

From: [Chelsey True](#)
To: [AdministrativeServices](#)
Subject: Public comment for planning and zoning review - Courtenay and Pioneer
Date: Saturday, November 29, 2025 1:04:39 PM

[EXTERNAL EMAIL] DO NOT CLICK links or attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

To Planning and Zoning for Brevard County

Re: Proposed Rezoning for 11-acre Parcel at Courtenay Pkwy & Pioneer Rd

Parcel ID: 24-36-14-00-259

Dear Members of the Agency,

My name is Chelsey True and I live in the neighborhood directly adjacent to the proposed multifamily development on Courtenay Parkway and Pioneer Road. I am submitting my public comment regarding the rezoning request for the parcel at Courtenay Parkway and Pioneer Road. I understand this item may be scheduled for the upcoming planning and zoning agenda and I would like my comments distributed to the board.

I want to be clear from the start: I am not opposed to development. Growth is inevitable, and it can bring positive improvements to our community. My concern is that this specific project, at this scale, on this particular corner, does not align with safe or responsible planning for Merritt Island.

This is an 11-acre parcel proposed for 222 multifamily units, three stories tall, with multiple access points feeding directly into a two-lane road in a school zone and a heavily congested five-lane arterial operating at 88% of capacity. When I reviewed and researched the data, the concerns fell into three key areas: traffic, compatibility, and environmental impact.

1. Traffic & Safety Concerns

A. Courtenay Parkway is already operating at 0.88 V/C

The Space Coast TPO confirmed that the corridor's current volume-to-capacity ratio is 0.88, meaning it is approaching its allowable limit.

A development generating 1,400–1,600 trips per day (a standard estimate for 222 units) would materially worsen congestion right where:

- A school creates daily queuing
- A drawbridge produces routine traffic backups
- Pioneer Road narrows to two lanes and funnels directly into neighborhoods

It is also worth noting that since 2022 this section of roadway has had an increase in ADT of 42%.

B. Pioneer Rd cannot safely absorb apartment-level traffic

Pioneer is a constrained two-lane road with no room for expansion. It already backs up during school drop-off/pickup. Adding a direct entrance from a 222-unit community would worsen this bottleneck.

C. The bridge, freeway on-ramps, and school traffic create compounding pressure

This is not a normal intersection. It is a stacked conflict zone where several congestion factors overlap. Adding several hundred daily apartment trips to this mix creates an obvious safety and mobility issue for residents, school families, and emergency vehicles.

2. Neighborhood Compatibility & Scale

This proposal changes the parcel from AG/Residential to Multifamily, jumping from very low-density use to one of the densest housing types available. Our surrounding neighborhoods consist of single-family homes with substantially lower density and height.

A three-story, 222-unit complex on an 11-acre site is a drastic departure from the existing pattern. It overwhelms the character, privacy, and scale of the adjacent neighborhoods. This is especially concerning because Merritt Island is unincorporated, and our infrastructure and services were not designed for high-density infill of this magnitude. Parking Demand: The developer is proposing 396 parking spaces for 222 units, or 1.78 spaces per unit. However, every available data source shows this is inadequate for a suburban, car-dependent community like Merritt Island:

- The U.S. Census Bureau ACS shows renter households in suburban areas average 2 vehicles per unit.
- The Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) Parking Generation Manual indicates mid-rise suburban apartments generate 2.0–2.3 parked vehicles per unit, well above the 1.78 proposed here.
- FDOT and the UF Shimberg Center report similar suburban averages of 1.9–2.2 vehicles per renter household.

Based on this, the proposed parking ratio is underbuilt by approximately 50–100 parking spaces, which would force overflow parking onto surrounding streets, nearby businesses, and neighborhood entrances. This is not compatible with surrounding single-family communities

3. Environmental & Stormwater Impact

A. Loss of 11 acres of mature tree canopy

Removing essentially the entire canopy will:

- Increase stormwater runoff
- Reduce natural drainage
- Raise localized flood risk
- Increase heat and reduce habitat

While developers may engineer stormwater ponds, engineered systems do not replace lost

natural retention. With recent storms and flooding across the county, removing this many acres of trees needs careful analysis.

B. This area has known drainage challenges

Even with engineered retention, clearcutting this much acreage on a low-lying barrier island, next to residential areas and near the river, carries meaningful impacts that should be fully evaluated before rezoning.

4. About the Developer

RangeWater is a high-volume multifamily developer known for:

- Producing dense, three-story, garden-style apartments
- Maximizing units per acre
- Removing most existing tree canopy
- Using surface parking with high turnover and vehicle demand
- Building “efficient” mid-range communities designed for quick leasing

This model may fit highly urban corridors with excess roadway capacity. It is not typically compatible with single-family neighborhoods or constrained arterial roads already approaching capacity.

This is not an issue with renters or multifamily housing. It is an issue of scale, location, and fit.

Conclusion

I support growth. I support improvement. But it must be responsible growth, aligned with the real conditions on the ground especially in areas already strained by traffic, school congestion, and constrained roadways.

This proposal, in its current form, does not meet that standard.

The applicant has acknowledged that the purchase of this property is contingent upon the approval of a rezoning that would allow significantly higher density than what the current zoning permits. This is a clear indication that the proposed development cannot be supported by the land under its existing constraints. If a project is only financially viable by increasing density threefold, that suggests the underlying capacity of the site (traffic, safety, stormwater, and compatibility) is already stretched.

I respectfully ask the Agency to consider the traffic capacity, neighborhood compatibility, and environmental impacts thoroughly before making a recommendation. We deserve development that enhances Merritt Island; not development that overwhelms it.

Thank you for your time and consideration. I look forward to discussing this further at the rezoning meeting.

Respectfully,

Chelsey True

Merritt Island Resident

Subject: Comprehensive Request for Denial of Zoning Application 25Z00054 – Parcel ID 24-36-14-00-259

Dear Members of the Planning and Zoning Board,

I am writing to formally and respectfully request denial of **Zoning Application No. 25Z00054**, which seeks a change in zoning classification for the property identified as **Parcel ID 24-36-14-00-259 (Tax Account No. 2412106)**, located on North Courtenay Parkway in Merritt Island.

I am a former Chairman of a Local Development Finance Authority in Huron Township, Michigan, where I worked closely with planning staff, zoning boards, and elected officials on land-use, redevelopment, and zoning matters. I am also a Merritt Island resident who owns property in close proximity to the subject parcel. I submit these comments based on that experience and on a careful review of the application materials, staff analyses, mapped resource data, and Brevard County's adopted Comprehensive Plan and zoning framework.

This letter is not an objection to growth or development in principle. Rather, it is a request that the County apply its zoning standards consistently, as it has done in prior cases, and deny a rezoning that is not supported by the record and that raises significant concerns related to plan consistency, compatibility, precedent, and long-term land-use integrity.

I. Inconsistency with the Comprehensive Plan and Classic Spot Zoning Indicators

The requested rezoning from **AU to RU-2-15**, with an associated development intensity of approximately **220 multi-family dwelling units**, represents a substantial increase in density and intensity that is not consistent with the intent, structure, or expectations established by the adopted Comprehensive Plan for this area.

Rezoning actions are intended to **implement** the Comprehensive Plan, not to override it or create parcel-specific exceptions that function as de facto policy changes. When a rezoning request introduces a use or density that materially departs from what the surrounding area has been planned to accommodate, it raises classic **spot zoning** concerns.

Spot zoning is not defined by size alone. It is identified by context: whether a single parcel is being singled out for preferential treatment that is inconsistent with surrounding zoning and land-use patterns, and whether the change advances a broad public purpose or primarily benefits a particular development proposal. In this case, the requested rezoning would single out one parcel for a level of intensity that is not reflected in the surrounding zoning framework, undermining the predictability and coherence of the Comprehensive Plan.

Approval under these circumstances would weaken the Plan's role as a guiding document and invite further requests that rely on exception rather than compliance.

II. Incompatibility with Surrounding Uses and Established Development Pattern

The subject property is located within an area characterized by lower-density residential development and long-established neighborhood patterns. These patterns reflect decades of zoning decisions and planning expectations that residents and property owners have relied upon.

Introducing multi-family development at the proposed density would significantly alter the character of the area and create incompatibilities related to:

- Scale and massing
- Intensity of use
- Traffic generation and circulation impacts
- Long-term land-use expectations

These impacts are not speculative. They are the predictable and cumulative effects of inserting a higher-intensity zoning district into an area that has not been planned, zoned, or built to support it.

In prior zoning cases, the County has routinely cited incompatibility with surrounding uses as a valid and sufficient basis for denial, particularly where a proposal represents a clear departure from the established development pattern.

III. Consistency with Prior Planning and Zoning Board Denials

Brevard County has a well-documented history of recommending and issuing denials where rezoning requests are inconsistent with adopted policy, incompatible with surrounding uses, or likely to set problematic precedent. The current request aligns closely with scenarios in which the Board has previously recommended denial.

A. Merritt Island Rezoning Denial (22Z00033 – August 15, 2022)

On August 15, 2022, the Planning and Zoning Board **unanimously recommended denial** of a rezoning request (**Application 22Z00033**) involving a change from **AU to RU-1-13** for a property located on **North Tropical Trail in Merritt Island**.

In that case, the Board heard testimony that the requested zoning was **out of character, incompatible with the surrounding area**, and would set a precedent encouraging similar requests. A Board member specifically noted that approving the request would “open the door” to additional rezonings and concluded that the proposal was “not conducive to this particular area.” The motion to recommend denial passed unanimously.

This case is directly relevant. It demonstrates the Board’s willingness to recommend denial where increased residential intensity would disrupt established land-use patterns and create precedent pressures—precisely the concerns raised by Application 25Z00054.

B. PUD Rezoning Denial (23PUD00001 – October 14, 2024)

Similarly, on October 14, 2024, the Planning and Zoning Board **unanimously recommended denial of Application 23PUD00001**, which sought to rezone property from **BU-1 and RU-2-10 to PUD**.

The minutes reflect that the request had been previously considered and that the Board had already recommended denial. Upon reconsideration, the Board again voted unanimously to recommend denial, reinforcing the principle that rezoning should not be approved simply because it is requested or resubmitted.

This case underscores that the Board consistently applies its standards and does not hesitate to recommend denial when the record does not support approval.

C. Broader Pattern of Denials to Preserve Plan Integrity

In addition to zoning cases, the Planning and Zoning Board has also recommended denial of **small-scale Comprehensive Plan amendments** where proposals were inconsistent with adopted policy or premature. For example, on August 12, 2024, the Board unanimously recommended denial of multiple plan amendment items, reinforcing the broader principle that the County prioritizes plan consistency over ad hoc changes.

Together, these actions demonstrate a clear and consistent history: when a request undermines adopted planning policy, compatibility, or long-term land-use coherence, **denial is not only appropriate but expected**.

IV. Reasonable and Economically Viable Use Exists Under Current Zoning

Denial of this application does not deprive the property of reasonable or economically viable use. The existing zoning designation allows lawful development that is consistent with surrounding land uses and long-standing planning objectives.

Rezoning is not intended to maximize development yield on a parcel-by-parcel basis, particularly where such maximization conflicts with adopted land-use policy. The existence of viable development options under current zoning weighs strongly against approval of the requested change.

V. Infrastructure Availability Does Not Cure the Land-Use Conflict

It is acknowledged that the subject property is served by an existing sewer system, eliminating the need for septic-based nitrogen mitigation. However, infrastructure availability alone does not

justify a zoning change that is otherwise inconsistent with the Comprehensive Plan or incompatible with surrounding development.

Environmental considerations—including wetlands, protected species, and tree preservation requirements—remain applicable. More importantly, zoning decisions must be based on land-use compatibility and policy consistency, not solely on the presence or absence of utilities.

VI. Public Interest, Precedent, and Long-Term Consequences

Zoning decisions are cumulative. Each approval sets expectations and shapes future requests. Approving this rezoning would:

- Signal that parcel-specific exceptions are acceptable
- Encourage similar requests in the surrounding area
- Weaken the County's ability to defend future denials

Denial, by contrast, reinforces predictability, fairness, and adherence to adopted policy. It protects both nearby property owners and the County's long-term planning framework.

Conclusion

For the reasons outlined above—including inconsistency with the Comprehensive Plan, classic spot zoning concerns, incompatibility with surrounding uses, a clear history of similar denials by the Planning and Zoning Board, the availability of reasonable use under current zoning, and the absence of a demonstrated public benefit—I respectfully request that **Zoning Application No. 25Z00054** be denied and that the existing zoning classification for **Parcel ID 24-36-14-00-259** remain unchanged.

Such a decision would be consistent with prior County actions, preserve the integrity of the zoning map, and uphold the principles that guide responsible land-use planning in Brevard County.

Respectfully submitted,

John C. Golovich
2540 Raintree Lake Circle
Merritt Island, FL 32953

I. Findings of Fact – Outline Supporting Denial

(Zoning Application No. 25Z00054 | Parcel ID 24-36-14-00-259)

A. Jurisdiction and Application

1. The Board has jurisdiction over **Zoning Application No. 25Z00054**, which requests a change in zoning classification for **Parcel ID 24-36-14-00-259**, located on North Courtenay Parkway, Merritt Island.
 2. The application requests a rezoning from **AU to RU-2-15**, allowing a significant increase in residential density and intensity.
-

B. Comprehensive Plan Consistency

3. The Brevard County Comprehensive Plan serves as the controlling policy framework for zoning decisions.
 4. Rezoning actions are intended to implement the Comprehensive Plan and are not intended to create parcel-specific exceptions or de facto plan amendments.
 5. The requested rezoning would allow a residential density and intensity that is not consistent with the intent and expectations of the adopted Comprehensive Plan for this area.
 6. Approval of the requested rezoning would undermine the role of the Comprehensive Plan as a predictable, guiding document for land-use decisions.
-

C. Spot Zoning Considerations

7. The requested rezoning would single out one parcel for treatment that is materially different from the surrounding zoning framework.
 8. The surrounding area is characterized by lower-density residential development and established land-use patterns.
 9. The requested zoning change exhibits characteristics of **spot zoning**, including preferential treatment of a single parcel without a corresponding public benefit or plan amendment.
 10. Approval of the request would weaken the consistency and integrity of the County's zoning map.
-

D. Compatibility with Surrounding Uses

11. The proposed rezoning would introduce a higher-intensity residential use that is incompatible with surrounding land uses in terms of scale, intensity, and character.
 12. Increased traffic, development intensity, and land-use impacts are foreseeable consequences of the proposed rezoning.
 13. The surrounding infrastructure and neighborhood pattern were not designed to accommodate the level of development intensity proposed.
-

E. Precedent and Consistency with Prior Board Actions

14. The Planning and Zoning Board has previously recommended denial of rezoning requests where increased intensity was incompatible with surrounding uses or inconsistent with adopted planning policy.
 15. Prior Board actions, including unanimous recommendations of denial for similar rezoning requests, demonstrate a consistent application of zoning standards.
 16. Approval of the requested rezoning would depart from this established pattern and make future denials of similar requests more difficult to defend.
-

F. Reasonable Use Under Existing Zoning

17. The subject property retains reasonable and economically viable use under its current zoning classification.
 18. Denial of the requested rezoning does not deprive the property owner of all reasonable use of the land.
 19. Rezoning is not required to ensure reasonable use of the property.
-

G. Infrastructure and Environmental Context

20. The property is served by an existing sewer system; however, infrastructure availability alone does not justify a zoning change that is inconsistent with adopted policy.
 21. Environmental considerations, including wetlands, protected species, and tree preservation requirements, remain applicable to the property.
 22. These considerations further support cautious, plan-consistent land-use decision-making.
-

H. Public Interest and Long-Term Planning

23. Zoning decisions have cumulative impacts and set expectations for future land-use requests.

24. Approval of the requested rezoning would encourage similar requests and erode predictability in the zoning process.
 25. Denial of the application is consistent with the public interest, long-term planning objectives, and the County's responsibility to apply zoning regulations uniformly.
-

I. Conclusion

26. Based on the foregoing findings, the requested rezoning is not consistent with the Comprehensive Plan, is incompatible with surrounding uses, raises spot zoning concerns, and is not required to ensure reasonable use of the property.
27. Denial of **Zoning Application No. 25Z00054** is supported by competent, substantial evidence in the record.

From: [Bob Davis](#)
To: [AdministrativeServices](#)
Cc: [Bob Davis](#)
Subject: Change of Zoning Classification ID# 25Z0054
Date: Sunday, January 11, 2026 9:20:15 AM

[EXTERNAL EMAIL] DO NOT CLICK links or attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Sadly I am unable to attend the P&Z Board meeting Monday, 12 Jan on the above subject.

I would like to voice my concern of rezoning this area from AU to the proposed RU-2-15 Medium and RU-2-30 High density.

