

PLANNING AND ZONING BOARD/LOCAL PLANNING AGENCY MINUTES

The Brevard County Planning & Zoning Board met in regular session on **Monday, April 20, 2026**, at **3:30 p.m.**, in the Florida Room, Building C, Brevard County Government Center, 2725 Judge Fran Jamieson Way, Viera, Florida.

The meeting was called to order at 3:30 p.m.

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

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

Mark Wadsworth stated that if any Board Member has had any ex-parte communication regarding any application, please disclose now.

John Hopengarten disclosed that he'd had conversations with the engineer on Items H.1. and H.2.

Robert Brothers disclosed that he'd had conversation with some of the neighbors to Item H.1.

EXCERPT OF COMPLETE AGENDA

H.2. Domanique F. Culpepper, Ralph M. Williams, III, Ralph Williams, IV, Erikka Williams (Antonio Owen) request a zoning classification change from AU (Agricultural Residential) to RU-2-15 (Medium-Density Multiple-Family Residential). (26Z00004) (Tax Account 2455061) (District 2)

Trina Gilliam read item H.2. into the record.

Antonio Owen spoke to the application. We're proposing a rezoning of an AU parcel in Merritt Island. We're asking for RU215. The current zoning is AU. The future land use RES 15. So, it's in line with the future land use of the property. There's RU215 north of the parcel, south of the parcel, to the west of the parcel, and then there's RU212 that's just west of the parcel as well. So, to us it's in line with the future land use and what the intention of the area which you want to do. Our plan is to do 36 apartment units for senior living affordable housing.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Beverly Neurock stated she is north of the proposed area. My concern is unfortunately we have a flooding problem there already. I have pictures from October of 2024 and October 2025, but I didn't know that they had to be submitted. My concern is that I want to make sure that as we start working on that property, if this rezoning is approved they will take the appropriate actions to ensure that the current flooding problem isn't any worse than it already is. In addition to that I noticed that just looking at where the county is on infrastructure at this point, Merritt Island, I read an article on how they're preparing for the FDEP's camera scoping requirements for piping and stuff like that. Merritt Island's not even in the picture on that. There's already a funding problem in the county for fixing flooding issues and Merritt Island took a hit. So, I'm just asking for your consideration. I appreciate that you want to improve the property and I'm just saying that the flooding needs to be addressed prior to....

END PUBLIC COMMENT

Mr. Johnson stated you mentioned affordable housing and senior living. Is it senior?

Mr. Owen responded it's a senior living community and we're going to be targeting affordable housing for seniors.

Mr. Minneboo asked what that meant. 55 plus?

Mr. Owen responded we're planning to work with the Brevard Housing Authority to supply choice vouchers and choice vouchers are the HUD program. So, they could use that to have a place to live.

Mr. Minneboo asked for an explanation about the runoff. You're not going to make her problem worse.

Mr. Owen responded I know St. John's has new rules. So, we can't make the problem worse. We must retain all our water. If you look at the pictures, there's a lot of little lines around there. That's retention. So, most of the site is going to be retention. If it's not parking or building, it's retention. So, we must by state code requirements take care of all the storm water overflow.

Mr. Bartcher inquired if the large area in the center the retention area. How big is that?

Mr. Owen responded it's another area retention. I don't know. We haven't done the calculations. This is just conceptual right now. We're still working on that. We're planning to do a preapp in the next couple of weeks. I was trying to get this going first, the rezoning, before I get too much ahead of myself.

Mr. Bartcher continued with you said it's going to be for seniors. Are you going to have anything other than just apartments? And are those multiple stories?

Mr. Owen responded no; after talking to Mike Bean over at the housing authority, their need right now is just living quarters really. Single story. Our conceptual plan is just single story.

Mr. Bartcher said you stated it's for seniors. How are you going to restrict it to seniors?

Mr. Owen responded I don't know what kind of law bylaws we'll have, but our plan is just to set up an operating management company that's going to use the choice vouchers system in coordination with the housing authority.

Mr. Bartcher asked if the choice vouchers are only for seniors.

