are companion applications. She added at their meeting on April 09, 2026, the North Merritt Island Dependent Special District Board unanimously recommended denial of both items. Also on this one, we are asking the board to consider the proposed point of ingress egress in relation to the character of the surrounding area as access to the local roads. One other thing that was not mentioned in the staff report that kind of is mentioned in the staff report is the density of the number of units. So, here we say proposed that they can get 283 lots. Of course, we know application of regulations can typically reduce development potential. And so, on this we are also asking the board to consider policy 2.10 as well which talks about limiting the density. It gives you the option if you want to make a recommendation to cap the density on this project.

Kim Rezanka spoke to the application. This is a project up in North Merritt Island off North Courtenay Parkway. This is old school board property that was surplus that my client bought several years ago. So, obviously, it was land that couldn't be used for schools but was intended for schools and now it has a future land use of public facilities and a zoning of governmentally managed lands which is very interesting. So, there are two applications. One is to change the future land use to community commercial and then to change the zoning to recreational vehicle park. This is on state road 3. It's only about 5 miles north of State Road 528, not 24 miles as was in the staff reports. As I said, it's formerly owned by the school board of Brevard County. It's approximately 28.37 acres and we need to change the community commercial future land use to allow RV park. We have no issues with limiting access to State Road 3. That makes perfect sense. We wouldn't go on McGruder. So, if we need a BDP for that, that's fine. Mr. Hopengarten, I heard you were at the North Merritt Island Special Dependent District Board meeting.

Mr. Hopengarten responded yes, I was.

Ms. Rezanka asked if he spoke against this item.

Mr. Hopengarten responded no, I did not. I just asked questions. Because I live just north of there.

Ms. Rezanka asked Do you own property up there.

Mr. Hopengarten responded, "No I rent."

Ms. Rezanka continued with the government managed lands is to recognize the presence of facilities that are managed by federal, state and local government special districts, organizations that partner with government. Obviously this is not appropriate any longer for government managed lands. The permitted uses are interesting. None of which my client wants to do. My client has developed a recreational vehicle park in Washington state. Those are the pictures that you have in your packet that were presented. Obviously there are different land use requirements in Washington than here. We have storm water. We have all kinds of things they may not have. So those pictures were just representative of something he has developed in the past. His business model is RV parks. But what could be here are cemeteries and mausoleums, group homes, parking lots or garages, space related activities, assisted living facilities, hospitals, recycled materials facilities, and then there's lots of conditional uses. Arsenals and explosives. We could have another night's armament here. Electrical, natural gas, water, wastewater utilities, hazardous waste facility, prison camps, solid waste management, and water and sewage treatment facilities. Obviously, none of those are appropriate in this place either. So, my client wants to come in and bring a luxury resort style recreational vehicle park to serve the needs of tourists, space launches, things along those lines. This property was purchased with that intent. Might have wanted to come to you first but did not; so here we are. This is a commercial use. There are many references in the staff report to residential use, but this is purely a commercial use, limited to the number of days you can stay at an RV park. 180 days is the maximum. The maximum intensity of the park is 10 sites per acre. Minimum site size is 2,000 square feet. Again, we don't have a site plan. It hasn't been developed. We don't have elevations. We don't have a lot of things to do a site plan yet. But all those things will be designed at the site plan stage as well as performance standards, lighting, noise, things along those lines. Buffering. Code requires that 10% of the land be used for recreational activities for the residents of the recreational vehicle park. So that'd be close to three acres if not more. The accessory uses allow be a laundry facility, playgrounds, picnic areas, swimming pools, ball and game courts, and a manager's residence. All of those are proposed for this. RV parks are not allowed to be permanent residences. So again, this is a commercial use. What I provided to you was a larger version of what you get in your packet. I don't believe the very limited narrow scope of your maps shows the full picture of this area. When you look at the future land use map, you see the area in blue that I colored, and you'll see what is around it. There is residential to the west. North, that is an old 1962 manufactured home community of quarter acre lots. There's also Teen Mission which has about 20 homes back there, which I was surprised to find as well. So, this is an interesting neighborhood. It's an old neighborhood. Most of them are not homesteaded, so they're mostly rental properties. Not that that matters, but they'll still be protected from any of the uses here. So, as you see if you go further north on Courtenay, you wind up with Air Liquide and the borrow pit, which came before you just two months ago. So, you have some commercial activities to the north, you have commercial activities to the south. You don't have many commercial activities. I don't believe you have a community cluster because there's not 10 acres of commercial activities to the south of here. But there are community commercial future land uses and neighborhood commercials all along Courtenay Parkway, which is considered a commercial corridor. If you look at the zoning map which is on the back side you have institutional which is the church

