

## 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.

### EXCERPT OF COMPLETE AGENDA

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

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

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

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

Mr. Hopengarten responded yes, I was.

Ms. Rezanka asked if he spoke against this item.

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

Ms. Rezanka asked Do you own property up there.

Mr. Hopengarten responded, "No I rent."

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

#### PUBLIC COMMENT

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

END PUBLIC COMMENT

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Meeting adjourned at 5:10 p.m.