Mr. Owen responded no; anyone can get them. When we talked to Mike Bean, he said we could just have it where only seniors can apply for it there. They have a veteran community and only the veterans can apply to it. So, you can set it up in different ways with the choice vouchers.

Mr. Bartcher then asked if these are rental apartments and not a condominium.

Mr. Owen responded it is not a condominium. It's single ownership that owns all the apartments and then the choice vouchers to be able to rent.

Ana Saunders asked the applicant if they saw that the staff report mentioned you're in a type three aquifer and there's a restriction for the impervious. You're aware of that?

Mr. Owen responded yes, I have another engineer that's working on it, so he's probably aware of it. I'll get in touch with him.

Ms. Saunders continued with the site plan you submitted now exceeds that impervious percentage, so I just want to make sure you know that. And then from the stormwater perspective, I realize it's a zoning component, but you're right, the storm water rules for St. John's have changed significantly. Where is the point of outfall going to be for this project?

Mr. Owen responded that he'd have to talk with the engineer he's working with. This is just conceptual, more like putting something together on paper. Like I said, we haven't gone too deep with it yet. Talk to us in a week if we get past this board meeting.

Ms. Amato asked staff what the max density could be after the rezoning. I know what he's asking for, but often what they ask for might not be the maximum density that would be allowed on the property once you change the zoning. What would that be?

Ms. Gilliam responded 36.

Ms. Amato then asked if they could go two stories if they decided to change their mind after the zoning.

Ms. Gilliam responded they can go to two stories.

Ms. Saunders asked if there are additional buffering requirements that'll be between this property and the single family to the east required?

Ms. Gilliam responded no, they're both residential. So, there'd be no change. It's not commercial or industrial.

Mr. Hopengarten asked if the units can be made as two story. Usually, your units are single stories.

Mr. Owen responded with if we have to. We can do two story; we can do three story. But our intention is to do single.

Mr. Hopengarten replied, "I mean structurally."

Mr. Owen responded structurally you can do five, whatever the limits are for the county. But our intent for cost savings is to go one story. If you go two story, it costs a lot more. So, to be affordable, you start losing the affordability.

Mr. Hopengarten asked if they're going for any tax incentives.

Mr. Owen responded possibly, I don't know. I'm sure we'll try. I'm not really part of that. There are other partners that are dealing with that stuff.

Mr. Bartcher asked what size the apartments are going to be.

Mr. Owen responded that they're 511 square feet for one bedroom, the real need right now is one bedroom, one bath. So, we're doing mostly those. And then they said that there's a couple times that some of the seniors have a son or daughter that's living with them. So, there are six that will be two-bedroom, one bath with 760 square feet somewhere around there.

Mr. Bartcher stated that most of them are going to be single.

Mr. Owen responded that's what their needs are. We're just trying to target what their needs are and satisfy that.

Mr. Bartcher asked if he'd be willing to have a binding development plan that says you're only going to have single story.

Mr. Owen responded saying yeah, I have no problem with that.

Ms. Orriss stated you mentioned that it's only going to be seniors. But you said they can have children that live with them too. If the senior passes on and their child wants to stay living there, then you have the younger generation living there too. Is that part of this? I mean suddenly it opens to just affordable living.

Mr. Owen responded unless that child has a voucher, they can't live there. It's all based on the choice vouchers.

Ms. Orriss stated so, it's based on the voucher. It's not based on senior living.

Mr. Owen responded it's senior living with vouchered senior living. A choice voucher. They're probably in their 70s and 80s. So, their children are probably 45, 50. They're not kids. They're probably going to be seniors themselves. And it's not an often thing. I don't really know that part of it. He just said to do the one bedroom, one bath and just throw a couple two bedrooms in there because sometimes there might be a caretaker too that's living with them or something. That's what their request was so, we're just trying to satisfy their request.

Ms. Orriss asked if they'd be open to a binding development plan or something that said there has to be a senior living there? Since that's how it was advertised to us.

Mr. Owen responded yes.

Motion to recommend approval of Item H.2. with a BDP limiting to one-story building and seniors only, by Ron Bartcher, seconded by Erika Orriss. Motion passed unanimously.

Meeting adjourned at 5:10 p.m.