immediately to the east. Then going forward you have BU2. Then you have industrial going south. You have the fire station. You have a Dollar General store that's been permitted but not built, and several different BU1 uses and BU2 uses to the south. So again, this is a commercial corridor. This is intended for commercial use. Originally intended for a school that didn't work out. The staff report says there are no identifiable concurrency issues. North Courtenay Parkway will operate at 47.67% of maximum average vehicle utilization. Brief research on the internet says the average trip per site is about 4.1 which is much less than town homes, apartments or single-family homes. It will not generate school children as the park is a commercial use. It's located in a transitional area according to the staff report. The staff report does mention that there are a great deal of coastal high hazard and flood plain issues. Again, these will be addressed at site plan stage. This is not increasing residential density as the comp plan says. This is a commercial intensity issue. Coastal management element object 7 aims to limit densities. This is again not residential. Jake Wise is working on a concept plan. We don't have one, but he was the one who attended North Merritt Island Special Dependent District Board. If you have any questions about storm water, development, things that will come along with a site plan, he can answer those questions. We request approval of the change of the comprehensive plan to community commercial and the change of zoning to recreational vehicle park. If you want to put conditions on that through a BDP, we understand that, especially as to access.

Mr. Johnson inquired as far as RV Park, do you have any idea at this point since you're not at site plan, but how many sites would it have.

Ms. Rezanka responded the max it can have is 280, but when you start looking at flood plains and things like that, the recreational, the buffering, we don't know.

Mr. Hopengarten stated yes, he had been at the North Merritt Island District meeting inadvertently. So, it wasn't like I knew about this one coming up. I had a couple of questions at the time. Number one, how do you all propose to get into the park? The gentleman had said that they were coming in off Courtenay, but there's no lane to do that. It's a divided highway. And I was concerned because they would have to make a U-turn at Pine Island Road, which is where I live, and that would be a mess. Because there's no other way to go if you're going north to make the left turn into that property. So, that was one concern I had. Also, I had asked him if they would be willing to put a tree buffer along Courtenay so that we wouldn't see all the RV vehicles from the road and he was amendable to it. I also asked him if the RV vehicles were going to be parked on hardened pads.

Ms. Rezanka responded they must be, by the code.

Mr. Hopengarten continued with it's going to have your impervious surface issue. And, because you don't have a conceptual site plan, we don't know how much retention because flooding is a big issue up here. And we're very concerned about that. The last big storm in October, it took a week for the water to go away. It was quite a mess. Also, he had said something about putting a convenience store on the property and staff said that that was not allowed.

Ms. Rezanka stated I believe the "he" you're referring to is Jake Wise just to keep the record. I don't know about the access. Again, that's a site plan issue and it's going to have to be reviewed with FDOT since this is an FDOT road. So, I do not know what that is, but again, county is going to have to approve it. FDOT is going to have to approve it. Tree buffer is fine. RVs must be on pads, concrete pads pursuant to the code. And storm water is something that is addressed as a site plan. Also, with the flood plain issue and the coastal hazard area, those are going to have to be addressed. And it's

going to be run through the storm water modeling for North Merritt Island, which is the new protocol in that area. So, it's going to be looked at by many, many people.

Mr. Hopengarten asked if this was going to be on sewer.

Ms. Rezanka responded yes, it must be on sewer.

Mr. Bartcher asked about access to the park. It's my understanding they're going to have to create a cut through the median and DOT would have to authorize that. If DOT were to decide not to authorize that is that a deal breaker?

