

North Merritt Island Dependent Special District Board

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

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

Board members present: Mary Hillberg, Chris Cook, Gina Lindhorst, John Speck and Frank Golan.

Staff members present: Tania Ramos, Planner; and Alice Randall, Operations Support Specialist.

EXCERPT OF COMPLETE AGENDA

Item H.4. ABRS LLC (Landon Scheer) requests a zoning classification change from BU-1 (General Retail Commercial) to BU-2 (Retail, Warehousing, and Wholesale Commercial). (26Z00024) (Tax Account 3033535) (District 2)

Tania Ramos read the application into the record.

Landon Scheer spoke to the application. He stated the request is to change the zoning from BU-1 to BU-2 to allow for mini-storage utilizing a metal building. Mini-storage is allowed in both BU-1 and BU-2. Metal buildings are allowed in both BU-1 and BU-2; however, County code restricts metal buildings specifically for mini-storage. To build a metal mini-storage building we must change to BU-2. This will not be climate controlled. They are old-fashioned rollup doors and it's the industry standard for this type of mini-storage use, the metal building. It's much more feasible for the project. We will maintain at least a 75' buffer from the western property line. We're placing the building in the upland portion of the site and will provide compensatory storage for water.

Mr. Speck inquired about what other material would be used if not metal.

Mr. Scheer responded with concrete block. But these are not climate-controlled units. There are no utilities being run to them. They are essentially rollup up garages.

Ms. Hillberg inquired about the bay doors.

Mr. Scheer responded they are interior facing, bay doors. The rollup doors are on the inside facing the drive aisle. So, none of the rollup doors are visible from Courtenay Parkway.

Ms. Lindhorst asked how many units are planned for the project. How big are the units and what kind of products will be stored there.

Mr. Scheer responded the plan shows 100, but will be reduced to 96 to provide more stormwater... The units will vary, generally they'll be 10x20 or 20x20 units. Storage will be whatever is in there. It's not climate controlled. Again, the use of mini-storage is allowed in both BU-1 and BU-2, it's the metal building that's not allowed in BU-1.

Ms. Hillberg asked if it was a cement floor.

Mr. Scheer responded with yes. And typical mini storage, 8' tall. Small buildings. The metal building is much more economical and realistic for this application. They must be hurricane rated.

Mr. Golan inquired about the air conditioning. Is that an issue if they were air conditioned under the BU-2 zoning designation?

Mr. Scheer responded they aren't necessarily prohibited from having air conditioning, they're just electing not to.

Mr. Speck asked if anyone has heard from the residents that the proposed project is abutting. This is totally undeveloped right now.

Mr. Scheer responded that just north of this there's a fire station and a Dollar General. To the south is a gas station and south of that is a multi-office complex. Again, the use is allowed, we're simply asking for BU-2 so we can change the material type of construction.

Mr. Cook inquired about access. It's shown as being shared with the Dollar General store. And, you're only showing 3 parking spaces.

Mr. Scheer responded yes. And, the county code for mini storage requires a minimum and a maximum of 5 spaces. And 1 ADA space. The owner of this property owned all of them together and they split them. I don't know if it was a condition, but they provided an access easement, before my client purchased the property. So, that access is in place and if that driveway wasn't built by the time we needed it we'd have to build it.

Mr. Golan read in the record the notes that had been provided by the North Merritt Island Homeowners Association. He stated that what is proposed seems innocuous, but once it's zoned BU-2, everything they're stating is.....

Mr. Scheer responded there is quite a bit of BU-2 in the area, so I would disagree with that. 2 properties south of us is BU-2, 2 south of that is BU-2, so there's quite a bit of BU-2 in the area. I understand the concern for introducing other uses, but this is what the use is going to be on the property. They've spent a lot of time and money on this plan, and this is what they are going to build.

Mr. Speck inquired if the other BU-2 properties had binding development plans attached to them so there would be some kind of filtering function and there wouldn't be an open BU-2. You're going to build this now, but you could sell it and maybe not build it. BU-2 is wide open. You could put a fish processing plant, a crematorium, you can put anything on that so that's the concern from the boards. I would propose putting in a binding development plan. Or put in a deviation in the BU-1 to allow the metal storage building.

Ms. Ramos responded you would have to do the BU-2 with a binding development plan.

Mr. Scheer stated his client would have no problem with that. My client would be okay with a BDP that stated it's zoned BU-2 with all the allowable uses in BU-1 including the mini-storage in BU-2 in a metal structure.

Discussion continued about consistency with the land use and intensity and the BU-2 zoning. And the possibility of a binding development plan.

Mr. Cook stated there are at least 4 other mini-storage units on North Merritt Island. And you don't have this wall all along there.

Mr. Scheer responded that they have an extensive landscape plan that was submitted with the site plan application. We must plant shrubs and trees along the frontage. The building setback on the smallest part is 25' from the property line and closer to 50' from the street. The easement on the map is the approved access to our site from FDOT.

Mr. Speck proposed the applicant come back with a binding development plan that goes along with the BU-2.

Mr. Golan stated based on administrative policy 62-1151c(7)5 he would recommend denial of the request.

Discussion continued pertaining to which policies of the administrative policy would be applied to the denial.

Motion to recommend denial of Item H.4. by Frank Golan, seconded by John Speck. Motion passed by a vote of 4:1.

The meeting adjourned at 7:25 p.m.

DRAFT