To increase to a medium and high density for this property just adds more traffic to an area that is already saturated due to the nearby public elementary school, single family homes and recently, the assisted living/rehab facility and of course creature comfort businesses (car wash, coffee (yuk) and bank). Try getting around in your car from say 7:00- 9:00a.m. and of course in the afternoon from 2:00-3:30pm. Even during the M-F afternoon rush at the nearby SR 528 traffic can back up to this property. I live in the Villa DePalma subdivision which adjoins this property, making an easterly turn from Southerly SR3 onto Via De La Renia is impossible (so much so I have to traverse to the light at Pioneer). Now it is proposed to add additional traffic?

That said until the Florida State DMV traffic plan for State Road 3 (Courtenay Pkwy) corridor is finalized this property, and all others, should remain at the lowest density. Most definitely NOT high density as proposed! Even if this is approved the developer should be held responsible for accommodating access to and from this property (turn lanes, no left turn to southerly SR3, barrier to prevent, etc.,) and also accommodate homeowner's requests whose property is directly against this property to help soften the massive proposed 3 story facility or parking lots.

Has the P&Z considered looking at traffic accidents at SR 3 and Via De La Renia (Villa DePalmas entrance) or Ventian Way intersections? It should be part of the discussions!

Thank you.

Robert Davis
102 Via Havarre
Merritt Island, FL 32953
321-480-5693

From: [Gayle Allenback](#)
To: [AdministrativeServices](#)
Subject: Request for Denial of Zoning Application 25Z00054 – Parcel ID 24-36-14-00-259
Date: Monday, January 12, 2026 1:23:06 AM

[EXTERNAL EMAIL] DO NOT CLICK links or attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Dear Members of the Planning and Zoning Board,

My name is Gayle Allenback, and I live here on Merritt Island near the parcel that's the subject of Zoning Application No. 25Z00054, located on North Courtenay Parkway.

I understand that our community will continue to change, and I support development when it's done thoughtfully and responsibly. My concern today isn't about development itself, or even about the possibility of higher-density residential use. It's specifically about the proposal to remove the Building Site Plan requirement.

Building Site Plans exist to give everyone—neighbors, future residents, and the County—some clarity and confidence about how a property will be developed. They help ensure that projects meet safety standards, follow established development rules, and fit reasonably with surrounding properties. From a neighbor's perspective, they provide predictability, and that predictability matters in a community like ours.

Removing that requirement creates uncertainty. It makes it harder for nearby residents to understand what may be built and how it could affect traffic, infrastructure, and neighborhood character over time. Those safeguards don't just protect current homeowners; they also help ensure that any future development on the parcel is successful and well-integrated into the community.

Based on these concerns—along with issues of compatibility, consistency with existing planning policies, previous Board decisions on similar requests, and the fact that the property already has reasonable use under its current zoning—I respectfully ask that this zoning application be denied. I also want to echo concerns already raised by fellow resident John Golovich regarding the lack of a clear public benefit associated with this request.

Thank you for listening and for the work you do on behalf of our community. I appreciate your consideration of the perspectives of those of us who live nearby and care deeply about Merritt Island's future.

Respectfully,

Gayle Allenback

2405 Raintree Lake Circle

Merritt Island, FL 32953





From: Amanda Smith <321smithamanda@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, January 15, 2026 4:56 PM
To: Zoning <Zoning@brevardfl.gov>
Subject: Rezoning 25Z00054

[EXTERNAL EMAIL] DO NOT CLICK links or attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

To: Brevard County Zoning Department
Re: Rezoning Application [25Z00054](#)

To whom it may concern,

I am writing to formally express my strong opposition to Rezoning Application 25Z00054 due to the significant negative impacts it would have on traffic safety, infrastructure capacity, and long-established surrounding neighborhoods.

Courtenay Parkway already experiences heavy traffic congestion throughout the day, particularly during peak commuting hours. Any additional traffic generated by a proposed 222-unit apartment complex would substantially worsen existing conditions. This congestion is not merely inconvenient—it presents serious and ongoing safety concerns for residents who depend on this corridor for daily travel.

Of particular concern is Pioneer Road, which serves as a designated school zone for Lewis Carroll Elementary School. Traffic is already heavy during morning drop-off and afternoon pick-up hours. Adding traffic from a development of this size would further strain this roadway, increasing risks to children, pedestrians, school staff, and residents.

I am a resident of Villa de Palmas, and I experience these issues firsthand. Turning south onto Courtenay Parkway from Via de la Reina is already dangerous due to traffic volume and speed. I am frequently forced to exit the neighborhood from the rear and use the traffic light at Pioneer Road simply to travel south safely. Additional traffic from this development would create even more congestion and delays at an already overburdened intersection, negatively impacting all surrounding communities.

Another major concern is parking inadequacy. The proposed complex provides only 394 parking spaces for 222 units, which is insufficient when accounting for residents, multiple-vehicle households, and visitors. This shortfall will inevitably result in overflow parking along Pioneer Road, which would further disrupt traffic flow and create additional safety hazards for pedestrians and cyclists who use this corridor.

Additionally, stormwater and water management must be carefully considered. Residents in Rain Tree by the Lake and Villa de Palmas already experience flooding issues during heavy storms. Existing pump stations frequently become overwhelmed and back up during significant rainfall events. Increasing impervious surfaces and runoff from a development of this size would place further strain on an already stressed drainage system, increasing the likelihood of flooding for residents who have lived in these neighborhoods for decades.

This rezoning request raises serious concerns regarding traffic safety, school-zone congestion, parking overflow, and flood risk. The existing infrastructure is not equipped to safely or responsibly support a development of this scale.

For these reasons, I respectfully urge the Commissioners to **deny approval of Rezoning Request 25Z00054** and to prioritize the safety, infrastructure limitations, and quality of life of current residents and families in the surrounding communities.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,

Amanda Smith

116 Via Havarre, Merritt Island

Resident/Owner, Villa de Palmas

Greetings Mrs. Katie Delaney and staff,

I am emailing you to state the importance of maintaining Merritt Island's current zoning laws and codes. The proposed development of the lot on Pioneer and Courtney is a grave flooding risk for nearby homes. That wetland absorbs rain water, and is one of the reasons the local neighborhood has been protected from flooding. Housing is a critical issue, and so any development plan which puts current housing at risk as well as reducing the quality of life for current residents is not a smart development plan. I urge to vote against the proposed rezoning.

Thank you.

Best regards,
Ethan Herrell

Merritt Island resident

From: [Dan Tweed](#)
To: [Commissioner, D1](#); [Commissioner, D2](#); [Commissioner, D3](#); [Commissioner, D4](#); [Commissioner, D5](#)
Cc: [Lynn Tweed](#)
Subject: Rezoning Proposal for Merritt Island Apartment Units at Pioneer Road and Courtenay Parkway
Date: Monday, January 19, 2026 3:03:42 PM

[EXTERNAL EMAIL] DO NOT CLICK links or attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

We are writing in vigorous opposition to subject rezoning proposal and strongly urging you to deny it. We understand that the Merritt Island Redevelopment Agency recommended against the request but that there was a tie vote by the Planning and Zoning Board, and that it is now up to our County Commissioners to disposition the request. PLEASE do the right and sensible thing and kill this project!!

We have lived on Raintree Lake Circle for over 4 decades and have endured countless negative effects due to nearby residential and commercial growth, with a substantial spike in just the past few years with Hampton Manor, Starbucks, Twins Car Wash and Space Coast Credit Union all chipping away at our green spaces and tranquility.

We are all for progress and sensible development but this proposal is a terrible idea. It would exacerbate the already extremely congested and unsafe conditions on both Courtenay Parkway and Pioneer Road. On a daily basis, we witness red light runners at the intersection of Courtenay Parkway and Pioneer Road. Courtenay currently backs up frequently in both directions from SR 528 past Pioneer, and Pioneer already backs up nearly to Courtenay every afternoon with Lewis Carroll Elementary traffic. Dumping additional vehicles from hundreds of new residences would create serious logjams on both roads and preclude the ability to properly and safely manage traffic flow and signal timing. In addition, this project will have a significant impact on existing storm drainage systems and greatly increase the potential for flooding our homes.

I'm sure you have been made aware of a few key points that should make for an easy decision to deny this request:

- Affected roadway(s) already at 88% capacity and this proposed project exceeds the "25% of remaining capacity" rule
- The proposed project is clearly incompatible with our community, with the rezoning report admitting that a complex with 222 units is not consistent with the surrounding single family neighborhoods
- This proposed project represents "spot zoning," placing a high density apartment complex in a low density residential pocket. Under Administrative Policy #3, this use will significantly diminish the quality of life and the safety of existing neighborhoods through noise and traffic.

We must acknowledge that zoning rules are in place for good reason. Please do your duty, stand up for your constituents, and deny this rezoning proposal.

Thank you for your time and serious attention to this important matter.

Daniel and Lynn Tweed
2855 Raintree Lake Circle

Merritt Island

Sent from my iPad

Commissioner,

Please vote no on re-zoning the property on the corner of Courtney and Pioneer Rd!

Thank you,

David Pratt

1645 Seashell

Merritt Island

From: [Dave P](#)
To: [Commissioner, D1](#); [Commissioner, D2](#); [Commissioner, D3](#); [Commissioner, D4](#); [Commissioner, D5](#)
Subject: Please vote no
Date: Monday, January 19, 2026 10:57:19 AM

[EXTERNAL EMAIL] DO NOT CLICK links or attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Commissioner,
Please vote no on re-zoning the property on the corner of Courtney and Pioneer Rd!

Thank you,
David Pratt
1645 Seashell
Merritt Island

From: [Dan Tweed](#)
To: [Commissioner, D1](#); [Commissioner, D2](#); [Commissioner, D3](#); [Commissioner, D4](#); [Commissioner, D5](#)
Cc: [Lynn Tweed](#)
Subject: Rezoning Proposal for Merritt Island Apartment Units at Pioneer Road and Courtenay Parkway
Date: Monday, January 19, 2026 3:03:42 PM

[EXTERNAL EMAIL] DO NOT CLICK links or attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

We are writing in vigorous opposition to subject rezoning proposal and strongly urging you to deny it. We understand that the Merritt Island Redevelopment Agency recommended against the request but that there was a tie vote by the Planning and Zoning Board, and that it is now up to our County Commissioners to disposition the request. PLEASE do the right and sensible thing and kill this project!!

We have lived on Raintree Lake Circle for over 4 decades and have endured countless negative effects due to nearby residential and commercial growth, with a substantial spike in just the past few years with Hampton Manor, Starbucks, Twins Car Wash and Space Coast Credit Union all chipping away at our green spaces and tranquility.

We are all for progress and sensible development but this proposal is a terrible idea. It would exacerbate the already extremely congested and unsafe conditions on both Courtenay Parkway and Pioneer Road. On a daily basis, we witness red light runners at the intersection of Courtenay Parkway and Pioneer Road. Courtenay currently backs up frequently in both directions from SR 528 past Pioneer, and Pioneer already backs up nearly to Courtenay every afternoon with Lewis Carroll Elementary traffic. Dumping additional vehicles from hundreds of new residences would create serious logjams on both roads and preclude the ability to properly and safely manage traffic flow and signal timing. In addition, this project will have a significant impact on existing storm drainage systems and greatly increase the potential for flooding our homes.

I'm sure you have been made aware of a few key points that should make for an easy decision to deny this request:

- Affected roadway(s) already at 88% capacity and this proposed project exceeds the “25% of remaining capacity” rule
- The proposed project is clearly incompatible with our community, with the rezoning report admitting that a complex with 222 units is not consistent with the surrounding single family neighborhoods
- This proposed project represents “spot zoning,” placing a high density apartment complex in a low density residential pocket. Under Administrative Policy #3, this use will significantly diminish the quality of life and the safety of existing neighborhoods through noise and traffic.

We must acknowledge that zoning rules are in place for good reason. Please do your duty, stand up for your constituents, and deny this rezoning proposal.

Thank you for your time and serious attention to this important matter.

Daniel and Lynn Tweed
2855 Raintree Lake Circle

Merritt Island

Sent from my iPad

From: [Ethan Guthrie Herrell](#)
To: [Commissioner, D4](#)
Subject: Vote Against Merritt Island Rezoning
Date: Monday, January 19, 2026 4:32:35 PM

[EXTERNAL EMAIL] DO NOT CLICK links or attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Greetings Mr. Rob Feltner and staff,
I am emailing you to state the importance of maintaining Merritt Island's current zoning laws and codes. The proposed development of the lot on Pioneer and Courtney is a grave flooding risk for nearby homes. That wetland absorbs rain water, and is one of the reasons the local neighborhood has been protected from flooding. Housing is a critical issue, and so any development plan which puts current housing at risk as well as reducing the quality of life for current residents is not a smart development plan. I urge you to vote against the proposed rezoning.
Thank you.

Best regards,
Ethan Herrell
Merritt Island resident

From: [Chelsey Bjork](#)
To: [AdministrativeServices](#)
Cc: [Commissioner, D1](#); [Commissioner, D2](#); [Commissioner, D3](#); [Commissioner, D4](#); [Commissioner, D5](#)
Subject: Public comment for record - rezoning application 25Z00054
Date: Tuesday, January 20, 2026 11:42:11 AM

[EXTERNAL EMAIL] DO NOT CLICK links or attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Dear Planning and Zoning Staff,

Please include the following statement as part of the public record for the referenced rezoning application:

“For clarity, the proposed three-story height reflects the maximum height permitted under the requested zoning and should not be characterized as a voluntary reduction or mitigation measure. Compliance with height limitations does not reduce the intensity, traffic generation, or infrastructure demands associated with the proposed density.”

Thank you for ensuring this clarification is included in the official record.

Respectfully,

Chelsey True

Merritt Island Resident

From: [Marlene Corbett](#)
To: [Commissioner, D1](#); [Commissioner, D5](#); [Commissioner, D4](#); [Commissioner, D3](#); [Commissioner, D2](#)
Subject: NO to Rezoning on Merritt Island
Date: Tuesday, January 20, 2026 12:20:24 PM

[EXTERNAL EMAIL] DO NOT CLICK links or attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Urge Brevard County Commissioners to oppose rezoning on Merritt Island.

From: [Teresa Nick](#)
To: [Commissioner, D1](#); [Commissioner, D2](#); [Commissioner, D3](#); [Commissioner, D4](#); [Commissioner, D5](#)
Subject: Rezoning 25Z00054
Date: Tuesday, January 20, 2026 12:49:56 PM

[EXTERNAL EMAIL] DO NOT CLICK links or attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Dear Commissioners,

I have been made aware of a rezoning meeting/ vote that will be occurring on February 5th for the land north of pioneer road. I encourage you to leave this land alone. These rare parcels of land are needed for wildlife corridors and are detrimental to maintaining Florida's natural beauty and endangered habitats. This is one of the few areas that exist for wildlife to pass from Ulumay Sanctuary to north of the barge and potential up to Pine Island Sanctuary and Merritt Island National Wildlife Refuge.

LEWIS Carroll Elementary School families will also be negatively impacted by the extra traffic and congestion and construction. This area is already a mess during pickup and drop off times. I URGE you to be an advocate for Merritt Islands minimal untouched lands. Thank you!

The local advisory boards (MIRA and P&Z) couldn't find a majority to support this project. As representatives of the entire county, the Commissioners should not override the local experts and the very residents who will be most impacted by this decision.

- The road is already at 88% capacity and this project exceeds the "25% of remaining capacity" rule
- Compatibility: The report admits 222 units is "not consistent" with the surrounding single-family neighborhoods.
- This project represents 'Spot Zoning'—placing a high-density apartment complex in a low-density residential pocket. Under Administrative Policy #3, this use will significantly diminish the quality of life and safety of the existing neighborhood through noise and congestion.



REZONING NOTICE

25Z00054

The Brevard County Planning & Zoning Board will hold a public hearing at 3:00 P.M., on JANUARY 12, 2026, at the Brevard County Government Center, Building C, 2725 Judge Fran Jamieson Way, Viera, FL, to consider the proposed zoning action on the property as indicated below:

Owner: Merritt Bidco SPV LLC (Kim Rezanka)

Present Zoning: AU with BSP

Acreage: 11.24 ACRES

Requested Action(s): RU-2-15 (Medium-Density Multiple-Family Residential) & RU-2-30 (High-Density Multiple-Family Residential with removal of BSP)

The recommendations from the aforementioned public hearing will be presented to the County Commission at 5:00 P.M., on FEBRUARY 05, 2026, at the Brevard County Government Center, Building C, 2725 Judge Fran Jamieson Way, Viera. Interested parties are invited to appear and be heard. Written comments filed with the Brevard County Zoning Official, Brevard County Government Center, 2725 Judge Fran Jamieson Way, Viera, FL 32940 will be considered.

Removal of this sign prior to FEBRUARY 05, 2026, is illegal and subject to prosecution.

