



CITY OF TITUSVILLE

TITUSVILLE ENVIRONMENTAL COMMISSION

AGENDA

Regular Meeting

February 26, 2026 - 5:30 PM

Council Chamber at City Hall

555 South Washington Avenue, Titusville, FL 32796

All persons who anticipate speaking on any Public Hearing item must fill out an Oath Card to be heard on that agenda item and sign the oath contained thereon. These cards are located on the table near the entrance to the Council Chamber or may be obtained from the Recording Secretary. This meeting will be conducted in accordance to the procedures adopted in Resolution No. 24-1997.

Those speaking in favor of a request will be heard first, those opposed will be heard second, and those who wish to make a public comment on the item will speak third. The applicant may make a brief rebuttal if necessary. A representative from either side, for or against, may cross-examine a witness.

Anyone who speaks is considered a witness. If you have photographs, sketches, or documents that you desire for the Commission to consider, they must be submitted into evidence and will be retained by the City. Please submit such exhibits to the Recording Secretary.

1. CALL TO ORDER

2. ROLL CALL

3. DETERMINATION OF A QUORUM

4. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

5. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

A. Minutes February 11, 2026

Approve Minutes

6. PETITIONS AND REQUESTS FROM THE PUBLIC PRESENT (NON-AGENDA ITEMS)

7. OLD BUSINESS

A. Wetlands

Continue to provide feedback and review changes to the comprehensive plan regarding wetland policies and strategies.

8. NEW BUSINESS

9. PETITIONS AND REQUESTS FROM THE PUBLIC PRESENT

10. REPORTS

11. FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS

12. ADJOURNMENT

Any person who decides to appeal any decision of the Titusville Environmental Commission with respect to any matter considered at this meeting will need a record of the proceedings, and for such purpose, may need to ensure that a verbatim record of the proceedings is made, which record includes the testimony and evidence upon which the appeal is to be based.

The City desires to accommodate persons with disabilities. Accordingly, any physically handicapped person, pursuant to Chapter 286.26 Florida Statutes, should, at least 48 hours prior to the meeting, submit a written request to the chairperson that the physically handicapped person desires to attend the meeting.

City of Titusville
"Gateway to Nature and Space"

REPORT

To: Members of the Titusville Environmental Commission

From:

Subject: **Minutes February 11, 2026**

Department/Office: Planning

Recommended Action:

Approve Minutes

Summary Explanation & Background:

Minutes February 11, 2026

Alternatives:

Item Budgeted:

Source/Use of Funds/Budget Book Page:

Strategic Plan:

Strategic Plan Impact:

ATTACHMENTS:

1. 02.11.26 TEC Minutes Draft

The Titusville Environmental Commission (TEC) of the City of Titusville, Florida met in regular session at City Hall in the Council Chamber located at 555 South Washington Avenue on Wednesday, February 11, 2026, at 5:30 pm.

XXX

Chairman Myjak called the meeting to order at 5:30 pm. Present were, Vice Chairwoman Laurilee Thompson, Member Beth Ann Tucker, Member Hector Delgado, Member Jason Miller, Member Jonathan Burdette, Alternate Member Kevin Rosa and Alternate Member William Young. Member John Nico was absent. Staff present were Sustainability Program Coordinator Lily Galleo, Assistant City Attorney David Melito and Recording Secretary Laurie Dargie.

XXX

Member Miller made a motion to approve the January 27, 2026 meeting minutes with corrections. Member Tucker seconded. There was a unanimous voice vote in favor.

XXX

Petitions and Requests from Public Present

Stan Johnston of Titusville, Florida came and made comments of the city's cover ups, dishonesty, and corruption. Mr. Johnston also spoke about concerns with Elizabeth Avenue.

Member Miller spoke of Senate Bill 290 and House Bill 433 and how it relates to Conservation Easements and how it would allow any purchased conservation land after 2023 to be determined if they are suitable for agricultural use and if they are, the land may be surplus for agricultural use with the state retaining an easement. Member Miller said he got this information from Audubon and wanted to bring this to the Titusville Environmental Commission's attention as it does relate to conservation easements.

