

PLANNING AND ZONING BOARD/LOCAL PLANNING AGENCY MINUTES

The Brevard County Planning & Zoning Board met in regular session on **Monday, August 18, 2025**, at **3:00 p.m.**, in the Florida Room, Building C, Brevard County Government Center, 2725 Judge Fran Jamieson Way, Viera, Florida.

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

Board members present were Mark Wadsworth, Chair (D4); Henry Minneboo, Vice-Chair (D1); Ana Saunders (D5); Erika Orriss (D3); Debbie Thomas (D4); Greg Nicklas (D3); Ron Bartcher (D2); Ruth Amato (D1); John Hopengarten (D1); Jerrad Atkins (D1); Robert Brothers (D5); Melissa Jackson (D5) and Eric Michajlowicz (3).

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

Excerpt of complete agenda

Item H.3. Cobblestone II RVG LLC (D. Scott Baker) requests a Small-Scale Comprehensive Plan Amendment (25S.12) to change the Future Land Use Map (FLUM) designation from RES-1, RES-2, CC, and NC to RES-6. (23SS00006) (Tax Account 3006458, 3010260) (District 3)

Item H.4. Cobblestone II RVG LLC (D. Scott Baker) requests a zoning classification change from TR-3, BU-1, and RU-1-9 to all TR-3 with a BDP. (23Z00038) (Tax Account 3006458, 3010260) (District 3)

Trina Gilliam read both item H.3. and H.4. into the record as they are companion applications but will need separate recommendations.

Scott Baker spoke to the applications. He stated he wanted to be clear at the outset that there's no new development proposed. There's no changes at all proposed. What happened is my client purchased a property about two years ago. The lender looked carefully at the zoning situation and realized there was some inconsistency between the zoning and the future land use. So, the future land use today would not allow this park. The park has been there probably since the late 60s maybe early 70s. It's developed at a relatively high density at six units per acre. So, it's an existing non-conforming use. We'd like to make the zoning and the land use consistent. We're also proposing to do a binding development plan to cap the unit count where it is today. So, nothing new is planned. And the reason we do that is it helps out with: 1) making the lender happy when they see that there's no inconsistencies, and 2) is if we want to do any kind of improvements to the property, not add units, but perhaps do a rec center or do some kind of amenity or something, we're non-conforming as we sit here today, and it puts us in a situation where we must go through a lot of additional steps at the county to get approval. There's also a small little house up on US-1 that we'd like to use and it's zoned RU-1. So, we can't use that as an office unless the whole thing is zoned TR-3, which allows mobile home parks. So, if any residents are here, I want them to be assured nothing's changing out there. We just need to make it legally consistent and have a unified zoning and land use approach.

Public Comment

David Fields stated he has about a hundred questions. What are they wanting to do is my first question.

Mr. Wadsworth responded with we don't know that information. You're either for the rezoning or against. We're just the planning and zoning.

Mr. Fields stated I understand that and that's what I can't find out from the notice that was posted is what are they wanting to do? What's the rezoning that they want to do? That's my question which I can't get answered from the post or from anybody else. And then I also have comments for whomever is in charge after the meeting about again the information on the post. I've been to three different buildings, and this can be on the record. I have no problem with that. I've been to three different buildings, and nobody exactly knew until I got to the last one which was over in building A and it's the planning and development. At least that lady knew where I needed to be in which building. But I still didn't get what room I needed to be in until I talked to the information lady out front. The complaint is your rezoning notice doesn't have any of that information on it. It just said this address which covers this whole facility ABC, and I don't know how many buildings you got. The other thing is on the rezoning notice, it doesn't tell me what they want to do, what zoning they're changing, what zoning they want to improve, any of that. And I can't find that out. And I've tried to ask people and nobody can tell me. Not blaming you guys. I'm just saying as far as the notice goes. I don't know if I'm against it or for it because I can't find out what they're doing. So, if that makes any sense to you, because hopefully you guys know what kind of rezoning they're wanting to do if you're here for a yay or nay vote. So, right now my vote is I abstain, but I would like to find out well what it is they're wanting to do.

Mr. Wadsworth stated we don't know that ourselves neither. We just know the zoning changes.

Mr. Fields asked then how can you approve or disapprove if you don't know what they're doing?