GEWATER

BUILDING #1 TYPE 4

BUILDING #2 TYPE 3

BUILDING #3 TYPE 4

BUILDING #4 TYPE 2

BUILDING #5 TYPE 3

BUILDING #6 TYPE 4

BUILDING #7 TYPE 2

BUILDING #8 TYPE 2

CLUB HOUSE

RETENTION POND

TRASH

SW-1 (0.14 ac.±)

N Courtenay Pkwy

Merritt Island

1 Density Study - Option 1

Scale: 1" = 100'-0"

PIC·COLLA

25 Poole & Poole Architecture, LLC, 4240 Park Place Court, Glen Allen, Virginia, 23060

Warm Regards,
Teresa V. Nick
321-704-4161

"To love a place is not enough. We must find ways to heal it."

– Robin Wall Kimmerer, *Braiding Sweetgrass: Indigenous Wisdom, Scientific Knowledge and the Teachings of Plants*

From: [Thomas Dixon](#)
To: [Commissioner, D4](#)
Date: Friday, January 23, 2026 7:28:03 PM
Attachments: [.png](#)
[.png](#)
[.png](#)
[.png](#)

[EXTERNAL EMAIL] DO NOT CLICK links or attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

We are closing in on 1,500 signatures to stop the 222-apartment complex at the corner of Pioneer and N. Courtenay. This location cannot support this project 🚫

We are so close! Our petition is gaining major traction, and we've confirmed the County Commissioners are officially paying attention. To protect our island, we are aiming for 1,500+ signatures by next week!

If you can't attend the upcoming meeting, your email is your vote. Please take 60 seconds to send a quick message to the Commissioners letting them know we demand Smart Growth, not dangerous over-development.

Why this project is wrong for Merritt Island:

⚠️ **PUBLIC SAFETY:** The Staff Report (p. 10) explicitly warns of a "Material Danger to Public Safety."

🚗 **TRAFFIC:** Our roads are already at 88% capacity. This project violates the "25% remaining capacity" rule.

🏠 **INCOMPATIBLE:** Even the county admits 222 units is NOT consistent with our single-family neighborhoods.

🚫 **NO LOCAL SUPPORT:** Our local advisory boards (MIRA/P&Z) refused to back this project
Sent from my iPad

From: [Greg McClasky](#)
To: [Commissioner, D1](#); [Commissioner, D2](#); [Commissioner, D3](#); [Commissioner, D4](#); [Commissioner, D5](#)
Subject: Please reject the 222-apartment complex at the corner of Pioneer and N. Courtenay
Date: Friday, January 23, 2026 9:44:42 PM

[EXTERNAL EMAIL] DO NOT CLICK links or attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Please reject the 222-apartment complex at the corner of Pioneer and N. Courtenay.

Why this project is wrong for Merritt Island:

⚠️ **PUBLIC SAFETY:** The Staff Report (p. 10) explicitly warns of a "Material Danger to Public Safety." If you've ever tried to drive on Pioneer or turn onto Courtenay when the elementary school children are being dropped off and picked up, you'd have a better understanding of one of the safety issues. I also know that it is very risky trying to turn left (southbound) on Courtenay from Venetian Way.

TRAFFIC: North Courtenay is already at 88% capacity. This project violates the "25% remaining capacity" rule.

INCOMPATIBLE: Even the county admits 222 units is NOT consistent with our single-family neighborhoods.

NO LOCAL SUPPORT: Our local advisory boards (MIRA/P&Z) refused to back this project. Many residents in the area are also concerned about lower property values and privacy issues with being so close to the 3-story buildings. After increase issues with flooding since developers built Starbucks, Hampton Manor, and the car wash on the southwest corner, many concerned about flooding issues even though this developer says "trust us".

From: [Tina McClasky](#)
To: [Commissioner, D1](#); [Commissioner, D2](#); [Commissioner, D3](#); [Commissioner, D4](#); [Commissioner, D5](#)
Subject: Please reject the 222-apartment complex at the corner of Pioneer and N. Courtenay.
Date: Friday, January 23, 2026 9:52:37 PM

[EXTERNAL EMAIL] DO NOT CLICK links or attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Please reject the 222-apartment complex at the corner of Pioneer and N. Courtenay.

Why this project is wrong for Merritt Island:

⚠️ **PUBLIC SAFETY:** The Staff Report (p. 10) explicitly warns of a "Material Danger to Public Safety." If you've ever tried to drive on Pioneer or turn onto Courtenay when the elementary school children are being dropped off and picked up, you'd have a better understanding of one of the safety issues. I also know that it is already very risky trying to turn left (southbound) on Courtenay from Venetian Way.

TRAFFIC: North Courtenay is already at 88% capacity. This project violates the "25% remaining capacity" rule.

INCOMPATIBLE: Even the county admits 222 units is NOT consistent with our single-family neighborhoods.

NO LOCAL SUPPORT: Our local advisory boards (MIRA/P&Z) refused to back this project. Many residents in the area are also concerned about lower property values and privacy issues with being so close to the 3-story buildings. After increased issues with flooding since developers built Starbucks, Hampton Manor, and the car wash on the southwest corner, many residents are concerned about flooding issues even though this developer says "trust us", as I suspect the other developer also said.

Dear Members of the Planning Commission,

I am writing to formally oppose the proposed apartment development planned for my neighborhood.

First, the traffic impact alone makes this project inappropriate. The primary roadway serving this area is already operating at approximately 88% capacity. Approving a development of this size would exceed the established policy limiting projects to no more than 25% of remaining roadway capacity. This is not a theoretical concern—it directly affects daily safety, emergency response times, and overall livability for current residents.

Second, the project fails the most basic test of compatibility. The development report itself acknowledges that 222 apartment units are “not consistent” with the surrounding single-family residential neighborhoods. This admission alone should disqualify the proposal. Introducing high-density housing into a clearly low-density area disregards the existing character and long-term planning intentions for this neighborhood.

Finally, this proposal conflicts with Administrative Policy #3, which exists specifically to prevent situations like this. Placing a high-density apartment complex within a low-density residential pocket will significantly diminish the quality of life and safety of the existing neighborhood. Increased traffic congestion, noise, and overcrowding are unavoidable consequences that current residents will be forced to absorb.

Growth should be intentional, compatible, and infrastructure-supported. This project is none of those. I respectfully urge the Commission to deny approval and protect the safety, character, and quality of life of our neighborhood.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,

Amanda Palmer

Concerned Resident

ts and concerns regarding the zoning request on Merritt Island.

1. Property values. Please see the attached photo. This home is for sale in Raintree. You can see in the background beautiful live oak trees and other foliage. This homes property line borders the proposed site of a towering apartment complex. Won't that be a lovely sight when everything is cleared from that lot and viewing that home, instead of nature, you will see tall buildings with a direct view of everything you do. Gatherings in back yard, pool time, etc. No privacy whatsoever. Values for homes bordering that complex will plummet. I would venture to say all homes in Raintree will suffer. Who will want to purchase in there when as soon as you enter the neighborhood the entire length of the road you enter borders towering apartment buildings.
2. Traffic. The proposed main entrance appears to be via Courtenay. Since there are 0 grocery stores, 0 retail shops, 0 restaurants to the north of there, it only makes sense 200+ car owners will be using Pioneer as the exit point from that complex if they want to go south. Only someone with a death wish try's to make a left turn onto Courtenay without a light. Pioneer is heavily travelled. There is only one way in/out of Raintree, that is via Pioneer. Lewis Carroll grade school is only about 1/4 mile down off Pioneer. Traffic backs up terribly, and with Pioneer and Courtenay light being a school crossing, there are numerous walkers/riders of grade school age as well as cars both at drop off and pickup. Courtenay in itself is sometimes a nightmare. With drawbridge only 1/2 mile north of Pioneer, I have seen traffic back up south of Pioneer.
3. Safety. In event of evacuation, we are talking possibility of an extra 300 cars or more trying to exit the island, all jammed right at the Beachline. Is our small island Fire department equipped to handle a major emergency such as fire in a complex this size, especially with homes in such close proximity?
4. Schools. Possible impact to our schools. They already use trailers placed for extra classrooms.
5. I fail to see any benefit whatsoever for rezoning this land to multi family. Too many vehicles, too much impact on our roads and schools, and possible devastation to property values. Towering apartments are meant for people who want water views, not looking into people's backyards and onto a busy road.

Thank you for taking these thoughts into consideration when you vote.

PLEASE vote NO!



Back to listing

Photos

Take a tour

Save Home

Share



For sale: \$375,000 (3 beds, 2 baths, 1,572 Square Feet)

Sent from my iPad

Please Stop this action for the following reasons (to name a few)...

Why this project is wrong for Merritt Island:

 **PUBLIC SAFETY:** The Staff Report (p. 10) explicitly warns of a "Material Danger to Public Safety."

 **TRAFFIC:** Our roads are already at 88% capacity. This project violates the "25% remaining capacity" rule.

 **INCOMPATIBLE:** Even the county admits 222 units is NOT consistent with our single-family neighborhoods.

 **NO LOCAL SUPPORT:** Our local advisory boards (MIRA/P&Z) refused to back this project.

And don't forget the growing flooding issue in this area...

Sincerely
Jean Nordfors

Sandra Muller called our office to say she is opposed to the proposed apartment complex on or near Courtney and Pioneer.



From: [Debbie Montgomery](#)
To: [Commissioner, D1](#); [Commissioner, D2](#); [Commissioner, D3](#); [Commissioner, D4](#); [Commissioner, D5](#)
Subject: Fwd: Rezoning
Date: Wednesday, January 28, 2026 9:30:01 PM
Attachments: [Screenshot 2026-01-27 at 1.59.08 PM.png](#)

[EXTERNAL EMAIL] DO NOT CLICK links or attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Sent from my iPad

Begin forwarded message:

From: Debbie Montgomery <debmontgomery09@gmail.com>
Date: January 28, 2026 at 9:06:05 PM EST
To: Debbie Montgomery <debmontgomery09@gmail.com>
Subject: Rezoning

ts and concerns regarding the zoning request on Merritt Island.

1. Property values. Please see the attached photo. This home is for sale in Raintree. You can see in the background beautiful live oak trees and other foliage. This homes property line borders the proposed site of a towering apartment complex. Won't that be a lovely sight when everything is cleared from that lot and viewing that home, instead of nature, you will see tall buildings with a direct view of everything you do. Gatherings in back yard, pool time, etc. No privacy whatsoever. Values for homes bordering that complex will plummet. I would venture to say all homes in Raintree will suffer. Who will want to purchase in there when as soon as you enter the neighborhood the entire length of the road you enter borders towering apartment buildings.
2. Traffic. The proposed main entrance appears to be via Courtenay. Since there are 0 grocery stores, 0 retail shops, 0 restaurants to the north of there, it only makes sense 200+ car owners will be using Pioneer as the exit point from that complex if they want to go south. Only someone with a death wish try's to make a left turn onto Courtenay without a light. Pioneer is heavily travelled. There is only one way in/out of Raintree, that is via Pioneer. Lewis Carroll grade school is only about 1/4 mile down off Pioneer. Traffic backs up terribly, and with Pioneer and Courtenay light being a school crossing, there are numerous walkers/riders of grade school

age as well as cars both at drop off and pickup. Courtenay in itself is sometimes a nightmare. With drawbridge only 1/2 mile north of Pioneer, I have seen traffic back up south of Pioneer.

3. Safety. In event of evacuation, we are talking possibility of an extra 300 cars or more trying to exit the island, all jammed right at the Beachline. Is our small island Fire department equipped to handle a major emergency such as fire in a complex this size, especially with homes in such close proximity?
4. Schools. Possible impact to our schools. They already use trailers placed for extra classrooms.
5. I fail to see any benefit whatsoever for rezoning this land to multi family. Too many vehicles, too much impact on our roads and schools, and possible devastation to property values. Towering apartments are meant for people who want water views, not looking into people's backyards and onto a busy road.

Thank you for taking these thoughts into consideration when you vote.
PLEASE vote NO!

Sent from my iPad

From: [gigi nordfors](#)
To: [Commissioner, D1](#); [Commissioner, D2](#); [Commissioner, D3](#); [Commissioner, D4](#); [Commissioner, D5](#)
Subject: Proposed 222 Unit Apartment complex, Corner of Pioneer and Courtenay, Merritt Island
Date: Wednesday, January 28, 2026 7:47:48 PM

[EXTERNAL EMAIL] DO NOT CLICK links or attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Please Stop this action for the following reasons (to name a few)...

Why this project is wrong for Merritt Island:

PUBLIC SAFETY: The Staff Report (p. 10) explicitly warns of a "Material Danger to Public Safety."
TRAFFIC: Our roads are already at 88% capacity. This project violates the "25% remaining capacity" rule.
INCOMPATIBLE: Even the county admits 222 units is NOT consistent with our single-family neighborhoods.
NO LOCAL SUPPORT: Our local advisory boards (MIRA/P&Z) refused to back this project.

And don't forget the growing flooding issue in this area...

Sincerely
Jean Nordfors

Sent from my iPad

From: [Thomas Dixon](#)
To: [Commissioner, D2](#)
Date: Friday, January 23, 2026 7:27:25 PM
Attachments: [.png](#)
[.png](#)
[.png](#)
[.png](#)

[EXTERNAL EMAIL] DO NOT CLICK links or attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

We are closing in on 1,500 signatures to stop the 222-apartment complex at the corner of Pioneer and N. Courtenay. This location cannot support this project

We are so close! Our petition is gaining major traction, and we've confirmed the County Commissioners are officially paying attention. To protect our island, we are aiming for 1,500+ signatures by next week!

If you can't attend the upcoming meeting, your email is your vote. Please take 60 seconds to send a quick message to the Commissioners letting them know we demand Smart Growth, not dangerous over-development.

Why this project is wrong for Merritt Island:

- PUBLIC SAFETY: The Staff Report (p. 10) explicitly warns of a "Material Danger to Public Safety."
 - TRAFFIC: Our roads are already at 88% capacity. This project violates the "25% remaining capacity" rule.
 - INCOMPATIBLE: Even the county admits 222 units is NOT consistent with our single-family neighborhoods.
 - NO LOCAL SUPPORT: Our local advisory boards (MIRA/P&Z) refused to back this project
- Sent from my iPad

From: [Chelsey Bjork](#)
To: [Chelsey True](#)
Cc: [Commissioner, D2](#)
Subject: Re: Request for brief meeting regarding the Courtenay and Pioneer rezoning: Application 25Z00054
Date: Wednesday, January 21, 2026 1:03:44 PM

[EXTERNAL EMAIL] DO NOT CLICK links or attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Dear Commissioner,

I wanted to follow up on my earlier email regarding the rezoning application scheduled for a vote on February 5.

I know schedules are full, but I wanted to reiterate my interest in briefly sharing concerns related to concurrency, environmental review timing, and the potential loss of County leverage if the rezoning proceeds prior to completion of key analyses.

I have meetings scheduled with other commissioners this week and wanted to be sure you had the same opportunity to hear these concerns if your availability allows.

Thank you again for your time and consideration.

Respectfully,
Chelsey True
206-300-0013

Sent from my iPhone

On Jan 16, 2026, at 8:14 PM, Chelsey True <bjork.chelsey@gmail.com> wrote:

Dear Commissioner Goodson,

My name is Chelsey True and I live immediately adjacent to the proposed rezoning at Courtenay Parkway and Pioneer Road.

I attended the developer outreach meeting, the MIRA meeting and the planning and zoning hearing. Based on Staff analysis identifying potential traffic concurrency deficiencies, unresolved environmental constraints and compatibility concerns, I am respectfully requesting a brief meeting or call prior to the upcoming vote to share my perspective as a nearby resident.

I'm not opposed to development, my concerns are specific to whether this rezoning meets County's adopted standards at this stage.

If you or your staff have availability next week I would appreciate the opportunity to speak for a few minutes.

Thank you for your time and consideration,

Chelsey True
Merritt Island resident

From: [Commissioner, D2](#)
To: [Smith, Susan](#)
Subject: Fw: Rezoning notice 25Z00054
Date: Wednesday, January 21, 2026 9:28:01 AM

From: Bill Cauffman <otisdog361@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, January 14, 2026 10:52 AM
To: Commissioner, D2 <D2.Commissioner@brevardfl.gov>
Subject: Rezoning notice 25Z00054

[EXTERNAL EMAIL] DO NOT CLICK links or attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Hello Tom, the proposed zoning change for 10 acres to medium and high density residential at Pioneer and Courtenay is extreme and will cause many problems. I understand that there must be growth, but 3 story high density dwellings in such an already busy area doesn't appear to be well planned. Please try to convince your fellow Commissioner to reject the proposal. Best regards, Bill Cauffman

From: mmcb23@comcast.net
To: [Commissioner, D2](#)
Subject: RangeWater apartment complex
Date: Tuesday, January 20, 2026 8:14:49 PM

[EXTERNAL EMAIL] DO NOT CLICK links or attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Good Evening Mr. Goodson,

I am a resident in your district and am among the thousands of local residents who oppose the zoning change and the proposed apartment complex by RangeWater. I live on Oak Park Circle and use Pioneer road as my way of going north on Courtenay to get to Route 528 for both work and recreation. It would be closer for me to use Venetian Way to get onto Courtenay but it's a hazard trying to make a left onto Courtenay most times of the day. As it stands now, it is often a stressful frenzy of traffic in the immediate area trying to get from my house to 528. There is significantly more traffic in this area since I purchased the house in 2017. I cannot fathom additional traffic.