Ms. Rezanka responded with I do not know. Again, we're in site plan. I haven't had that conversation with the client. I don't know if Jake has. But even if it's access I don't know. I do not think there's that many median cuts that would prevent another one, but I do not know. I'm not an engineer.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Bill Boggs stated he has serious concerns. I've personally experienced flooding and know of the sensitivity of that area. The land that they show.... a bunch of stuff. Your people that did the research and the summary, excellent job. But you know the part that's the surge zone and the hydraulic and everything, four to six months out of the year that is underwater. That's almost half the property. If they are allowed to add fill that water's got to go somewhere and the only place it can go is the neighborhood to the northwest. Courtenay is built up much higher and it's almost like a wall. It's got to go north. It can't go south. I'd also like to point out the awkwardness of that location with Tropical Trail dumping out onto the middle of a curve of Courtenay and the major traffic flow during rush hours for the Cape. And the turn lanes are not appropriate for larger vehicles. I'm opposed.

Brian Bussen stated he's the land development manager for Outback Reserve which is the Dominus subdivision within 500 feet that hasn't started yet immediately to the west of this property. The engineers spent four years working with the county to get the drainage right, to get the permits for these 164 lots. Minimum half acres on 164 acres with the future being 40-acre botanical gardens in the middle of the subdivision. Our problem is having something that's going to be a high-end subdivision, probably the best-looking subdivision on North Merritt Island since the Savannas, and to have this commercial activity which will have its own management office and must be able to buy things on the run. So just part of that I'm sure will come in with some commercial usage, and there are 10 units per acre. My client spent four years getting the permits to start at one unit per acre. That's where I have a little bit of a problem with this. I'm speaking against this super commercial activity this close.

Mr. Minneboo stated I've known you long enough, Mr. Bussen, to call you Brian and marvelous job at the Savannas. Those lots, with the way that the property up there has been escalating in cost, those lots that you all are working on have got to be \$200,000 lots. Am I being realistic from what everybody else up there wants? \$100,000 an acre and then you fill another 100,000. So, I mean it's crazy.

Mr. Bussen responded I'm guessing at this point, but based on what I see, the numbers coming out, working with the plans, are going to be \$300,000 lots. It's going to have to be an upper end community and it's the prettiest piece of land on North Merritt Island.

Jack Kirschenbaum stated he is a trustee of the trust that is developing the Outback. It was the Ron

Demina property, and it's owned by the Domina Family Trust. For 45 years I came before this board and talked as a lawyer and now I'm talking as a representative of the owner, as an owner, and I'm not real comfortable with it. We've been working for over four years on the Outback. It is as complicated an engineering project as a lawyer that I've ever worked on. These lots are going to be spectacular. They're going to be half acre. They're going to be hugely expensive. The development will be something that North Merritt Island hasn't seen before. We are in the throes of completing it and getting it to the subdivision level and working the drainage out with the help of your staff. It has been a monumental project. I hardly ever speak against projects because all I ever did was come before you and ask for permissions and rezonings and the like, but we don't think this is consistent with the land use. We don't think it's compatible. We think the traffic issues are going to be insurmountable. We believe that this isn't the right project for this parcel. We would very much like to have seen a site plan. We would have liked to have seen answers to all the questions your staff has already asked, and it would be premature to grant these two requests before all ~~that~~ information is available and before you. We are so sensitive to transportation issues and ~~drainage~~ issues and development issues that it's just not the right time or place for this project.

Rose Plummer stated she is representing the North Merritt Island Homeowners Association. Based on our review, I'm here to speak in opposition to the requested small-scale comprehensive plan amendment. After reviewing this proposal, it's clear that ~~the~~ request to allow an RV park does not meet the requirements for a small-scale comprehensive plan amendment. There are already numerous RV parks operating in Brevard County and there is existing commercial space just 0.25 miles from the property. The applicant has not demonstrated a need that would justify changing the land use designation and additionally North Courtenay Parkway is not designated as a major multi-county transportation corridor. For these reasons, the site does not meet the locational criteria of policy 2.8F with respect to interstate accessibility or corridor designation. Approving this amendment would open the door for further land use changes down the road that are not in this community's best interest or long-term interest. Any amendment must be consistent with the comprehensive plan, and this proposal does not meet that threshold. Additionally, there are way too many unanswered questions. For these reasons, I respectfully recommend that you deny the request to change the SSCPA.