Member Young said that the 1,000 Friends of Florida had a workshop regarding this legislation and they will also be following these Legislation Bills.

XXX

New Business

None

XXX

Old Business

Wetland Conservation

Mary Sphar of Cocoa, Florida came to continue the in-depth review on Policy 1.16.2.

Ms. Sphar provided several handouts: 1. Saint Johns River Water Management District Policy on releasing Conservation Easements. 2. Chronology of Park Avenue Subdivision, and comp Plan/ordinance changes rezoning in Conservation land use 3. Rationale for proposed changes to FLUE Policy 1.16.2.

Ms. Sphar went over the handouts in detail and went over presentation slides regarding the Park Avenue Subdivision Transmittal.

The Titusville Environmental Commission had some discussion with Ms. Spahr regarding the review of their previous motion from the January 14, 2026 meeting when they agreed with Ms. Sphar to remove part of the language in Policy 1.16.2.

XXX

Vice Chairwoman Thompson made a motion to reaffirm their previous motion from January 14, 2026 in removing the following sentence from Policy 1.16.2, ***unless such wetlands are preserved by a conservation easement as part of a Planned Development (PD) or other master planned development, and any other.*** Member Tucker seconded.

Roll call was as follows:

Member Young	Yes
Member Burdette	Yes
Member Delgado	Yes
Member Tucker	Yes
Vice Chairwoman Thompson	Yes
Member Miller	Yes
Chairman Myjak	Yes

Motion passed.

XXX

Titusville Environmental Commission
Regular Meeting
February 11, 2026

Draft

Member Miller made a motion to accept the rationale that Mary Sphar provided in her handout to better clarify the removal of the sentence in Policy 1.16.2. Member Delgado seconded.

Roll call was as follows:

Member Miller	Yes
Vice Chairwoman Thompson	Yes
Member Young	Yes
Member Delgado	Yes
Member Burdette	Yes
Member Tucker	Yes
Chairman Myjak	Yes

Motion passed.

XXX

Ms. Sphar said she had intended to discuss Policy 1.16.4 but is asking that this policy be discussed at a future meeting to allow feedback from Community Development Director Brad Parrish.

Ms. Sphar provided handouts: 1. Natural Resources Management (NRM) Department Zoning Review & Summary 2. Conceptual Development Titusville EIR 3. Overall Conceptual Ste Plan 4. Lieberman Multifamily Summary Explanation & Background

Ms. Sphar went over the Lieberman Multifamily project as it relates to Policy 1.16.3 in detail.

Ms. Sphar asked the Titusville Environmental Commission members what the problem is with this project relating to this policy. Vice Chairwoman Thompson said knowing what it the reasonable use of the property. Ms. Sphar said she is correct and Policy 1.16.3 needs to be fixed.

Ms. Sphar went over the handout Natural Resources Management (NRM) Department Zoning Review & Summary and explained what Brevard County implements.

The Titusville Environmental Commission had discussion with Ms. Sphar regarding multifamily developments, one unit per five acres and the 1.8% impact to wetlands.

Member Miller said Ms. Sphar provided a great amount of information and he would personally like to have time to review this information before making any motions.

Chairman Myjak agreed and stated that the Titusville Environmental Commission will continue the review of Policy 1.16.3 and 1.16.4 at the next meeting.

XXX

Petitions and Requests from Public Present

David Hobart of Titusville, Florida made brief comments regarding the discussion that took place as he was attending the meeting to listen.

XXX

Reports

Vice Chairwoman Thompson said there will be a public meeting tomorrow by the Saint Johns River Water Management District regarding a feasibility study that they did to determine their next round of projects. Vice Chairwoman Thompson said they are doing a 1.5-million-dollar upgrade at the Chain of Lakes Park. Vice Chairwoman Thompson said she will be attending this meeting in person but it is available to watch as a webinar. Vice Chairwoman Thompson said she would send a link to register for the webinar if anyone is interested. The meeting is from 8:00am to 12noon. Sustainability Program Coordinator Lily Galleo said she will be attending virtually and she will provide a link.