Additionally, seeing our beautiful trees razed and our landscape raped by never ending development is sickening. It's one of the reasons I moved from Philadelphia suburbs to what was a little piece of heaven here on Merritt Island. The urban sprawl took over the suburbs and our voices at the community meetings fell on deaf ears.

Please hear our voices and vote no on this project. Also, I have been a real estate appraiser for over 30 years and can assure you that there is only an adverse effect on value and marketability of our current properties in this area from this proposed project.

Thank you for your time,

Marie Vassalotti

625 Oak Park Cir

Merritt Island

From: [Jason via Change.org](#)
To: [Commissioner, D2](#)
Subject: You've been identified on a petition: Urge Brevard County Commissioners to oppose rezoning on Merritt Island
Date: Monday, January 19, 2026 7:16:28 PM

[EXTERNAL EMAIL] DO NOT CLICK links or attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.



Hi Tom Goodson,

My name is Jason, and I'm reaching out from Change.org to let you know that you've been tagged on a petition on our platform: '**Urge Brevard County Commissioners to oppose rezoning on Merritt Island**'.

[View the petition](#)

With over 500 million users worldwide, Change.org is the world's largest platform for civic participation. Every day, people use our nonpartisan platform to speak up about the issues that matter to them and reach the elected officials who can make change happen.

Being tagged on a petition means that **people believe you have the power to influence this issue**. It's a sign that your leadership is needed, and **your constituents are eager to engage**.

If you'd like to learn more about the petition or discuss next steps, we're here to help. You can reach our team anytime at decision.makers@change.org or by phone at 415-907-4737.

Thank you for your time and consideration. We look forward to connecting with you soon.

Best,

Photo of Jason



Jason Barnaby
Decision Maker Outreach
415-907-4737
jason@change.org

This is an informational notification sent to the email address listed as the decision maker for this petition. If you are not the decision maker, let us know by replying directly to this email.

[Privacy policy](#)

We'd love to hear from you! [Contact us](#) through our help center.

Change.org · 548 Market St #29993, San Francisco, CA 94104-5401, USA

From: [Jason Barnaby](#)
To: [Commissioner, D2](#)
Subject: Tom, can you share a quick update?
Date: Monday, January 19, 2026 9:31:11 AM
Attachments: [Screenshot 2025-07-02 at 2.49.06 PM.png](#)

[EXTERNAL EMAIL] DO NOT CLICK links or attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Hello Tom — I know you're busy, and that our outreach is just one of many you receive each day from people across the community. We also know you work hard on behalf of the community you serve and may have preferences or rules for how constituents share feedback on the issue elevated in the petition.

Before you close this email, **would you review the summary below and reply with a brief statement noting that you've seen and reviewed the petition, or clarify if you'd rather constituents share feedback directly with you?** Petition starters and signers appreciate hearing from public officials like you — even a quick acknowledgment that you've seen the petition.

We're also happy to share a link or statement if you've already addressed this issue elsewhere.

Even a sentence or two we can pass along would mean a lot. Thank you!

Petition Title: Urge Brevard County Commissioners to oppose rezoning on Merritt Island

Summary: This petition urges Brevard County Commissioners to oppose a proposed rezoning on Merritt Island, citing concerns over increased traffic congestion, potential flooding, and the loss of vital green spaces that contribute to the community's unique character. It matters to the petition signers as they seek to protect their home environment and ensure that future developments align with the existing infrastructure and the safety of residents.

Link: <https://change.org/p/urge-brevard-county-commissioners-to-oppose-rezoning-on-merritt-island>



Jason Barnaby
Senior Civic Engagement Specialist
jason@change.org
(415) 907-4737

--

Is this email not relevant to you? Click [here](#)

From: [Don Peplow](#)
To: [Commissioner, D2](#)
Subject: please reject rezoning the parcel along SR 3 just south of the beachline
Date: Friday, January 16, 2026 9:02:59 PM

[EXTERNAL EMAIL] DO NOT CLICK links or attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Don Peplow

From: [Budd Fisher](#)
To: [Commissioner, D2](#)
Subject: Apartment complex between Pioneer and Courtenay
Date: Thursday, January 15, 2026 6:42:37 PM

[EXTERNAL EMAIL] DO NOT CLICK links or attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Dear Mr. Goodson

I wanted to make sure you are aware of the petition against this new development. Over 800 local residents have already signed a petition against. While we know you voted for the development we are respectfully asking you to reverse your decision. We do not want the added cars and congestion especially around Lewis Carroll elementary. .

I trust you will respect your constituents wishes.

Sincerely

Budd Fisher

1893 Sykes Creek Dr.

Merritt Island,Fl

[Sent from Yahoo Mail for iPad](#)

From: [Jason Barnaby](#)
To: [Commissioner, D2](#)
Subject: Response Requested: 652 Constituents Oppose Rezoning on N. Courtenay Parkway
Date: Thursday, January 15, 2026 6:01:21 AM
Attachments: [Screenshot 2025-06-30 at 11.48.42 AM-3.png](#)
[Screenshot 2025-07-02 at 2.49.06 PM.png](#)

[EXTERNAL EMAIL] DO NOT CLICK links or attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Hello Tom Goodson,

My name is Jason, and I'm part of the Civic Engagement team at Change.org. Nice to meet you! I'm reaching out because a petition on our platform is currently trending among your constituents: Urge Brevard County Commissioners to oppose rezoning on Merritt Island <https://change.org/p/urge-brevard-county-commissioners-to-oppose-rezoning-on-merritt-island>



Because you haven't publicly responded to the petition, your status currently appears as unresponsive. **Would you like to update your response status? You can simply reply to this email with the message you'd like to share, and I'll post it on your behalf.** This would let your constituents know that you're aware of the issue, engaged, and listening.

A response does not mean you endorse the petition. In your response, you can:

- Acknowledge you've seen the petition, aware of the concerns raised, and share any relevant updates
- Share details for the next public meeting where constituents can share their views
- Any relevant updates, resources, or information

If you have any questions, please feel free to reach me directly at +1 415-907-4737. Look forward to hearing from you soon!

Best,
Jason



Jason Barnaby
Senior Civic Engagement Specialist
jason@change.org
(415) 907-4737

--

Is this email not relevant to you? Click [here](#)

From: [Chelsey Bjork](#)
To: [Commissioner, D2](#); [Commissioner, D3](#); [Commissioner, D1](#); [Commissioner, D4](#)
Subject: Rezoning application 25Z00054 - Public Comment
Date: Wednesday, January 14, 2026 7:58:43 PM

[EXTERNAL EMAIL] DO NOT CLICK links or attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Dear Commissioner Goodson and fellow Commissioners,

My name is Chelsey True, and I am a Merritt Island resident who lives immediately adjacent to the proposed rezoning at Courtenay Parkway and Pioneer Road.

As a resident who attended the developer meeting held on November 24, 2025, the MIRA meeting, and the Planning and Zoning hearing, I am writing ahead of the upcoming Board of County Commissioners hearing to respectfully share my concerns and provide context for my position. I also want to note that I spoke with Marcus Herman, a board member of the Merritt Island Redevelopment Agency (MIRA), following the Planning and Zoning meeting. He encouraged me to reach out directly and to continue grounding my comments in fact and adopted policy, which I have attempted to do throughout this process.

I want to be clear from the start: I am not opposed to multifamily housing. I have worked professionally within multifamily development in the past. My concerns here are specific to location, intensity, and infrastructure compatibility.

Staff analysis indicates that the proposed development does not align with the existing or recent development pattern of the surrounding area. Adjacent land uses are predominantly single-family residential to the east, with institutional and commercial uses along Courtenay Parkway. Notably, no multifamily residential development has been approved or constructed within the immediate area in recent years, which undermines the claim that this proposal represents a natural continuation of established land use patterns.

From an infrastructure standpoint, staff has identified potential traffic concurrency deficiencies. Courtenay Parkway is already operating above the 85% threshold required for concurrency vesting, and the proposed development would exceed the 25% remaining capacity limitation. Staff further notes that this could result in a concurrency deficiency at the site plan stage. These findings suggest that concurrency issues are not hypothetical, but a real risk at this stage. As stated in the staff analysis, "the proposed development has the potential to cause traffic capacity issues that could impact design capabilities or a de facto change in functional classification."

Staff analysis also indicates that the proposed development has the potential to generate approximately 2,308 trips per day. Given the existing operating level of this corridor and the added trip generation, my concern is that the rezoning is being requested prior to the completion of the evaluations required under the County's

adopted concurrency policies.

These concerns are compounded by existing constraints, including school-related congestion, proximity to the SR-528 interchange, drawbridge operations, and the scheduled 2027 FDOT median and signalization project, which will alter traffic patterns in ways current studies cannot fully capture. A development cannot assume capacity from future roadway projects. Because these improvements are not yet constructed, they cannot be relied upon for concurrency or mitigation purposes. Approving a rezoning before these changes are operational and their impacts understood creates additional uncertainty for an already constrained roadway.

Additionally, I contacted Brevard County Natural Resources Management to confirm whether a formal wetland delineation has been completed for the subject property. Staff confirmed in writing that a site-specific wetland delineation has not yet been performed and would only be required at the site plan stage. As a result, current review relies on mapped resources rather than field-verified conditions. Given the presence of mapped wetlands and hydric soils, the site's location within the Indian River Lagoon Nitrogen Reduction Overlay, and proximity to a documented bald eagle nest, the full environmental constraints of the site are not yet known. Advancing a rezoning prior to completion of this analysis shifts risk forward and limits the County's ability to evaluate environmental impacts at the appropriate stage.

I would also like to acknowledge the applicant's revised site plan, which includes a 100-foot buffer along the east side and a 50-foot buffer along the north side of the property. While these revisions reflect an effort to reduce impacts, the updated plan also removes the previously proposed retention pond and instead relies on dry stormwater mitigation. Given the site's environmental context, I respectfully ask that these stormwater revisions be carefully evaluated for long-term performance, maintenance, and cumulative impact. Buffer enhancements alone do not resolve the outstanding infrastructure, traffic, and environmental concerns identified in the staff analysis.

I respectfully ask that you give weight to the Planning and Zoning staff findings, MIRA's recommendation, and the unresolved infrastructure and compatibility concerns when considering this rezoning request. My goal is not to oppose growth, but to advocate for development that aligns with adopted standards and protects the long-term functionality and character of our community. Planning and Zoning could not reach a majority in favor of approval, staff analysis raised multiple substantive concerns, and MIRA formally recommended against the proposal. Advancing this rezoning under these conditions would transfer unresolved risk to the surrounding community rather than address it at the appropriate stage.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Respectfully,

Chelsey True

Merritt Island Resident

Sources:

Brevard County Planning and Zoning Staff Analysis

Space Coast Transportation Planning Organization (TPO)

From: [Marie-Claire Villanueva, DPM](#)
To: [Commissioner, D2](#)
Subject: Please vote NO
Date: Wednesday, January 14, 2026 4:22:02 PM

[EXTERNAL EMAIL] DO NOT CLICK links or attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Dear Commissioner Goodson,
Please vote NO on the rezoning of Merritt Island off Pioneer Rd. and N. Courtenay Blvd. As a long time resident, our community is vehemently opposed to the proposed changes.
Thank you very much for your time and service.

--

Marie-Claire Villanueva, D.P.M.
mobile (321) 213-0249
fax (866) 590-7237

From: [Heike Jahnert](#)
To: [Commissioner, D1](#); [Commissioner, D2](#); [Commissioner, D3](#); [Commissioner, D4](#); [Commissioner, D5](#)
Subject: Rezoning on North Courtenay Pkwy
Date: Wednesday, January 14, 2026 9:26:42 AM

[EXTERNAL EMAIL] DO NOT CLICK links or attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Good Morning Commissioners !

Ask any resident on Merritt Island and they will tell you that Merritt Island is getting too crowded and too busy.

Rezoning a property on the East Side of North Courtenay Pkwy just 420 ft South of Via DeLa Reina is not in the best interest of Merritt Island residents.

As our Representatives I urge you to listen to your Constituents and not rezone above mentioned property.

We have enough housing on Merritt Island. In addition, due to enforcements of immigration laws more housing will be available to U.S. citizens.

Commissioners, please remember the oath you took and your role as a Public Servant which both command you to represent your constituents and not special interest.

Respectfully,

Heike Jahnert
6729 Mangrove Dr.
Merritt Island

From: [Giles Malone](#)
To: [Commissioner, D2](#)
Subject: Fwd: Urge Commissioner Goodson to oppose rezoning on Merritt Island
Date: Tuesday, January 13, 2026 2:33:30 PM

[EXTERNAL EMAIL] DO NOT CLICK links or attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

GILES MALONE M.B.A.

PARTNER
MAVERICK MULTIMEDIA INC.
BREVARD PRODUCTION INC..
Tel: (321) - 323- 4460
GilesMalone@GMail.com



[SpaceCoastDaily.com](#)
[SpaceCoastStateFair.com](#)
[SpaceCoastKeyLimePieFestival.com](#)
[SpaceCoastStrawberryFestival.com](#)
[CocoaBeachBaseballSpringTraining.com](#)
[CocoaBeachSoftballSpringTraining.com](#)
[CocoaBeachLacrosse.com](#)
[CocoaBeachSpringTraining.com](#)
[SpaceCoastRenaissanceFair.com](#)

[FOLLOW US ON FACEBOOK – CLICK HERE](#)

Please excuse any typos as this may be dictated via a mobile device.

This message is for the named person's use only. It may contain private, proprietary, or legally privileged information. No privilege is waived or lost by any mistransmission. If you receive this message in error, please immediately delete it and all copies of it from your system, destroy any hard copies of it, and notify the sender. You must not, directly or indirectly, use, disclose, distribute, print, or copy any part of this message if you are not the intended recipient.

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **Giles Malone** <gilesmalone1@icloud.com>
Date: Mon, Jan 12, 2026 at 11:39 PM
Subject: Urge Commissioner Goodson to oppose rezoning on Merritt Island
To: GILES MALONE <gilesmalone@gmail.com>

Hey,

I just signed the petition “Urge Commissioner Goodson to oppose rezoning on Merritt Island” and wanted to see if you could help by adding your name.

Our goal is to reach 500 signatures and we need more support. You can read more and sign the petition here:

<https://c.org/FzXMFB9qjH>

Thanks!

Giles

Sent from my iPhone

From: [Chelsey True](#)
To: [Commissioner, D2](#)
Subject: Request for brief meeting regarding the Courtenay and Pioneer rezoning: Application 25Z00054
Date: Friday, January 16, 2026 8:15:04 PM

[EXTERNAL EMAIL] DO NOT CLICK links or attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Dear Commissioner Goodson,

My name is Chelsey True and I live immediately adjacent to the proposed rezoning at Courtenay Parkway and Pioneer Road.

I attended the developer outreach meeting, the MIRA meeting and the planning and zoning hearing. Based on Staff analysis identifying potential traffic concurrency deficiencies, unresolved environmental constraints and compatibility concerns, I am respectfully requesting a brief meeting or call prior to the upcoming vote to share my perspective as a nearby resident.

I'm not opposed to development, my concerns are specific to whether this rezoning meets County's adopted standards at this stage.

If you or your staff have availability next week I would appreciate the opportunity to speak for a few minutes.

Thank you for your time and consideration,

Chelsey True
Merritt Island resident

From: [Erica Miller Cochran](#)
To: [Commissioner, D2](#); [Commissioner, D1](#); [Commissioner, D3](#); [Commissioner, D4](#); [Commissioner, D5](#)
Subject: Rezoning Pioneer/Courtenay Pkwy
Date: Thursday, January 29, 2026 8:04:47 PM

[EXTERNAL EMAIL] DO NOT CLICK links or attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

I plead with you all to deny the rezoning of the property at Pioneer and N. Courtenay Pkwy in Merritt Island. Courtenay cannot support this influx of growth. With the apartments being built behind the Merritt Island mall we're looking at 100's of more cars on the road already. This large project of multi-family units would be devastating to this island. I know growth is inevitable but this isn't the right project for this specific area. This would not be beneficial to the small island community that Merritt Island has been known for since as long as I've lived here.

Thank you for your time.