Mr. Wadsworth responded because if it's compatible with surrounding properties, etc., etc., we can go on forever.

Mr. Fields asked is it compatible? You don't know that either. Correct.

Mr. Wadsworth responded we do know that.

Mr. Fields continued but you don't know what it is they want to do. You just know it's compatible with other properties.

Mr. Esseeesse reminded the Chair that you don't have to go back and forth with members of the public. They're allowed to ask questions, but it's up to the discretion of the board if they want to engage in dialogue. I'm sure there's staff in the back that can assist you with explaining what the request is for, sir.

Mr. Fields responded okay. Great. I don't have a problem with that either. I can even step outside. I just I'm here today to find out what the heck they're wanting to do, because I live there.

Mr. Esseeesse commented just a suggestion if I may. If we want to wait for those two individuals to have a chance to speak with staff, then maybe they could come back and either say for or against or at least have a better understanding of what the request is for. It's up to you and the board. But that would be my recommendation.

Mr. Wadsworth stated items 3 and 4 we'll just scoot over to the side until you all have your time and we're going to go to item H5 and H6.

Mr. Atkins stated it seems like the applicant kind of gave a rundown of what they were looking to do. Is he allowed to join them out there and give them a brief explanation of what he said prior to that gentleman walking in the back door? That might streamline things a little bit.

Mr. Wadsworth replied that would be up to him.

Mr. Brothers stated he thought the applicant was very concise and straightforward in what you were planning.

Items H.3. and H.4. will be continued after items H.5. and H.6.

Item H.3. Cobblestone II RVG LLC (D. Scott Baker) requests a Small-Scale Comprehensive Plan Amendment (25S.12) to change the Future Land Use Map (FLUM) designation from RES-1, RES-2, CC, and NC to RES-6. (23SS00006) (Tax Account 3006458, 3010260) (District 3)

Item H.4. Cobblestone II RVG LLC (D. Scott Baker) requests a zoning classification change from TR-3, BU-1, and RU-1-9 to all TR-3 with a BDP. (23Z00038) (Tax Account 3006458, 3010260) (District 3)

Trina Gilliam read both item H.3. and H.4. into the record as they are companion applications but will need separate recommendations.

Scott Baker spoke to the application and stated he only spoke with one lady outside. There was another group talking to your staff. I think I addressed her questions. She's right over there. What we're doing, nothing. That's kind of the simple answer. Just changing zoning and land use to make everything consistent with each other.

Mr. Minneboo commented you're just changing words.

Mr. Baker responded Yes. And colors on your map.

No Public Comment

Mr. Hopengarten commented I don't have a copy of the existing BDP.

Mr. Baker responded there is no existing BDP. We're going to enter into one as a condition to have board approval. BOCC approval.

Mr. Hopengarten asked do you have a proposed.

Mr. Baker responded yes. It was provided to me by your staff, and we have no issue with the form.

Mr. Hopengarten commented they gave it to you and you have to agree to it and then you'll give it back.

Mr. Baker responded yes, I've submitted it to our client for signature.

Ms. Gilliam commented I've given them a template and they need to add the information in the template, but basically what they're proposing is to limit the unit count to the existing already there,

which is I think 173 units. They don't want to add anymore. What's going to be in the BDP is just to limit what's there.

Mr. Hopengarten stated I made a count on the aerial, and I come up with 178 units. Maybe I miscounted.

Mr. Baker stated he thinks it is 178, it's six units per acre, though. I can tell you that.

Mr. Hopengarten continued if the BDP states 173, you're going to have to get rid of five units.

Mr. Baker replied I just don't have that BDP in front of me. I know the form is approved and we didn't even put a unit count in there. I think we put we can never exceed six units per acre which is what we have today. But I'm happy to add a total unit.

Mr. Hopengarten replied no, because the staff said that they had stipulated 173 units and there are currently 178 on that site. So don't get tied up with 173 if that's on the BDP because it'll hold you back. You see what I'm saying?

Mr. Baker responded sure. And thank you for pointing that out.

Motion to recommend approval of Item H.3. Debbie Thomas, seconded by Erica Orriss. Motion passed unanimously.

Motion to recommend approval of Item H.4. with a BDP capping to the existing units, by Debbie Thomas, seconded by Erica Orriss. Motion passed unanimously.

Meeting adjourned at 4:18 p.m.