Christianne Connor began with I'm not an attorney and I wasn't prepared to speak. I wanted to see what other people were saying, but I'm just a concerned citizen. I think it's strange that this is called Turtle Mound Ventures. I can't even imagine. I have so many turtle mounds on my property. At some point, I'm hoping Brevard's going to step in and take care of the natural resources we have. I can't imagine 280 RVs on this piece of property. We already have a lot of environmental impact going on around that area. Additionally, I make a left right there to get on North Tropical Trail and I cannot make a left anymore between the hours of 3:30 and 5:00 p.m. at night as all the SpaceX and Blue Origin traffic comes down that way. We're going to have to have a light. So, I can't imagine the traffic impact of all these RVs and all the people going in and out of North Tropical Trail and Courtenay Parkway. The traffic with the barge bridge there, getting in and out. And as you all know, we don't have a school, so parents trying to get their kids to and from must get over the Barge bridge with all this traffic. Adding any more traffic is going to be devastating for this area. And again, yes, I think it would be great to have a tree line, but this area of Brevard is suffering from flooding and all the natural impacts. Even with the sewer system, I've been told multiple times, we can't have sewer on our property. Brevard can't handle the number of new residents in the sewer system that we have currently. So, I just don't know how we're going to tax it further. And that's just those are just my concerns. I'm opposed.

Katie McCarver stated from my back door, you can see the very tiptop of this piece of property that they're looking at to build this. And we are opposed. My husband and I are opposed to this because. I'm kind of piggybacking off what she said, and I'm glad you also brought it up, sir. The traffic would be monumental on my street, McGruder, which is kind of that back road between Pine Island and Tropical. And so, especially since it hasn't been improved yet, like he was saying, to have that left-hand turn and it's a lot of unanswered questions. It's a big concern of ours and mine and my neighbors that inevitably all these RVs are going to miss this turn and they're going to turn down Pine Island, come across McGruder where we do have children that play out there. We have several houses and things with small kids, me included. And we're very worried about that. And, we just would ask that you would consider all the neighbors back there that live and have to deal with that traffic and things. And the things that would come because of this and the worry that it's going to lower our property value as well. To have the tree line would help, but I can see the top of this property from my back door. And it's a concern for sure. And so, we appreciate your consideration that we oppose this.

Mary Hillberg started with I'm on the North Merritt Island special advisory board. Part four of the excellent staff comments that the staff has created for us noted that RES 1 is in all directions of this property. So, if we have RES 1 in every direction, then that would be our recommendation for the request. Pages 40, 41, 42, and 45 of the staff comments plainly demonstrate hydric soil, coastal flood zones, coastal high hazard areas and scrub jay occupancy on all those areas respectively. To suggest that traffic would not negatively affect this development or proposal is absurd. It would be a real nightmare. It'll congest that whole curve and it is very congested now and it's not going to get any less. The North Merritt Island Special Advisory Board voted to recommend denial of this application based on administrative policies 3A B C D and administrative policy 4A and B4 5B C and E and administrative policy 6A and B and administrative policy 7 as well as section 62 1151 of the Brevard code 1 3 4 and 5 as well as factors to consider 1 3 and 5 as firm basis for denial. We respectfully ask this board to follow our recommendations since we tried to offer an option. We would recommend RES1.

END PUBLIC COMMENT

Ms. Rezanka stated she wants to turn back to the zoning map again. There are many zonings in this area. We are not seeking residential use. The need for the change is because this was school board surplus property that is not being used as surplus. So, it needs a new use, and this is along a commercial corridor. With tourism as it's becoming, having these high-end luxury resorts that can have the RVs is going to be of great benefit to the community. The traffic concerns are not supported by the record, nor has any evidence been presented here today. In fact, the only evidence is the staff report. However, a traffic study will be required at site plan stage and that will require turn lanes, whatever we need to do to make it safe because we don't want anyone in the community not to be safe. We don't want the people that are staying here to not be safe. As for commercial use, there may be a little general store for laundry detergent and beer, but there's a Circle K less than half a mile down the street. So, there's not going to be full-blown commercial uses on this property. Looking at the staff report they're pretty much the same, but looking at the comprehensive plan analysis, it talks about the existing commercial development, talks about the gas and convenience store, that there was a Dollar General store approved, talks about community commercial activities located south of the subject property. It does talk about this being a transitional area. It's not truly residential. The outback development that Mr. Bussen is working on will be substantially buffered from here. And again, he is not an MIA appraiser. Mr. Kirschbaum's not an MIA appraiser. No one here has said that