[Erica Cochran](#)

From: [AmyBrooke Muir](#)
To: [Commissioner, D4](#)
Subject: Deny Rezoning 142 Acres off E Crisafulli
Date: Friday, January 30, 2026 9:14:18 AM

[EXTERNAL EMAIL] DO NOT CLICK links or attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Dear Mr. Feltner,

I am writing to you as a resident of North Merritt Island and as someone who deeply cares about the place my family calls home.

I respectfully ask that you **vote NO on the proposed rezoning of the 142 acres off East Crisafulli Road**. This request is not about being anti-growth — it is about protecting an area that simply is not equipped to handle higher-density development.

Those of us who live here already experience significant flooding. We have watched roads become impassable after storms and worry every rainy season about water levels rising higher and staying longer. Increasing density on agricultural land means more pavement, more runoff, and more displaced water — and that water has to go somewhere. Once flooding patterns change, they cannot be undone.

Traffic and safety are also real concerns. East Crisafulli Road is narrow, rural, and was never designed to support suburban-level traffic. Additional daily traffic and construction vehicles will make the road less safe for residents, children, and emergency responders.

Most importantly, this land has long been designated as agricultural. Rezoning it to higher-density residential development fundamentally changes the character of our community and sets a precedent that cannot be reversed. Once the land is rezoned and developed, the rural nature of this area is gone forever.

Maronda's current design has a house 30 feet from my barn filled with pigs, goats, and chickens. I don't think 1/2 acre lots are compatible with being so close to farm animals.

I believe your role as a commissioner requires balancing development with the long-term well-being of existing residents. In this case, the risks — flooding, safety, infrastructure strain, and loss of rural character — outweigh the benefits.

Thank you for taking the time to listen to those of us who live here and will bear the consequences of this decision for decades to come. I respectfully urge you to stand with our community and please **vote NO on this rezoning**.

Sincerely,

Amy Muir

1100 E Crisafulli Road

Merritt Island

From: [Kathy Brandt](#)
To: [Commissioner, D4](#)
Subject: rezoning on Merritt Island
Date: Friday, January 30, 2026 10:24:05 AM

[EXTERNAL EMAIL] DO NOT CLICK links or attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Please oppose the rezoning on Merritt Island. The area at Pionee Rd. and Courtnenay Parkway will be harmfully impacted if this goes through. The high desity apartment complex in single family neighborhoods will compromise safety and traffic flow.

Thank you,
Kathleen Brandt

From: [Karie Hanselman](#)
To: [Commissioner, D1](#); [Commissioner, D2](#); [Commissioner, D3](#); [Commissioner, D4](#); [Commissioner, D5](#)
Subject: STOP THE DEVELOPMENT!
Date: Saturday, January 31, 2026 9:42:16 AM

[EXTERNAL EMAIL] DO NOT CLICK links or attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Over the past 40 years, the once-quiet drive from Cocoa into Merritt Island has transformed dramatically. What used to be a peaceful, natural sanctuary has become increasingly congested, especially on weekends, when out-of-town visitors crowd the unpaved shoulders as if they were public parks—camping, grilling, selling items, and often interfering with traffic flow.

Simultaneously, Port Canaveral has expanded from a small cruise hub into the largest port in Florida, yet the surrounding infrastructure has not kept pace. Weekend traffic jams on the Beachline are now almost guaranteed as thousands of cruise passengers rush to the port, frequently causing accidents or gridlock. Much of the remaining open land has been converted into cruise parking lots, further intensifying traffic pressures without meaningful road improvements.

As drivers exit the Beachline onto Courtney Parkway, they encounter additional congestion from Kennedy Space Center traffic, daily launch activity, and drivers racing to beat poorly timed lights. The nearby drawbridge often rises at the worst possible moment, pushing traffic backups well beyond the Pioneer/Courtney intersection. In the immediate vicinity of the proposed apartment development, three residential neighborhoods, an elementary school, a nursing home, Starbucks, a car wash, a bank, and a medical plaza all share a single narrow roadway. This road already struggles with backups, lacks turn lanes, and experiences frequent accidents as drivers take risks to avoid delays. It sits within half a mile of both the chronically congested Beachline interchange and the drawbridge that routinely traps vehicles for miles.

Adding a 225-unit apartment complex—introducing more than 250 additional vehicles—would create dangerous conditions for residents, schoolchildren, parents, teachers, and emergency responders. It would further complicate evacuation routes and increase risks in an area already beyond its infrastructure and environmental capacity.

After four decades of living on this small island, it is clear that Merritt Island has exceeded sustainable growth. Recent developments have already caused flooding in older neighborhoods, degraded water quality, and strained natural systems. Approving another high-density project in a location unable to support it is not progress—it is a failure of responsible urban planning and a decision driven purely by profit, not community well-being.

Apartments are not an ideal fit for this area due to several key factors related to infrastructure capacity, community character, and long-term planning considerations. I would strongly recommend you go to this area at 7:30-7:45am, 2:30pm or 5:30 pm and experience the congestion and craziness yourself before you vote for this madness.

Regards,
Karie Hanselman, concerned resident of area

From: [Rebecca Hauser](#)
To: [Commissioner, D4](#)
Subject: Opposition to Rezoning Case #25Z00054 – Public Safety Danger, Flooding Risks, & 1,800+ Residents Opposed
Date: Friday, January 30, 2026 5:37:51 PM

[EXTERNAL EMAIL] DO NOT CLICK links or attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Dear Commissioner Rob Feltner,

I am writing to formally request that you **DENY Rezoning Application #25Z00054** (RangeWater/Pioneer Rd). This proposal is not merely a "neighborhood concern"; it is a documented risk to the infrastructure, environmental stability, and life safety of the Merritt Island community.

As a resident and taxpayer, I urge you to consider the following critical facts:

1. Staff Report Warning: “Material Danger to Public Safety” The County’s own Staff Report (page 10) explicitly warns that this project creates a **“material danger to public safety.”** It is rare for staff to use such definitive language. For the Commission to override this warning would be to knowingly ignore a documented safety hazard regarding traffic flow and emergency access in a failing corridor.

2. Extreme Risk to School Zone Safety (Lewis Carroll Elementary) Pioneer Road is a primary corridor for children walking and biking to Lewis Carroll Elementary. During drop-off and pick-up, this area already experiences severe congestion and gridlock. Adding **400+ cars** (approx. 1,379 to 3,000 daily trips) into this specific intersection creates an unacceptable safety crisis.

3. Environmental Hazard: Myakka and Anclote Hydric Soils The project site consists of **Myakka and Anclote hydric soils**, which serve as a critical natural "sponge" for the area due to their high water table. Paving over 11 acres of these soils will displace massive volumes of groundwater, forcing runoff into surrounding low-lying neighborhoods that are **already prone to flooding**. We cannot replace a natural drainage basin with 11 acres of asphalt without causing major flooding for existing homeowners.

4. Overwhelming Community Opposition (1,800+ Signatures) The community has spoken with a unified voice. I have initiated a petition that currently has **over 1,800 residents** (online and on paper) who are formally opposed to this project. This number grows daily, reflecting the deep-seated concern of your constituents.

5. Violation of Administrative Policy #3 & Infrastructure

Failure Under **Administrative Policy #3**, the County must protect the quality of life of existing residents from "Land Use Shocks." North Courtenay Parkway is already at **88% capacity**. This project alone would consume **24.95% of the total remaining capacity**, violating the spirit of our concurrency rules and diminishing the safety of our neighborhoods through noise and transient traffic.

6. Unanimous Denial by MIRA (7-0) The Merritt Island Redevelopment Agency (MIRA) board—the local body that best understands our island's unique constraints—voted **unanimously (7-0)** to recommend denial.

The Planning and Zoning Board's **7-7 tie** reflects the deep flaws in this application. With 1,800 residents standing in opposition, a Staff Report warning of "**material danger to public safety**," and the severe risks to our school children and environment, there is no justification for approval.

I urge you to follow the recommendation of MIRA and Staff and **deny this rezoning**.

Sincerely,

Rebecca Hauser

815-608-8451

Petition can be found here: <https://www.change.org/p/urge-brevard-county-commissioners-to-oppose-rezoning-on-merritt-island>

From: [Gayle Allenback](#)
To: [Commissioner, D4](#)
Subject: Request for Denial of Zoning Application 25Z00054 – Parcel ID 24-36-14-00-259
Date: Saturday, January 31, 2026 4:21:28 PM

[EXTERNAL EMAIL] DO NOT CLICK links or attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Dear Commissioner Feltner,

I am writing as a concerned resident of Merritt Island to respectfully urge you not to approve the proposed zoning change (zoning application 25Z00054) that would allow medium- to high-density housing at the property located on the east side of N. Courtenay Parkway, approximately 420 feet south of Via De La Reina (parcel ID 24-36-14-00-259).

While growth can be beneficial when thoughtfully planned, this particular proposal threatens the safety, infrastructure, environmental balance, and character of the immediate neighborhood as well as the whole island in ways that are already well documented in the official reports on record.

Public safety must be paramount. One of the reports explicitly warns that this project presents a “material danger to public safety.” This is not merely a speculative concern, but a formal conclusion based on the project’s own analysis. Approving a development identified as posing such a risk would place current residents, future occupants, and first responders in jeopardy.

Traffic and infrastructure capacity are already strained. Many are familiar with the daily congestion along N. Courtenay Parkway. According to the report, local roads are operating at approximately 88% capacity, leaving very little margin for additional traffic. The proposed development exceeds the established “25% of remaining capacity” guideline; thus, rezoning this property would only exacerbate an already dangerous situation—raising the likelihood of accidents and posing increased risks to both drivers and adult and child pedestrians, particularly as the area awaits roadway redesign to place a raised median.

In addition, flooding concerns cannot be ignored. Natural drainage systems on Merritt Island are already under stress, and increased density at this location would further burden those systems. The result could be heightened flood risk for nearby homes and businesses, creating long-term consequences that are difficult and costly to reverse.

The proposal is also incompatible with surrounding land use. The report itself acknowledges that the planned 222 units are not consistent with the adjacent single-family neighborhoods. Such incompatibility threatens the stability, character, and quality of life of communities that residents, including myself, have invested in for decades.

Equally concerning is the loss of green space, especially wetlands and wildlife habitats, which would be irreversible. Our community has worked hard to preserve these areas, recognizing their importance to our ecosystem, natural drainage, and as a buffer against overdevelopment. Once lost, this land—and the balance it provides—cannot be restored. Preserving these spaces is essential to maintaining what makes Merritt Island a unique and cherished place to live.

Finally, there is clear local opposition and advisory concern. The Merritt Island Redevelopment Agency (MIRA) has already demonstrated its support for preserving our community by voting against the rezoning proposal, and even the Brevard County Planning & Zoning board was not able to reach a majority in favor of this project, after hearing both sides. As one of our elected representatives, I respectfully ask that you honor the judgment of local advisory boards and the residents they serve, rather than overriding their recommendations.

I support smart, appropriately scaled growth—but not this specific project, particularly in this specific location. The proposed density cannot be sustained without compromising safety, traffic flow, environmental resilience, and neighborhood compatibility.

For these reasons, I respectfully ask that you vote no on this zoning change and help protect the safety, environment, and long-term well-being of Merritt Island and its residents.

Thank you for your time, consideration, and service to our community.

Respectfully,

Gayle Allenback

2405 Raintree Lake Circle

Merritt Island, FL 32953

From: [Diane Duclos](#)
To: [Commissioner, D4](#)
Subject: Fwd: Brevard reasoning on Merritt island
Date: Monday, February 2, 2026 8:18:52 AM

[EXTERNAL EMAIL] DO NOT CLICK links or attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

From: Diane Duclos <duclos1957@yahoo.com>
Date: February 2, 2026 at 8:16:01 AM EST
To: D1.Commissioner@brevardfl.gov
Subject: Brevard reasoning on Merritt island

Good Day Commissioner-

I am a resident of Villa de Palma neighborhood on Merritt Island.

It has come to my attention that the Brevard County commissioner's office is contemplating rezoning the area off Pioneer Road on Merritt Island for an apartment complex.

The decision to rezone would be a huge mistake. Pioneer Road is already so busy between the three neighborhoods that are adjacent to it plus the school that has daily traffic in the morning and the afternoon that Pioneer Road cannot carry this much traffic. Plus all the neighborhoods surrounding the area for rebuild are all single family homes. An apartment complex just does not go with the complexion of the area. The area for rebuild is so small for the number of apartments that you want to put in.

Let alone losing more green space on Merritt Island that has over 50,000 people now living on it and losing the green space for all the animals that inhabit the area on Pioneer, which houses the endangered gopher turtles.

Putting up more apartments on Merritt Island is going to tax on the school system, the fire department and the police department along with all of our road wear.

Please reconsider your opinion on this rezoning for Merritt Island.

Thank you
Michael Duclos
Diane Duclos

Sent from my iPhone

From: [Chelsey True](#)
To: [Commissioner, D1](#); [Commissioner, D2](#); [Commissioner, D3](#); [Commissioner, D4](#); [Commissioner, D5](#)
Subject: Request for Clarification and Record Accuracy from the P&Z Vote Procedure (January 12, APP 25Z00054)
Date: Friday, January 30, 2026 10:25:06 AM

[EXTERNAL EMAIL] DO NOT CLICK links or attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Dear Commissioners,

My name is Chelsey True, a Merritt Island resident who has been actively following and participating in the public process regarding Application 25Z00054.

I am writing to respectfully flag a procedural concern from the Planning & Zoning Board meeting on January 12, which I believe is important for the County Commission to be aware of as this application moves forward.

While rewatching the meeting video, I observed confusion during the vote count related to the Chair's participation in the vote. A headcount appeared to reflect a 7-6 vote; however, there was audible discussion on the record indicating that the Chair would only vote in the event of a tie. Despite this, the outcome was ultimately announced as a 7-7 tie, followed by a second vote without a clearly stated tally.

I am not alleging misconduct. My concern is that the procedure created ambiguity on the record regarding how the final vote count was reached. Given the significance of this application and the level of public interest, clarity in voting procedure and documentation is important for public confidence and for the Commission's review.

I have raised this question with staff and understand that the approved minutes will reflect the official tally. My intent in contacting you directly is simply to ensure that Commissioners are aware of the procedural confusion observed on the video record as you consider this item.

I appreciate your time and your service, and I look forward to discussing this and other substantive infrastructure and safety concerns related to this application in upcoming meetings.

Chelsey True
Merritt Island Resident

Dear Commissioner Goodson,

I am writing regarding the upcoming vote on the rezoning request for the property located at Pioneer Road and Courtenay Parkway. I am a resident of the Palmetto neighborhood, which lies north of Villa De Palmas and just south of State Road 528.

I respectfully urge you to vote **against** this rezoning request to allow multi-family development in what is currently a single-family area. My primary concern is traffic, which has already reached an unsafe and congested level along Courtenay Parkway.

As a resident who travels this corridor daily, I can attest that **turning left from the Palmetto neighborhood onto Courtenay Parkway (southbound) or turning left into the Palmetto Neighborhood onto Venetian Way from Courtenay Parkway (southbound)** is difficult at most times of day and becomes nearly impossible when the bridge is raised and traffic backs up. According to the developer, the project would include an average of 1.75 parking spaces per unit, potentially adding approximately 389 additional vehicles to Courtenay Parkway. This figure does not account for visitor traffic or service vehicles.

Anyone familiar with this corridor during **school drop-off and pick-up hours, rush hour, or Space Center shift changes** knows that Courtenay Parkway is already operating at or near capacity. Traffic has increased significantly since I moved into my home in 2017, due in part to multiple large developments approved north of SR 528. Each new project adds to an already overburdened roadway.

This raises an important question: when was the most recent traffic capacity study conducted for Courtenay Parkway, and does it adequately account for the cumulative impact of these developments? Beyond traffic, increased density places additional strain on emergency services and contributes to overcrowding that affects the safety and quality of life of existing residents.

I am also aware that the Merritt Island Redevelopment Agency (MIRA) voted against this project. I respectfully ask that you and your fellow commissioners stand with the residents of Merritt Island and vote no on this rezoning request.

Thank you for your time, consideration, and service to our community.

Sincerely,

Marie Chiaino

321-591-1663 (cell)

From: [Marie Chiaino](#)
To: [Commissioner, D2](#)
Cc: [Commissioner, D1](#); [Commissioner, D3](#); [Commissioner, D4](#); [Commissioner, D5](#)
Subject: Opposition to Rezoning Notice 2500054 on Merritt Island
Date: Tuesday, February 3, 2026 7:17:59 PM

[EXTERNAL EMAIL] DO NOT CLICK links or attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Dear Commissioner Goodson,

I am writing regarding the upcoming vote on the rezoning request for the property located at Pioneer Road and Courtenay Parkway. I am a resident of the Palmetto neighborhood, which lies north of Villa De Palmas and just south of State Road 528.