Member Delgado said that there are three different rockets sitting on the launch pads right now which would have been unheard of twenty years.

Vice Chairwoman Thompson said she heard that the City of Cape Canaveral will be doing massive studies on structural integrity of buildings in Cape Canaveral due to starship launches. She said that this came up because of what is happening to structures in Boca Chica, Texas.

Member Miller said he would like to discuss at future meetings the idea of the city purchasing conservation land. Member Miller said he has researched properties in Titusville to have biking trails. Member Miller said he has looked at Wellfield #3 and has concerns that it isn't being protected.

Member Young would like to have future discussion again about zero energy homes.

Member Burdette said he attended a meeting in New Smyrna and one of the things that stuck out the most was research on protecting citrus trees from fungus.

Chairman Myjak said he took a tour of Wellfield #4.

Chairman Myjak said he is working with the Indian River Lagoon Roundtable and they filed a report to the county asking them to pull together a space force task force to deal with some of the concerns that are not being addressed regarding deluge system or common man safety system.

Sustainability Program Coordinator Lily Galleo said there is a Community Conference on March 7, 2026 at the Senior Center from 8:00am to 12 noon.

Sustainability Program Coordinator Lily Galleo said there is a Florida Friendly Landscaping Seminar in Melbourne on March 21, 2026.

Sustainability Program Coordinator Lily Galleo said there is a Sea Oat Planting Event on February 14, 2026 at 8:30am in the City of Cape Canaveral.

Sustainability Program Coordinator Lily Galleo said that there is a ribbon cutting for the nanobubbles on March 3, 2026 at 10:30am.

Chairwoman Thompson asked if Ms. Galleo could please have these events announced at the City Council meetings at the beginning of the meetings to get the word out. Ms. Galleo said she would pass this request on to Brad Parrish.

Chairwoman Thompson thanked Mary Sphar and Kay St. Onge for their in-depth research and work into the wetlands policy.

XXX

Future Agenda Items

Wetland Conservation

XXX

Adjournment 8:07 p.m.

City of Titusville
"Gateway to Nature and Space"

REPORT

To: Members of the Titusville Environmental Commission
From:
Subject: Wetlands
Department/Office: Planning

Recommended Action:

Continue to provide feedback and review changes to the comprehensive plan regarding wetland policies and strategies.

Summary Explanation & Background:

During the February 11th meeting, alternatives were presented for consideration in FLUE Policy 1.6.3 by Ms. Mary Sphar along with other documents attached. The TEC agreed to review these options and bring their comments back during the February 26th meeting.

Alternatives:

Item Budgeted:

Source/Use of Funds/Budget Book Page:

Strategic Plan:

Strategic Plan Impact:

ATTACHMENTS:

1. Wetlands Confusion and Clarification -- FLUE 1-07-26
2. Three Possible Choices for Clarifying FLUE Policy 1.16.3

3. Connection 1.16.4 sentence one and 1.16.3 page 1
4. Connection 1.16.4 sentence one and 1.16.3 pages 2 and 3
5. TEC Edits and Motions