there's going to be a depreciation value of their property by a high-end luxury RV park. Regarding the request for a site plan, Florida law does not require it. In fact, you cannot require it at zoning. It can be offered, but again, it's not even binding. You don't have a binding way to do that other than a binding development plan. There are conditions you want in the binding development plan such as buffering, no access on McGruder or things like that that can be put into a binding development plan. The drainage and flooding issues will obviously have to be addressed. We're going through that right now with the land alteration burrow pit. Spacewalk Groves is going through the storm water modeling program. It's costing them \$40,000 just to have it run by the experts. So, it's something that this project will also have to do. We're very aware of the flooding and we don't want the site to flood either nor the neighbors to flood. Again, this development proposal is for commercial and not residential use. Regarding the statement that the administrative policies support denial, they do not. There's nothing in your staff report that supports denial. It supports perhaps a review of whether it's compatible. This is a commercial corridor, it's compatible. It can be more compatible by buffering. There are no facts that are in the staff report or that were stated here today that support denial of this request. We have shown the need by the fact that this is surplus property that can only be developed for public facilities for governmental land. And so, a zoning change is needed. The request is for an RV park. We ask for approval of both requests.

Mr. Bartcher stated in the minutes from the North Merit Island meeting, Mr. Wise said that he expected there probably would be four to five trailer sites on the property as opposed to the 10 that's allowed.

Ms. Rezanka I didn't find those minutes anywhere. They weren't up on the website this morning when I looked.

Jake Wise stated he represented the project at the North Island Special Advisory Board, and they asked about the intensity because it is a commercial use, the number of potential sites. We've designed multiple RV parks in the past. Typically, we end up somewhere between four or five or six units per acre. This site has a triangular shape. It's a luxury. So bigger sites, more amenities, things like that, we anticipate being towards the lower end. So that's why we discussed the less than 10 units an acre. I've never seen one that was that intense and we are again just at the initial stage of zoning and land use. So, as Ms. Rezanka identified earlier all the points of access, utility extensions, buffering, wetland preservation, all those things are to be coming with the site plan, and we don't have any objection at all to a binding development plan. We would be happy to do that as we move forward with our specific site plan for this but it's a unique piece of property. It was supposed to be for school. So, buses would have had to be coming and going. Your peak hour AM would have been rough. RV parks are generally a very low traffic generator. There's not a lot of traffic coming and going daily for them. Any type of commercial use as Ms. Rezanka identified would be accessory to the RV park to provide a campground store or something like that for the residents well.

Mr. Bartcher stated he was wondering if they would be willing to, like Ms. Rezanka, entertain a BDP for example one that restricts the number of sites to say five or to six.

Mr. Wise responded yes, 10 would be high in our experience and so that is just the maximum that this zoning code happens to allow.

Mr. Bartcher stated I was wondering if you would be willing to entertain a BDP that would limit it to six.

Mr. Wise responded that it's something I'll have to confer with our client, and I can give you a quick answer on that.

Mr. Bartcher stated the other issue that I heard was traffic entrance way. Entrance into the property and out how it exits only on State Road 3 as opposed to using some of the side streets.