I respectfully urge you to vote **against** this rezoning request to allow multi-family development in what is currently a single-family area. My primary concern is traffic, which has already reached an unsafe and congested level along Courtenay Parkway.

As a resident who travels this corridor daily, I can attest that **turning left from the Palmetto neighborhood onto Courtenay Parkway (southbound) or turning left into the Palmetto Neighborhood onto Venetian Way from Courtenay Parkway (southbound)** is difficult at most times of day and becomes nearly impossible when the bridge is raised and traffic backs up. According to the developer, the project would include an average of 1.75 parking spaces per unit, potentially adding approximately 389 additional vehicles to Courtenay Parkway. This figure does not account for visitor traffic or service vehicles.

Anyone familiar with this corridor during **school drop-off and pick-up hours, rush hour, or Space Center shift changes** knows that Courtenay Parkway is already operating at or near capacity. Traffic has increased significantly since I moved into my home in 2017, due in part to multiple large developments approved north of SR 528. Each new project adds to an already overburdened roadway.

This raises an important question: when was the most recent traffic capacity study conducted for Courtenay Parkway, and does it adequately account for the cumulative impact of these developments? Beyond traffic, increased density places additional strain on emergency services and contributes to overcrowding that affects the safety and quality of life of existing residents.

I am also aware that the Merritt Island Redevelopment Agency (MIRA) voted against this project. I respectfully ask that you and your fellow commissioners stand with the residents of Merritt Island and vote no on this rezoning request.

Thank you for your time, consideration, and service to our community.

Sincerely,

Marie Chiaino
321-591-1663 (cell)

From: [Diane Duclos](#)
To: [Commissioner, D2](#)
Subject: Fwd: Brevard reasoning on Merritt island
Date: Monday, February 2, 2026 8:17:17 AM

[EXTERNAL EMAIL] DO NOT CLICK links or attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

From: Diane Duclos <duclos1957@yahoo.com>
Date: February 2, 2026 at 8:16:01 AM EST
To: D1.Commissioner@brevardfl.gov
Subject: Brevard reasoning on Merritt island

Good Day Commissioner-

I am a resident of Villa de Palma neighborhood on Merritt Island.

It has come to my attention that the Brevard County commissioner's office is contemplating rezoning the area off Pioneer Road on Merritt Island for an apartment complex.

The decision to rezone would be a huge mistake. Pioneer Road is already so busy between the three neighborhoods that are adjacent to it plus the school that has daily traffic in the morning and the afternoon that Pioneer Road cannot carry this much traffic. Plus all the neighborhoods surrounding the area for rebuild are all single family homes. An apartment complex just does not go with the complexion of the area. The area for rebuild is so small for the number of apartments that you want to put in.

Let alone losing more green space on Merritt Island that has over 50,000 people now living on it and losing the green space for all the animals that inhabit the area on Pioneer, which houses the endangered gopher turtles.

Putting up more apartments on Merritt Island is going to tax on the school system, the fire department and the police department along with all of our road wear.

Please reconsider your opinion on this rezoning for Merritt Island.

Thank you
Michael Duclos
Diane Duclos

Sent from my iPhone

From: [Gayle Allenback](#)
To: [Commissioner, D2](#)
Subject: Request for Denial of Zoning Application 25Z00054 – Parcel ID 24-36-14-00-259
Date: Saturday, January 31, 2026 4:18:54 PM

[EXTERNAL EMAIL] DO NOT CLICK links or attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Dear Commissioner Goodson,

I am writing as a concerned resident of Merritt Island to respectfully urge you not to approve the proposed zoning change (zoning application 25Z00054) that would allow medium- to high-density housing at the property located on the east side of N. Courtenay Parkway, approximately 420 feet south of Via De La Reina (parcel ID 24-36-14-00-259).

While growth can be beneficial when thoughtfully planned, this particular proposal threatens the safety, infrastructure, environmental balance, and character of the immediate neighborhood as well as the whole island in ways that are already well documented in the official reports on record.

Public safety must be paramount. One of the reports explicitly warns that this project presents a “material danger to public safety.” This is not merely a speculative concern, but a formal conclusion based on the project’s own analysis. Approving a development identified as posing such a risk would place current residents, future occupants, and first responders in jeopardy.

Traffic and infrastructure capacity are already strained. Many are familiar with the daily congestion along N. Courtenay Parkway. According to the report, local roads are operating at approximately 88% capacity, leaving very little margin for additional traffic. The proposed development exceeds the established “25% of remaining capacity” guideline; thus, rezoning this property would only exacerbate an already dangerous situation—raising the likelihood of accidents and posing increased risks to both drivers and adult and child pedestrians, particularly as the area awaits roadway redesign to place a raised median.

In addition, flooding concerns cannot be ignored. Natural drainage systems on Merritt Island are already under stress, and increased density at this location would further burden those systems. The result could be heightened flood risk for nearby homes and businesses, creating long-term consequences that are difficult and costly to reverse.

The proposal is also incompatible with surrounding land use. The report itself acknowledges that the planned 222 units are not consistent with the adjacent single-family neighborhoods. Such incompatibility threatens the stability, character, and quality of life of communities that residents, including myself, have invested in for decades.

Equally concerning is the loss of green space, especially wetlands and wildlife habitats, which would be irreversible. Our community has worked hard to preserve these areas, recognizing their importance to our ecosystem, natural drainage, and as a buffer against overdevelopment. Once lost, this land—and the balance it provides—cannot be restored. Preserving these spaces is essential to maintaining what makes Merritt Island a unique and cherished place to live.

Finally, there is clear local opposition and advisory concern. The Merritt Island Redevelopment Agency (MIRA) has already demonstrated its support for preserving our community by voting against the rezoning proposal, and even the Brevard County Planning & Zoning board was not able to reach a majority in favor of this project, after hearing both sides. As one of our elected representatives, I respectfully ask that you honor the judgment of local advisory boards and the residents they serve, rather than overriding their recommendations.

I support smart, appropriately scaled growth—but not this specific project, particularly in this specific location. The proposed density cannot be sustained without compromising safety, traffic flow, environmental resilience, and neighborhood compatibility.

For these reasons, I respectfully ask that you vote no on this zoning change and help protect the safety, environment, and long-term well-being of Merritt Island and its residents.

Thank you for your time, consideration, and service to our community.

Respectfully,

Gayle Allenback

2405 Raintree Lake Circle

Merritt Island, FL 32953

From: [Karie Hanselman](#)
To: [Commissioner, D1](#); [Commissioner, D2](#); [Commissioner, D3](#); [Commissioner, D4](#); [Commissioner, D5](#)
Subject: STOP THE DEVELOPMENT!
Date: Saturday, January 31, 2026 9:42:18 AM

[EXTERNAL EMAIL] DO NOT CLICK links or attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Over the past 40 years, the once-quiet drive from Cocoa into Merritt Island has transformed dramatically. What used to be a peaceful, natural sanctuary has become increasingly congested, especially on weekends, when out-of-town visitors crowd the unpaved shoulders as if they were public parks—camping, grilling, selling items, and often interfering with traffic flow.

Simultaneously, Port Canaveral has expanded from a small cruise hub into the largest port in Florida, yet the surrounding infrastructure has not kept pace. Weekend traffic jams on the Beachline are now almost guaranteed as thousands of cruise passengers rush to the port, frequently causing accidents or gridlock. Much of the remaining open land has been converted into cruise parking lots, further intensifying traffic pressures without meaningful road improvements.

As drivers exit the Beachline onto Courtney Parkway, they encounter additional congestion from Kennedy Space Center traffic, daily launch activity, and drivers racing to beat poorly timed lights. The nearby drawbridge often rises at the worst possible moment, pushing traffic backups well beyond the Pioneer/Courtney intersection. In the immediate vicinity of the proposed apartment development, three residential neighborhoods, an elementary school, a nursing home, Starbucks, a car wash, a bank, and a medical plaza all share a single narrow roadway. This road already struggles with backups, lacks turn lanes, and experiences frequent accidents as drivers take risks to avoid delays. It sits within half a mile of both the chronically congested Beachline interchange and the drawbridge that routinely traps vehicles for miles.

Adding a 225-unit apartment complex—introducing more than 250 additional vehicles—would create dangerous conditions for residents, schoolchildren, parents, teachers, and emergency responders. It would further complicate evacuation routes and increase risks in an area already beyond its infrastructure and environmental capacity.

After four decades of living on this small island, it is clear that Merritt Island has exceeded sustainable growth. Recent developments have already caused flooding in older neighborhoods, degraded water quality, and strained natural systems. Approving another high-density project in a location unable to support it is not progress—it is a failure of responsible urban planning and a decision driven purely by profit, not community well-being.

Apartments are not an ideal fit for this area due to several key factors related to infrastructure capacity, community character, and long-term planning considerations. I would strongly recommend you go to this area at 7:30-7:45am, 2:30pm or 5:30 pm and experience the congestion and craziness yourself before you vote for this madness.

Regards,
Karie Hanselman, concerned resident of area

From: [Rebecca Hauser](#)
To: [Commissioner, D2](#)
Subject: Opposition to Rezoning Case #25Z00054 – Public Safety Danger, Flooding Risks, & 1,800+ Residents Opposed
Date: Friday, January 30, 2026 5:34:15 PM

[EXTERNAL EMAIL] DO NOT CLICK links or attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Dear Commissioner Tom Goodson,

I am writing to formally request that you **DENY Rezoning Application #25Z00054** (RangeWater/Pioneer Rd). This proposal is not merely a "neighborhood concern"; it is a documented risk to the infrastructure, environmental stability, and life safety of the Merritt Island community.

As a resident and taxpayer, I urge you to consider the following critical facts:

1. Staff Report Warning: “Material Danger to Public Safety” The County’s own Staff Report (page 10) explicitly warns that this project creates a **“material danger to public safety.”** It is rare for staff to use such definitive language. For the Commission to override this warning would be to knowingly ignore a documented safety hazard regarding traffic flow and emergency access in a failing corridor.

2. Extreme Risk to School Zone Safety (Lewis Carroll Elementary) Pioneer Road is a primary corridor for children walking and biking to Lewis Carroll Elementary. During drop-off and pick-up, this area already experiences severe congestion and gridlock. Adding **400+ cars** (approx. 1,379 to 3,000 daily trips) into this specific intersection creates an unacceptable safety crisis.

3. Environmental Hazard: Myakka and Anclote Hydric Soils The project site consists of **Myakka and Anclote hydric soils**, which serve as a critical natural "sponge" for the area due to their high water table. Paving over 11 acres of these soils will displace massive volumes of groundwater, forcing runoff into surrounding low-lying neighborhoods that are **already prone to flooding**. We cannot replace a natural drainage basin with 11 acres of asphalt without causing major flooding for existing homeowners.

4. Overwhelming Community Opposition (1,800+ Signatures) The community has spoken with a unified voice. I have initiated a petition that currently has **over 1,800 residents** (online and on paper) who are formally opposed to this project. This number grows daily, reflecting the deep-seated concern of your constituents.

5. Violation of Administrative Policy #3 & Infrastructure

Failure Under **Administrative Policy #3**, the County must protect the quality of life of existing residents from "Land Use Shocks." North Courtenay Parkway is already at **88% capacity**. This project alone would consume **24.95% of the total remaining capacity**, violating the spirit of our concurrency rules and diminishing the safety of our neighborhoods through noise and transient traffic.

6. Unanimous Denial by MIRA (7-0) The Merritt Island Redevelopment Agency (MIRA) board—the local body that best understands our island's unique constraints—voted **unanimously (7-0)** to recommend denial.

The Planning and Zoning Board's **7-7 tie** reflects the deep flaws in this application. With 1,800 residents standing in opposition, a Staff Report warning of "**material danger to public safety**," and the severe risks to our school children and environment, there is no justification for approval.

I urge you to follow the recommendation of MIRA and Staff and **deny this rezoning**.

Sincerely,

Rebecca Hauser

815-608-8451

Petition can be found here: <https://www.change.org/p/urge-brevard-county-commissioners-to-oppose-rezoning-on-merritt-island>

From: [Kathy Brandt](#)
To: [Commissioner, D2](#)
Subject: rezoning on Merritt Island
Date: Friday, January 30, 2026 10:19:18 AM

[EXTERNAL EMAIL] DO NOT CLICK links or attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Please oppose the rezoning on Merritt Island. The area at Pioneer Rd. and Courtenay Parkway will be harmfully impacted if this goes through. The high density apartment complex in single family neighborhoods will compromise safety and traffic flow.

Thank you,
Kathleen Brandt

From: [Erica Miller Cochran](#)
To: [Commissioner, D2](#); [Commissioner, D1](#); [Commissioner, D3](#); [Commissioner, D4](#); [Commissioner, D5](#)
Subject: Rezoning Pioneer/Courtenay Pkwy
Date: Thursday, January 29, 2026 8:04:47 PM

[EXTERNAL EMAIL] DO NOT CLICK links or attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

I plead with you all to deny the rezoning of the property at Pioneer and N. Courtenay Pkwy in Merritt Island. Courtenay cannot support this influx of growth. With the apartments being built behind the Merritt Island mall we're looking at 100's of more cars on the road already. This large project of multi-family units would be devastating to this island. I know growth is inevitable but this isn't the right project for this specific area. This would not be beneficial to the small island community that Merritt Island has been known for since as long as I've lived here.

Thank you for your time.

[Erica Cochran](#)

Subject: Comprehensive Request for Denial of Zoning Application 25Z00054 – Parcel ID 24-36-14-00-259

Dear Members of the Planning and Zoning Board,

I am writing to formally and respectfully request denial of **Zoning Application No. 25Z00054**, which seeks a change in zoning classification for the property identified as **Parcel ID 24-36-14-00-259 (Tax Account No. 2412106)**, located on North Courtenay Parkway in Merritt Island.

I am a former Chairman of a Local Development Finance Authority in Huron Township, Michigan, where I worked closely with planning staff, zoning boards, and elected officials on land-use, redevelopment, and zoning matters. I am also a Merritt Island resident who owns property in close proximity to the subject parcel. I submit these comments based on that experience and on a careful review of the application materials, staff analyses, mapped resource data, and Brevard County's adopted Comprehensive Plan and zoning framework.

This letter is not an objection to growth or development in principle. Rather, it is a request that the County apply its zoning standards consistently, as it has done in prior cases, and deny a rezoning that is not supported by the record and that raises significant concerns related to plan consistency, compatibility, precedent, and long-term land-use integrity.

I. Inconsistency with the Comprehensive Plan and Classic Spot Zoning Indicators

The requested rezoning from **AU to RU-2-15**, with an associated development intensity of approximately **220 multi-family dwelling units**, represents a substantial increase in density and intensity that is not consistent with the intent, structure, or expectations established by the adopted Comprehensive Plan for this area.

Rezoning actions are intended to **implement** the Comprehensive Plan, not to override it or create parcel-specific exceptions that function as de facto policy changes. When a rezoning request introduces a use or density that materially departs from what the surrounding area has been planned to accommodate, it raises classic **spot zoning** concerns.

Spot zoning is not defined by size alone. It is identified by context: whether a single parcel is being singled out for preferential treatment that is inconsistent with surrounding zoning and land-use patterns, and whether the change advances a broad public purpose or primarily benefits a particular development proposal. In this case, the requested rezoning would single out one parcel for a level of intensity that is not reflected in the surrounding zoning framework, undermining the predictability and coherence of the Comprehensive Plan.

Approval under these circumstances would weaken the Plan's role as a guiding document and invite further requests that rely on exception rather than compliance.

II. Incompatibility with Surrounding Uses and Established Development Pattern

The subject property is located within an area characterized by lower-density residential development and long-established neighborhood patterns. These patterns reflect decades of zoning decisions and planning expectations that residents and property owners have relied upon.

Introducing multi-family development at the proposed density would significantly alter the character of the area and create incompatibilities related to:

- Scale and massing
- Intensity of use
- Traffic generation and circulation impacts
- Long-term land-use expectations

These impacts are not speculative. They are the predictable and cumulative effects of inserting a higher-intensity zoning district into an area that has not been planned, zoned, or built to support it.

In prior zoning cases, the County has routinely cited incompatibility with surrounding uses as a valid and sufficient basis for denial, particularly where a proposal represents a clear departure from the established development pattern.

III. Consistency with Prior Planning and Zoning Board Denials

Brevard County has a well-documented history of recommending and issuing denials where rezoning requests are inconsistent with adopted policy, incompatible with surrounding uses, or likely to set problematic precedent. The current request aligns closely with scenarios in which the Board has previously recommended denial.

A. Merritt Island Rezoning Denial (22Z00033 – August 15, 2022)

On August 15, 2022, the Planning and Zoning Board **unanimously recommended denial** of a rezoning request (**Application 22Z00033**) involving a change from **AU to RU-1-13** for a property located on **North Tropical Trail in Merritt Island**.