Wetlands Confusion and Clarification

FLUE Policies

Point of Confusion	Suggested Clarification Future Land Use Element policies for Conservation land use
<p>Comprehensive Plan Conservation Element Strategy 1.6.3.2 states: “At a minimum, wetlands 5 acres or more in size <u>shall</u> be designated as a conservation land use.” This is <u>very important</u> because there is a density limitation of one residential unit per 5 acres stated in FLUE Policy 1.16.3.</p> <p>FLUE Policy 1.16.2 contains an outdated loophole allowing removal of some wetlands 5 acres or greater from the Conservation land use. Strategy 1.16.2.1 does not require a wetland delineation when wetlands are suspected on land not designated as Conservation.</p>	<p>Revise the language in Policy 1.16.2 and Strategy 1.16.2.1 so that all wetlands 5 acres and greater in size are designated Conservation land use and always remain in Conservation.</p>
<p>When a property contains only a small portion (less than 5 acres) of a large wetland totaling 5 acres or greater, how should the City ensure that this small part of the larger wetland is designated Conservation land use? How can the City ensure that wetland size determination does not stop at property boundaries?</p>	<p>Add language ensuring that the best available and appropriate data shall be used to determine whether a wetland continuing onto adjacent property is 5 acres or greater in size.</p>
<p>How is compliance with the residential limitation of one unit per five acres to be assessed? Should the density limitation be interpreted as a percentage, such as 1.8% of the Conservation land use?</p> <p>Does “residential uses of one unit per five acres” allow for any residential types other than single-family?</p>	<p>Add language to Policy 1.16.3 specifying a method for assessing compliance with the one residential unit per five acres limitation.</p> <p>Also clarify in this policy whether or not “residential uses of one unit per five acres” can include residential types other than single-family.</p>
<p>How can the City discourage applicants from using “reasonable use of the land” as an excuse to try to wiggle out of the Conservation land residential density limitation?</p> <p>How should the City and the permitting agencies work together to regulate wetlands, but avoid duplication of effort?</p>	<p>Replace the confusing and problematic FLUE Policy 1.16.4 wording with a statement saying that the City shall apply the Comprehensive Plan land use and density requirements when wetland destruction or degradation has been permitted by SJRWMD or any applicable permitting agency.</p>

Three Possible Choices for Clarifying FLUE Policy 1.6.3

Choice 1 –

- Explicit prohibition on commercial and industrial land development activities in the Conservation land use category

Policy 1.16.3:

Permitted uses within the Conservation land use area shall be limited to residential uses of one unit per five acres, conservation, recreation, open space, and stormwater management systems consistent with the policies of the Conservation Element and the land development regulations. **Commercial and industrial uses are not permissible in the Conservation land use category.**

Choice 2 –

- Explicitly prohibit commercial and industrial land development activities in the Conservation land use category AND
- Allow the one residential unit per five acres limitation to be extended to subdivisions and multi-family developments by applying it as a percentage of Conservation land use.

Policy 1.16.3:

Permitted uses within the Conservation land use area shall be limited to residential uses of one unit per five acres, conservation, recreation, open space, and stormwater management systems consistent with the policies of the Conservation Element and the land development regulations. **The preceding limitation of one (1) dwelling unit per five (5) acres within the Conservation land use category may be applied as a maximum percentage limiting wetland impacts to not more than 1.8% of the total Conservation land use on a cumulative basis for subdivisions and multi-family developments. Commercial and industrial uses are not permissible in the Conservation land use category.**

Choice 3 –

- Explicitly prohibit commercial and industrial land development activities in the Conservation land use category AND
- Allow the one residential unit per five acres limitation to be extended to subdivisions, multi-family developments, and residential portions of mixed-use development projects by applying it as a percentage of Conservation land use.

Policy 1.16.3:

Permitted uses within the Conservation land use area shall be limited to residential uses of one unit per five acres, conservation, recreation, open space, and stormwater management systems consistent with the policies of the Conservation Element and the land development regulations. **The preceding limitation of one (1) dwelling unit per five (5) acres within the Conservation land use category may be applied as a maximum percentage limiting wetland impacts to not more than 1.8% of the total Conservation land use on a cumulative basis for subdivisions, multi-family developments, and residential portions of mixed-use development projects. Commercial and industrial uses are not permissible in the Conservation land use category.**

CONNECTION between FLUE Policy 1.16.3 and FLUE Policy 1.16.4

FLUE Policy 1.16.3

Permitted uses within the Conservation land use area shall be limited to residential uses of one unit per five acres,

Beginning of FLUE Policy 1.16.4:

Impacts to areas designated as Conservation land use designation shall be considered if it is unavoidable due to absence of feasible and/or practical alternatives for reasonable use of the land,

A very important addition made to Policy 1.16.3 in 2010 that affects Policy 1.16.4:

Pre-2010 Policy 1.16.3 -- No provision for residential uses in Conservation land use

2010 Change -- Permitted uses within the Conservation land use area shall be limited to residential uses of one (1) unit per five (5) acres . . .

Comment -- With this addition, the City has **added a criterion that specifies reasonable use of Conservation land for single-family homes**. This is similar to the criterion used by Brevard County, which says “Residential land uses within wetlands shall be limited to not more than one (1) dwelling unit per five (5) acres . . .