Mr. Wise stated they would not use the residential road to the north of them. That would not be our access at all. We fully anticipate, as I stated in the other meeting, that it would be coming off North Courtenay, but we'd have to of course work that out with DOT. Without a specific site plan, we don't know with 100% certainty how that'll be, but we would fully anticipate just like if it was a school site, school buses would have access to it from the main road. Typically, we would have the same. There could be a median cut that allows left ingress only. There's a lot of different things we can do to make sure there's plenty of safe travel. There's nothing we want more than to be able to come and go from a luxury RV park safely for the traveling public and for the residents. We're very aware of how busy it is in the PM peak hour, especially when people are leaving the space center in the evening. I've been in this area for a long time. I'm completely aware of that and especially the special flood zone areas. It's got a lot of different overlay districts. It's got the AE zoning on it and X zoning. So, that'll be a big part of our overall site plan. By county rule, by DOT rule, by state statute with St. John's we're not allowed to do anything that impacts adjacent property. So, we will have to maintain all our storm water on site. We'll provide a higher efficiency nutrient removal and all the other requirements that they have in addition to compensatory storage because it's on Merritt Island north of Hall Road. There are also additional restrictions for that as well.

Ms. Orriss stated that Ms. Rezanka had said that it is commercial, so we're not worried about increasing density in this area, but it is increasing density in a coastal high hazard area, is it not, it is significantly increasing density.

Mr. Wise responded density is based on residential uses and because it is a commercial use they look at it as intensity, that's how the staff report's written. So yes it would increase any use on this site, especially a school for example, which was the intention, would significantly increase trips and so that would be the case for any type of development on the site at all, would be an increase in trips. But we're proposing one that is a very low trip generator compared to most single-family homes, town homes typically are 10 trips a day. RV parks three or four. So, it's a significant reduction.

Ms. Saunders stated that in the meeting minutes from North Merritt Island, you had mentioned there was talk about this tree buffer and you had mentioned that was a great idea and the intent was to kind of create a more mature.... This place has been here for a while. Can you talk about that a little bit? I know it's not part of a site plan requirement. It's not technically in here, but can you give us an idea of the flavor of what you're looking for? Will you be trying to design around some of the larger trees and kind of create those moments or do we just not know that yet?

Mr. Wise responded what we typically do on most of our site plans, because of the new requirements, especially in Merrit Island, we elevate the sites to provide the treatment to not allow any runoff. So, our preservation opportunities are typically around the perimeter. And as I mentioned in the meeting, they were looking at some pictures with a beautiful mountain landscape at the back, from the state of Washington. It was in a valley. So, they were trying to compare that project to what it would look like. We were explaining that we wanted to have established preservation trees as much as we could around the perimeter where we're not typically elevating the site. Then we have more than likely

some wetland preservation areas and an upland buffer typically that we would preserve. I heard about a beautiful botanical garden on the other project nearby. We probably have similar vegetation and trees. So, there might be an opportunity for something like what they were talking about earlier. That's our best opportunity is that and we do want it to look mature. We do want to buffer especially the residential to the north. But we want it to be an attractive luxurious site that will be successful. And so that is the key component to that. And we will do a very specific site tree survey, and we'll make sure that we work around all the native mature trees as best we can.

Mr. Minneboo stated I probably know Merritt Island as good as any. We have really worked hard up there to try to make the North Courtenay corridor a business corridor. And we've tried not to add to the negative impacts of some of the things that have gone through there. This site just doesn't justify in anybody's mind that the true Merritt Islanders where it makes sense to operate or to have this in this triangle. You got a tremendous business, and you had two great spokesmen today to talk about a piece there that has been under development for four years just trying to get the permits and try to meet all the requirements, etc. And now this thing has become a three and \$400,000 lot location; and that's what you really want up there. Everybody owns land up there. I'm one of those people. We all own land and when you start talking about more modular homes, RV things, the inside talk is up there. They call it the combat zone. Nobody said today. But nobody checked with the sheriff's office. How many times do you go up there and there's negative things going on up there? You can't get a pizza delivered to your home on North Merritt Island on a tremendous piece of land because they don't want to go up there. They're not going to tell you that. But you must understand that area up there. It's designed for houses of major magnitude. You have Blue Origin just surrounds us. You have SpaceX that tries to buy us out every day. And so, there is no way I can support anything. I can't support a binding development plan for anything other than it's just not conducive to North Merritt Island.

Motion to recommend denial of item H.3. by Henry Minneboo, seconded by Robert Wise. Motion passed with a vote of 10:1.

Motion to recommend denial of item H.4. by Henry Minneboo, seconded by Erika Orriss. Motion passed with a vote of 10:1.

Meeting adjourned at 5:10 p.m.