In that case, the Board heard testimony that the requested zoning was **out of character, incompatible with the surrounding area**, and would set a precedent encouraging similar requests. A Board member specifically noted that approving the request would “open the door” to additional rezonings and concluded that the proposal was “not conducive to this particular area.” The motion to recommend denial passed unanimously.

This case is directly relevant. It demonstrates the Board’s willingness to recommend denial where increased residential intensity would disrupt established land-use patterns and create precedent pressures—precisely the concerns raised by Application 25Z00054.

B. PUD Rezoning Denial (23PUD00001 – October 14, 2024)

Similarly, on October 14, 2024, the Planning and Zoning Board **unanimously recommended denial of Application 23PUD00001**, which sought to rezone property from **BU-1 and RU-2-10 to PUD**.

The minutes reflect that the request had been previously considered and that the Board had already recommended denial. Upon reconsideration, the Board again voted unanimously to recommend denial, reinforcing the principle that rezoning should not be approved simply because it is requested or resubmitted.

This case underscores that the Board consistently applies its standards and does not hesitate to recommend denial when the record does not support approval.

C. Broader Pattern of Denials to Preserve Plan Integrity

In addition to zoning cases, the Planning and Zoning Board has also recommended denial of **small-scale Comprehensive Plan amendments** where proposals were inconsistent with adopted policy or premature. For example, on August 12, 2024, the Board unanimously recommended denial of multiple plan amendment items, reinforcing the broader principle that the County prioritizes plan consistency over ad hoc changes.

Together, these actions demonstrate a clear and consistent history: when a request undermines adopted planning policy, compatibility, or long-term land-use coherence, **denial is not only appropriate but expected**.

IV. Reasonable and Economically Viable Use Exists Under Current Zoning

Denial of this application does not deprive the property of reasonable or economically viable use. The existing zoning designation allows lawful development that is consistent with surrounding land uses and long-standing planning objectives.

Rezoning is not intended to maximize development yield on a parcel-by-parcel basis, particularly where such maximization conflicts with adopted land-use policy. The existence of viable development options under current zoning weighs strongly against approval of the requested change.

V. Infrastructure Availability Does Not Cure the Land-Use Conflict

It is acknowledged that the subject property is served by an existing sewer system, eliminating the need for septic-based nitrogen mitigation. However, infrastructure availability alone does not

justify a zoning change that is otherwise inconsistent with the Comprehensive Plan or incompatible with surrounding development.

Environmental considerations—including wetlands, protected species, and tree preservation requirements—remain applicable. More importantly, zoning decisions must be based on land-use compatibility and policy consistency, not solely on the presence or absence of utilities.

VI. Public Interest, Precedent, and Long-Term Consequences

Zoning decisions are cumulative. Each approval sets expectations and shapes future requests. Approving this rezoning would:

- Signal that parcel-specific exceptions are acceptable
- Encourage similar requests in the surrounding area
- Weaken the County's ability to defend future denials

Denial, by contrast, reinforces predictability, fairness, and adherence to adopted policy. It protects both nearby property owners and the County's long-term planning framework.

Conclusion

For the reasons outlined above—including inconsistency with the Comprehensive Plan, classic spot zoning concerns, incompatibility with surrounding uses, a clear history of similar denials by the Planning and Zoning Board, the availability of reasonable use under current zoning, and the absence of a demonstrated public benefit—I respectfully request that **Zoning Application No. 25Z00054** be denied and that the existing zoning classification for **Parcel ID 24-36-14-00-259** remain unchanged.

Such a decision would be consistent with prior County actions, preserve the integrity of the zoning map, and uphold the principles that guide responsible land-use planning in Brevard County.

Respectfully submitted,

John C. Golovich
2540 Raintree Lake Circle
Merritt Island, FL 32953

I. Findings of Fact – Outline Supporting Denial

(Zoning Application No. 25Z00054 | Parcel ID 24-36-14-00-259)

A. Jurisdiction and Application

1. The Board has jurisdiction over **Zoning Application No. 25Z00054**, which requests a change in zoning classification for **Parcel ID 24-36-14-00-259**, located on North Courtenay Parkway, Merritt Island.
 2. The application requests a rezoning from **AU to RU-2-15**, allowing a significant increase in residential density and intensity.
-

B. Comprehensive Plan Consistency

3. The Brevard County Comprehensive Plan serves as the controlling policy framework for zoning decisions.
 4. Rezoning actions are intended to implement the Comprehensive Plan and are not intended to create parcel-specific exceptions or de facto plan amendments.
 5. The requested rezoning would allow a residential density and intensity that is not consistent with the intent and expectations of the adopted Comprehensive Plan for this area.
 6. Approval of the requested rezoning would undermine the role of the Comprehensive Plan as a predictable, guiding document for land-use decisions.
-

C. Spot Zoning Considerations

7. The requested rezoning would single out one parcel for treatment that is materially different from the surrounding zoning framework.
 8. The surrounding area is characterized by lower-density residential development and established land-use patterns.
 9. The requested zoning change exhibits characteristics of **spot zoning**, including preferential treatment of a single parcel without a corresponding public benefit or plan amendment.
 10. Approval of the request would weaken the consistency and integrity of the County's zoning map.
-

D. Compatibility with Surrounding Uses

11. The proposed rezoning would introduce a higher-intensity residential use that is incompatible with surrounding land uses in terms of scale, intensity, and character.
 12. Increased traffic, development intensity, and land-use impacts are foreseeable consequences of the proposed rezoning.
 13. The surrounding infrastructure and neighborhood pattern were not designed to accommodate the level of development intensity proposed.
-

E. Precedent and Consistency with Prior Board Actions

14. The Planning and Zoning Board has previously recommended denial of rezoning requests where increased intensity was incompatible with surrounding uses or inconsistent with adopted planning policy.
 15. Prior Board actions, including unanimous recommendations of denial for similar rezoning requests, demonstrate a consistent application of zoning standards.
 16. Approval of the requested rezoning would depart from this established pattern and make future denials of similar requests more difficult to defend.
-

F. Reasonable Use Under Existing Zoning

17. The subject property retains reasonable and economically viable use under its current zoning classification.
 18. Denial of the requested rezoning does not deprive the property owner of all reasonable use of the land.
 19. Rezoning is not required to ensure reasonable use of the property.
-

G. Infrastructure and Environmental Context

20. The property is served by an existing sewer system; however, infrastructure availability alone does not justify a zoning change that is inconsistent with adopted policy.
 21. Environmental considerations, including wetlands, protected species, and tree preservation requirements, remain applicable to the property.
 22. These considerations further support cautious, plan-consistent land-use decision-making.
-

H. Public Interest and Long-Term Planning

23. Zoning decisions have cumulative impacts and set expectations for future land-use requests.

24. Approval of the requested rezoning would encourage similar requests and erode predictability in the zoning process.
 25. Denial of the application is consistent with the public interest, long-term planning objectives, and the County's responsibility to apply zoning regulations uniformly.
-

I. Conclusion

26. Based on the foregoing findings, the requested rezoning is not consistent with the Comprehensive Plan, is incompatible with surrounding uses, raises spot zoning concerns, and is not required to ensure reasonable use of the property.
27. Denial of **Zoning Application No. 25Z00054** is supported by competent, substantial evidence in the record.

Good Day,

I hope this email finds you well. This email is a response to the proposed rezoning of land at the intersection of N. Courtenay & Pioneer. Adding a structure that could potentially house 100's of additional people in an already very congested area is a terrible deal for the residents of Merritt Island. As a resident of North Merritt Island , PTO President at Lewis Carroll Elementary and Mom to 3 students attending LCE// the safety of the school's students & their families is of the utmost importance. This is a terrible idea and should be denied.

- Public Safety: The Staff Report (p. 10) explicitly warns that this project creates a "Material Danger to Public Safety."
- Infrastructure: Our roads are already at 88% capacity. This project exceeds the "25% of remaining capacity" rule.
- Incompatibility: The report admits 222 units is "not consistent" with our surrounding single-family neighborhoods.
- Local Opposition: The local advisory boards (MIRA/P&Z) could not find a majority to support this. As our representatives, we ask that you do not override the local experts and residents.

I hope you take time to review the 1000's of concerned residents and take the appropriate action on this item.

Thank you for your time

Caitlyn Winn

From: [John Golovich](#)
To: [Commissioner, D2](#); [Commissioner, D1](#); [Commissioner, D3](#); [Commissioner, D4](#); [Commissioner, D5](#)
Subject: Fw: Public Hearing - Zoning Application No. 25Z00054
Date: Wednesday, February 4, 2026 10:27:07 AM
Attachments: [Zoning Board Letter.pdf](#)

[EXTERNAL EMAIL] DO NOT CLICK links or attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Please accept this letter in regards to the Zoning Application 25Z00054 which is on the agenda for February 5th, 2026. While I intended to attend in person to voice my concerns, with the failure of the Artemis 2 Wet Dress Rehearsal, I will be on site at Kennedy Space Center while the meeting is being held.

Thank You

John Golovich
2540 Raintree Lake Circle
Merritt Island, FL 32953

From: [Rebecca Hauser](#)
To: [AdministrativeServices](#)
Cc: [Commissioner, D1](#); [Commissioner, D2](#); [Commissioner, D3](#); [Commissioner, D4](#); [Commissioner, D5](#)
Subject: Opposition to Continuance & Request for Denial – Item 25Z00054, Lack of Competent Substantial Evidence
Date: Wednesday, February 4, 2026 3:41:24 PM

[EXTERNAL EMAIL] DO NOT CLICK links or attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Dear Commissioners,

I am writing as a concerned Merritt Island resident to express my opposition to a continuance for Item 25Z00054. While the applicant has requested more time, the significant late-hour submission of 480 pages of technical data suggests the original application was incomplete and, more importantly, **lacks Competent Substantial Evidence** to support a change in zoning.

This project faces fundamental challenges that more time and paperwork cannot resolve:

- **Unanimous Local Opposition:** The **Merritt Island Redevelopment Agency (MIRA) voted 7-0 to recommend Denial**. This was followed by a 7-7 deadlock at the Planning & Zoning board. The local bodies most familiar with this land have already found the project unsuitable.
- **Infrastructure at a Breaking Point:** The surrounding roads are already failing. The SR 528 westbound ramps are expected to drop to a precarious state by next year, and the **southbound approach is projected to hit LOS F (Total Failure)**. Currently, North Courtenay and the SR 528 ramps operate at **LOS E** in the morning.
- **Illegal Access & Signal Conflict:** The proposed median break on SR 3 is roughly **600 feet** from the Pioneer Road signal. **Under FDOT Rule 14-97, this is not permitted** (1,320-foot spacing required).
- **Pioneer Road:** If FDOT denies the median break—which is highly likely given the proximity to the light—the North Courtenay exit becomes a **"Right-In, Right-Out" only**. This means 100% of the residents wanting to go South or toward the 528 will be forced to exit onto **Pioneer Road** to use the traffic light. This creates a massive, dangerous bottleneck on a residential street that cannot handle that volume.
- **Fiscal Deficit & Violation of County Code 62-16:** P&Z minutes (pages 4 & 5) show staff agrees the impact is actually ~3,000 trips, yet the applicant's study cites only 1,379. Under **Brevard County Code Section 62-16**, the developer must pay for the capacity they consume. By under-reporting traffic by over 50%, the applicant avoids their legal obligation to fund road repairs, leaving taxpayers to fix the resulting gridlock.
- **Fundamentally Flawed Traffic Data:** The study notes a 2:00 PM school dismissal, but **December 11th was a 1:30 PM Early Release**. By starting their counts 30 minutes late, the applicant missed 100% of the peak school-zone traffic.

Because the applicant's data is based on incorrect school times, unpermitted road access, and under-counted trip volumes, the application lacks the Competent Substantial Evidence required for approval. Rather than granting a continuance to review eleventh-hour data, I respectfully ask the Board to follow the recommendations of MIRA and P&Z and Deny this application today.

Sincerely,

Rebecca Hauser 815-608-8451

From: [Greg McClasky](#)
To: [AdministrativeServices](#); [Commissioner, D1](#); [Commissioner, D2](#); [Commissioner, D3](#); [Commissioner, D4](#); [Commissioner, D5](#)
Subject: I Oppose Continuance & Request for Denial – Item 25Z00054, Lack of Competent Substantial Evidence
Date: Wednesday, February 4, 2026 4:28:25 PM

[EXTERNAL EMAIL] DO NOT CLICK links or attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Dear Commissioners,

I am writing as a concerned Merritt Island resident to express my opposition to a continuance for Item 25Z00054. While the applicant has requested more time, the significant late-hour submission of 480 pages of technical data suggests the original application was incomplete and, more importantly, **lacks Competent Substantial Evidence** to support a change in zoning.

This project faces fundamental challenges that more time and paperwork cannot resolve:

- **Unanimous Local Opposition:** The **Merritt Island Redevelopment Agency (MIRA) voted 7-0 to recommend Denial**. This was followed by a 7-7 deadlock at the Planning & Zoning board. The local bodies most familiar with this land have already found the project unsuitable.
- **Infrastructure at a Breaking Point:** The surrounding roads are already failing. The SR 528 westbound ramps are expected to drop to a precarious state by next year, and the **southbound approach is projected to hit LOS F (Total Failure)**. Currently, North Courtenay and the SR 528 ramps operate at **LOS E** in the morning.
- **Illegal Access & Signal Conflict:** The proposed median break on SR 3 is roughly **600 feet** from the Pioneer Road signal. **Under FDOT Rule 14-97, this is not permitted** (1,320-foot spacing required).
- **Pioneer Road:** If FDOT denies the median break—which is highly likely given the proximity to the light—the North Courtenay exit becomes a **"Right-In, Right-Out" only**. This means 100% of the residents wanting to go South or toward the 528 will be forced to exit onto **Pioneer Road** to use the traffic light. This creates a massive, dangerous bottleneck on a residential street that cannot handle that volume.
- **Fiscal Deficit & Violation of County Code 62-16:** P&Z minutes (pages 4 & 5) show staff agrees the impact is actually ~3,000 trips, yet the applicant's study cites only 1,379. Under **Brevard County Code Section 62-16**, the developer must pay for the capacity they consume. By under-reporting traffic by over 50%, the applicant avoids their legal obligation to fund road repairs, leaving taxpayers to fix the resulting gridlock.

- **Fundamentally Flawed Traffic Data:** The study notes a 2:00 PM school dismissal, but **December 11th was a 1:30 PM Early Release.** By starting their counts 30 minutes late, the applicant missed 100% of the peak school-zone traffic.

Because the applicant's data is based on incorrect school times, unpermitted road access, and under-counted trip volumes, the application lacks the Competent Substantial Evidence required for approval. Rather than granting a continuance to review eleventh-hour data, I respectfully ask the Board to follow the recommendations of MIRA and P&Z and Deny this application today.

Sincerely,

Greg McClasky

Tel: 321-302-2844

From: [Tina McClasky](#)
To: [AdministrativeServices](#); [Commissioner, D2](#); [Commissioner, D3](#); [Commissioner, D4](#); [Commissioner, D5](#); [Commissioner, D1](#)
Subject: My Opposition to a Continuance & a Request for Denial – Item 25Z00054, Lack of Competent Substantial Evidence
Date: Wednesday, February 4, 2026 4:36:39 PM

[EXTERNAL EMAIL] DO NOT CLICK links or attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Dear Commissioners,

I am writing as a concerned Merritt Island resident to express my opposition to a continuance for Item 25Z00054. While the applicant has requested more time, the significant late-hour submission of 480 pages of technical data suggests the original application was incomplete and, more importantly, **lacks Competent Substantial Evidence** to support a change in zoning.

This project faces fundamental challenges that more time and paperwork cannot resolve:

- **Unanimous Local Opposition:** The **Merritt Island Redevelopment Agency (MIRA) voted 7-0 to recommend Denial**. This was followed by a 7-7 deadlock at the Planning & Zoning board. The local bodies most familiar with this land have already found the project unsuitable.
- **Infrastructure at a Breaking Point:** The surrounding roads are already failing. The SR 528 westbound ramps are expected to drop to a precarious state by next year, and the **southbound approach is projected to hit LOS F (Total Failure)**. Currently, North Courtenay and the SR 528 ramps operate at **LOS E** in the morning.
- **Illegal Access & Signal Conflict:** The proposed median break on SR 3 is roughly **600 feet** from the Pioneer Road signal. **Under FDOT Rule 14-97, this is not permitted** (1,320-foot spacing required).
- **Pioneer Road:** If FDOT denies the median break—which is highly likely given the proximity to the light—the North Courtenay exit becomes a **"Right-In, Right-Out" only**. This means 100% of the residents wanting to go South or toward the 528 will be forced to exit onto **Pioneer Road** to use the traffic light. This creates a massive, dangerous bottleneck on a residential street that cannot handle that volume.
- **Fiscal Deficit & Violation of County Code 62-16:** P&Z minutes (pages 4 & 5) show staff agrees the impact is actually ~3,000 trips, yet the applicant's study cites only 1,379. Under **Brevard County Code Section 62-16**, the developer must pay for the capacity they consume. By under-reporting traffic by over 50%, the applicant avoids their legal obligation to fund road repairs, leaving taxpayers to fix the resulting gridlock.

- **Fundamentally Flawed Traffic Data:** The study notes a 2:00 PM school dismissal, but **December 11th was a 1:30 PM Early Release.** By starting their counts 30 minutes late, the applicant missed 100% of the peak school-zone traffic.

Because the applicant's data is based on incorrect school times, unpermitted road access, and under-counted trip volumes, the application lacks the Competent Substantial Evidence required for approval. Rather than granting a continuance to review eleventh-hour data, I respectfully ask the Board to follow the recommendations of MIRA and P&Z and Deny this application today.

Sincerely,

Tina McClasky

Home Phone:321-449-4014

From: [Chelsey Bjork](#)
To: [AdministrativeServices](#)
Cc: [Commissioner, D1](#); [Commissioner, D2](#); [Commissioner, D3](#); [Commissioner, D4](#); [Commissioner, D5](#)
Subject: Public record submission - zoning item 25Z00054
Date: Thursday, February 5, 2026 8:08:28 AM

[EXTERNAL EMAIL] DO NOT CLICK links or attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Good morning Commissioners and Administrative Staff,

For record purposes, I respectfully submit the following comments regarding the proposed continuance of zoning item 25Z00054.

I understand and respect the rationale for a continuance when new information is introduced and the record requires additional review. However, based on the materials already submitted, including the staff analysis and documented compatibility, safety, and traffic concerns, I believe there is already substantial evidence indicating that this project, at its proposed location and scale, is deficient.

In an effort to better understand assumptions made in the traffic analysis, I contacted FDOT permit and project staff regarding the potential access configuration referenced in the report, including the use of the SR-3 median. At this time, I was informed that there is no known application or request on file related to this development. While I am awaiting written confirmation, this raises significant questions as to whether the “preferred” access scenario relies on improvements or access points that are neither approved nor guaranteed.

Rezoning at this stage would lock in density, rights, and entitlements before concurrency is verified. The FDOT project is independent, safety driven, and already in the design stage. It cannot be assumed as mitigation for this development and may, in fact, further constrain access. Rezoning now would require the County to speculate on future access permissions, turn movement restrictions, queuing impacts, and additional mitigation needs. Concurrency cannot be evaluated based on preferred, but unapproved scenarios, tied to a separate state project.

Additionally, the existence of theoretical by-right uses does not justify approval of a rezoning that removes existing safeguards while increasing intensity. The decision before you is not whether other uses might be permitted today, but whether removing a binding site plan while increasing density is compatible and supported by infrastructure. The current binding site plan provides enforceable protections related to access, circulation, buffering, and vegetation. Those protections would be lost with this rezoning, and future boards would lose leverage. The traffic analysis continues to rely on access patterns tied to the existing binding site plan, yet those assumptions are no longer guaranteed if it is removed.

Whether the density is achieved through a bonus or split designation does not change the real world impact. 222 units on approximately 11 acres represents an intense residential use at this intersection given existing traffic and safety constraints. The math may differ on paper, but the

impacts on the ground are the same.

The staff analysis notes the developer's willingness to pursue proportionate fair share; however, there is no agreement, no defined project, and no assurance that mitigation would occur prior to impacts. This is not a completed concurrency solution, but a placeholder. Impact fees, while valuable, are not project specific mitigation and do not replace concurrency or guarantee improvements on Pioneer Road.

While Florida Statute 163.3180 allows proportionate fair share to address concurrency, it does not override conditions that present a material danger to public safety. A financial contribution alone does not resolve site specific safety issues, particularly within an active school zone. Payment does not physically reduce queuing, improve sight lines, or make the Lewis Carroll Elementary corridor safer for the increased traffic volumes associated with this proposal.

Additionally, I want to note that proportionate fair share functions as a financial contribution, not a physical transportation solution. While payment may be offered, it does not widen North Courtenay Parkway, resolve queuing near the school zone, or improve safety conditions on its own. This concern is heightened by the fact that FDOT is already advancing a state funded safety project on this corridor that limits turning movements and lane configurations. Accepting proportional fair share under these circumstances risks allowing additional traffic to be approved on a roadway the State is actively redesigning to reduce conflicts, not accommodate new access. That disconnect underscores why concurrency cannot be satisfied by payment alone in this case.

I appreciate the Board's attention to maintaining a complete and accurate record. My intent in submitting these comments is not to challenge the process, but to ensure that unresolved issues related to traffic, concurrency assumptions, and compatibility are formally noted as this item moves forward.

While I respect the request for a continuance, I wish to state clearly for the record that the existing evidence already demonstrates that this rezoning is incompatible and unsupported. A continuance should not be interpreted as a lack of information, but rather as additional time to review concerns that are already well established.

Kindly,
Chelsey True
Merritt Island Resident

Dear Commissioners/Board Members,

We are writing to express our strong opposition to the proposed rezoning (Case #25Z00054) for the Maronda/Strada Homes development on East Crisafulli Road in Merritt Island. I am concerned about increased traffic congestion on already overburdened local roads, worsening flooding and stormwater issues, loss of natural wetlands, and the impact on the character and safety of the community. We respectfully urge you to deny this rezoning request and ensure proper studies and public input are completed before any land-use changes are considered.

Thank You For Your Consideration Of This Matter!

William and Sarah Hodge

390 Sanders Lane

Merritt Island, Florida 32953

Phone: 321-452-3340

Email: billhodge@juno.com

sarahkiserhodge@gmail.com

25Z00054

Dear Commissioner,

Please do not approve the proposed apartments at Pioneer and N. Courtenay. I live in Palmetto neighborhood a few blocks down. I have lived here for 15 years, and know that there have been at least 3 deaths from car accidents at the entrance to my neighborhood, possibly 4. The traffic is so bad at times, that I cannot get out of my neighborhood, and mostly cannot get in. The traffic has tripled in the past 6 years. We cannot sustain anymore traffic. These apartments will overload an already overcrowded street.

Thank you for your time!

Sincerely,

Rose Bray

3222 Glenridge Circle

Merritt Island FL 32953

Good evening,

Question, do you live on Merritt Island? If not have you visited the proposed site of the 220 unit apartment complex you will allow to be built there? If not, I suggest you do.

This is a area of single family homes. There are no apartment complexes there.

Besides bringing down property values, it will add a possible 220 to 440 plus cars at an already outdated and inadequate intersection of Pioneer and hwy 3. You are relying on a 16year old traffic study. That intersection has no let turn lanes or traffic lights. Pioneer is a 2 lane road. Nearly everyday, there are near misses and or accidents. People line the Pioneer road in am and pm for the Elm school.

The 528 and hwy 3 intersection is about 1/4 mile from the Pioneer intersection. This 528 one was not designed for this level of traffic when built 40+ years ago. This intersection absorbs North Merritt Island, South Merritt Island traffic. Add in the cruise parking you approved and built 2 yrs ago along with the busiest cruise terminal in the world. Disaster.

The FDOT has in their master plan to add a street light at Via DeLa Reina. Its not going to help. They also have a proposed plan to widen 528 to the port and to modernize the 528 hwy intersection as well as build new bridges. Until these are done, I insist that the project be re-examined and relocated.

I cannot leave my house on Via De La Reina. It is too dangerous. There isnt a county sheriff's presence for traffic enforcement anywhere on MI. People speed through my neighborhood whether they live there or not. People drink and drive, smoke dope so bad I get high driving down hwy 3 not because I smoke, rather whoever is doing it blows out the window in clouds.

I believe that the commissioners made up their mind a few years ago that they would do this apartment project. Otherwise they would not have put in a new lift station off courtenay next door to the project. It started in 2022 and has been going on for 3 years. Finally done. It caused damage to my house due to incompetence and laziness by the contractor.

I also believe that deception was used by putting a 1x1 sign about the first meeting for residents on the Stewart health site. No one knows what this project is. They wont till the trees come down. I didn't find out until very recently for a petition gathering.

No commissioner should vote yes. There will be opposition to those who do come voting time.

Respectfully,

Ted Howley

144 Via De La Reina

Merritt Island, FL 32953

4076151456

25Z00054

Please vote NO on the proposal for rezoning a property on the east side of N. Courtenay Parkway to make it suitable for an apartment complex to go in.

I live at 2605 Raintree Lake Circle, and struggle with major flooding from large storms. The neighborhood behind us was built at least a half a foot higher than ours so we get their runoff already. If the proposed rezoning is allowed to take place, it's going to negatively affect my home. I can't imagine how devastating the impact will be for the residents of Raintree by the Lake.

PLEASE VOTE NO!

Thank you sincerely,
Reina Dalton
(321)745-0596
Sent from my iPhone

25Z00054

I plead with you all to deny the rezoning of the property at Pioneer and N. Courtenay Pkwy in Merritt Island. Courtenay cannot support this influx of growth. With the apartments being built behind the Merritt Island mall we're looking at 100's of more cars on the road already. This large project of multi-family units would be devastating to this island. I know growth is inevitable but this isn't the right project for this specific area. This would not be beneficial to the small island community that Merritt Island has been known for since as long as I've lived here.

Thank you for your time.

25Z00054

Please oppose the rezoning on Merrit Island. The area at Pioneer Rd. and Courtenay Parkway will be harmfully impacted if this goes through. The high density apartment complex in single family neighborhoods will compromise safety and traffic flow.

Thank you,

Kathleen Brandt

Over the past 40 years, the once-quiet drive from Cocoa into Merritt Island has transformed dramatically. What used to be a peaceful, natural sanctuary has become increasingly congested, especially on weekends, when out-of-town visitors crowd the unpaved shoulders as if they were public parks—camping, grilling, selling items, and often interfering with traffic flow.

Simultaneously, Port Canaveral has expanded from a small cruise hub into the largest port in Florida, yet the surrounding infrastructure has not kept pace. Weekend traffic jams on the Beachline are now almost guaranteed as thousands of cruise passengers rush to the port, frequently causing accidents or gridlock. Much of the remaining open land has been converted into cruise parking lots, further intensifying traffic pressures without meaningful road improvements.

As drivers exit the Beachline onto Courtney Parkway, they encounter additional congestion from Kennedy Space Center traffic, daily launch activity, and drivers racing to beat poorly timed lights. The nearby drawbridge often rises at the worst possible moment, pushing traffic backups well beyond the Pioneer/Courtney intersection. In the immediate vicinity of the proposed apartment development, three residential neighborhoods, an elementary school, a nursing home, Starbucks, a car wash, a bank, and a medical plaza all share a single narrow roadway. This road already struggles with backups, lacks turn lanes, and experiences frequent accidents as drivers take risks to avoid delays. It sits within half a mile of both the chronically congested Beachline interchange and the drawbridge that routinely traps vehicles for miles.

Adding a 225-unit apartment complex—introducing more than 250 additional vehicles—would create dangerous conditions for residents, schoolchildren, parents, teachers, and emergency responders. It would further complicate evacuation routes and increase risks in an area already beyond its infrastructure and environmental capacity.

After four decades of living on this small island, it is clear that Merritt Island has exceeded sustainable growth. Recent developments have already caused flooding in older neighborhoods, degraded water quality, and strained natural systems. Approving another high density project in a location unable to support it is not progress—it is a failure of responsible urban planning and a decision driven purely by profit, not community well-being.

Apartments are not an ideal fit for this area due to several key factors related to infrastructure capacity, community character, and long-term planning considerations. I would strongly recommend you go to this area at 7:30-7:45am, 2:30pm or 5:30 pm and experience the congestion and craziness yourself before you vote for this madness

Regards,

Karie Hanselman, concerned resident of area

Dear Commissioner Delaney,

I am writing as a concerned resident of Merritt Island to respectfully urge you not to approve the proposed zoning change (zoning application [25Z00054](#)) that would allow medium- to high-density housing at the property located on the east side of N. Courtenay Parkway, approximately 420 feet south of Via De La Reina (parcel ID 24-36-14-00-259).

While growth can be beneficial when thoughtfully planned, this particular proposal threatens the safety, infrastructure, environmental balance, and character of the immediate neighborhood as well as the whole island in ways that are already well documented in the official reports on record.

Public safety must be paramount. One of the reports explicitly warns that this project presents a “material danger to public safety.” This is not merely a speculative concern, but a formal conclusion based on the project’s own analysis. Approving a development identified as posing such a risk would place current residents, future occupants, and first responders in jeopardy.

Traffic and infrastructure capacity are already strained. Many are familiar with the daily congestion along N. Courtenay Parkway. According to the report, local roads are operating at approximately 88% capacity, leaving very little margin for additional traffic. The proposed development exceeds the established “25% of remaining capacity” guideline; thus, rezoning this property would only exacerbate an already dangerous situation—raising the likelihood of accidents and posing increased risks to both drivers and adult and child pedestrians, particularly as the area awaits roadway redesign to place a raised median.

In addition, flooding concerns cannot be ignored. Natural drainage systems on Merritt Island are already under stress, and increased density at this location would further burden those systems. The result could be heightened flood risk for nearby homes and businesses, creating long-term consequences that are difficult and costly to reverse.

The proposal is also incompatible with surrounding land use. The report itself acknowledges that the planned 222 units are not consistent with the adjacent single-family neighborhoods. Such incompatibility threatens the stability, character, and quality of life of communities that residents, including myself, have invested in for decades.

Equally concerning is the loss of green space, especially wetlands and wildlife habitats, which would be irreversible. Our community has worked hard to preserve these areas, recognizing their importance to our ecosystem, natural drainage, and as a buffer against overdevelopment. Once lost, this land—and the balance it provides—cannot be restored. Preserving these spaces is essential to maintaining what makes Merritt Island a unique and cherished place to live.

Finally, there is clear local opposition and advisory concern. The Merritt Island Redevelopment Agency (MIRA) has already demonstrated its support for preserving our community by voting against the rezoning proposal, and even the Brevard County Planning & Zoning board was not able to reach a majority in favor of this project, after hearing both sides. As one of our elected representatives, I respectfully ask that you honor the judgment of local advisory boards and the residents they serve, rather than overriding their recommendations.

I support smart, appropriately scaled growth—but not this specific project, particularly in this specific location. The proposed density cannot be sustained without compromising safety, traffic flow, environmental resilience, and neighborhood compatibility.

For these reasons, I respectfully ask that you vote no on this zoning change and help protect the safety, environment, and long-term well-being of Merritt Island and its residents.

Thank you for your time, consideration, and service to our community.

Respectfully,

Gayle Allenback

2405 Raintree Lake Circle

Merritt Island, FL 32953

25Z00054

Dear Commissioner:

I want to email to let you know that I live in Villa de Palmas and I am very much against changing the zoning for the proposed 222 apartments at Pioneer and N. Courtney.

It would add so much traffic to an already crowded and dangerous intersection and road and impede traffic, which is already a mess at certain times a day.

Additionally, the purchaser of the property knew the zoning when they purchased it. So, I see no reason to change it to fit in with their plans.

Please keep the current residents in mind when you cast your vote.

Sincerely

Ute Steigerwald

241 Mariah Court

Merritt Island

25Z00054

From: 116mongo@gmail.com
To: [Commissioner, D2](#)
Subject: N.Courtney add Pioneer Housing
Date: Thursday, February 5, 2026 12:39:48 PM

[EXTERNAL EMAIL] DO NOT CLICK links or attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Vote NO on this preposterous housing project. We don't want it. Period.
Jeff Wilson,
Resident of North Merritt Island

Sent from my iPhone

Dear Members of the Planning Commission,

I am writing to formally oppose the proposed apartment development planned for my neighborhood.

First, the traffic impact alone makes this project inappropriate. The primary roadway serving this area is already operating at approximately 88% capacity. Approving a development of this size would exceed the established policy limiting projects to no more than 25% of remaining roadway capacity. This is not a theoretical concern—it directly affects daily safety, emergency response times, and overall livability for current residents.

Second, the project fails the most basic test of compatibility. The development report itself acknowledges that 222 apartment units are “not consistent” with the surrounding single-family residential neighborhoods. This admission alone should disqualify the proposal. Introducing high-density housing into a clearly low-density area disregards the existing character and long-term planning intentions for this neighborhood.

Finally, this proposal conflicts with Administrative Policy #3, which exists specifically to prevent situations like this. Placing a high-density apartment complex within a low-density residential pocket will significantly diminish the quality of life and safety of the existing neighborhood. Increased traffic congestion, noise, and overcrowding are unavoidable consequences that current residents will be forced to absorb.

Growth should be intentional, compatible, and infrastructure-supported. This project is none of those. I respectfully urge the Commission to deny approval and protect the safety, character, and quality of life of our neighborhood.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,

Amanda Palmer

Concerned Resident