What the 2010 change does **not** accomplish -- Although there is a reasonable use standard for single-family homes in Conservation land use, there is **NO REASONABLE USE STANDARD** for residential subdivisions, multifamily projects, or residential portions of mixed-use development projects.

Question -- Should the Titusville Planning Staff and City Council be put in the position of having to wrestle with the question of exactly how much wetland impact constitutes a reasonable use of the land for subdivisions, multifamily projects, or residential portions of mixed-use development projects when land use and zoning changes are requested? That is exactly what happened with the Lieberman Multifamily proposed Comp Plan change and rezoning request.

Two Changes in to Policy 1.16.4 in 2010

Change 1 -- A relatively minor change

Pre - 2010 -- **Conditional uses** within the Conservation land use designation **shall be considered if there is no practical alternative to insure reasonable use of the applicant's propertyand**

2010 Change -- **Impacts to areas** designated as Conservation land use designation **shall be considered if it is unavoidable due to absence of feasible and/or practical alternatives for reasonable use of the land**

Change 2 -- A very big change

Pre - 2010 -- Conditional uses within the Conservation land use designation . . . shall be based upon . . . [conditional use criteria].

2010 Change -- Impacts to areas designated as Conservation land use designation shall be considered if . . . **the regulations create an inordinate burden on an existing use of the land or a vested right to a specific use of the land¹, or due to significant site constraint and/or practical design modification constraint².**

¹ Comment 1

The words “if the regulations create an **inordinate burden** on an existing use of the land or a **vested right** to a specific use of the land” mirror the Bert Harris property rights law passed in 1995 which addresses an inordinate burdens and vested rights. The Bert Harris Act says: “When a specific action of a governmental entity has **inordinately burdened** an existing use of real property or a **vested right** to a specific use of real property, the property owner of that real property is entitled to relief.” This law can be used by landowners, and **the first sentence in Policy 1.16.4 is not needed for a Bert Harris challenge**. The logical target of any Bert Harris challenge would be Conservation Element Strategy 1.6.3.2 (nicknamed the Five Acre Rule). However, the Bert Harris law states: “No cause of action exists under this section as to the application of any law enacted on or before May 11, 1995”, and Strategy 1.6.3.2 became part of the Comp Plan before 5/24/1990.

With regard to vested rights, Titusville has vested right procedures which are stated in the Land Development Regulations, Chapter 34, Article VII, Division 3. **The first sentence in FLUE Policy 1.16.4 is not needed to guarantee the opportunity for vested rights determination and relief.**

² Comment 2

The phrase “significant site constraint and/or practical design modification constraint” is similar to regulatory permitting language that has been in Florida permitting agencies’ Applicant’s Handbooks for many years, including 2008 and 2009 when the language in Policy 1.16.4 was being revised. From the current *Environmental Resource Permit Applicant’s Handbook, Volume I*, effective June 28, 2024 :

10.2.1.1 Except as provided in subsection 10.2.1.2, below, if the proposed activity will result in adverse impacts to wetland functions and other surface water functions such that it does not meet the requirements of subsections 10.2.2 through 10.2.3.7, below, then the Agency in determining whether to grant or deny a permit shall consider whether the applicant has implemented **practicable design modifications** to reduce or eliminate such adverse impacts.

The term "modification" shall not be construed as including the alternative of not implementing the activity in some form, nor shall it be construed as requiring a project that is significantly different in type or function. A proposed modification that is not technically capable of being completed, is not economically viable, or that adversely affects public safety through the endangerment of lives or property is not considered "practicable."

Basically what this language is implying is that in some cases, an applicant’s project can be granted a permit even if it is not going to really meet the environmental criteria. This can happen if enough mitigation is offered. As Margaret Spontak stated in her memo *Partnership for Wetlands Protection: The Need for Land Use Planning and Permitting*:

It is a losing proposition to attempt to achieve proper land use planning through a regulatory program. By the time a developer requests a permit application, it is too late for planning. All that can be done at this point is to minimize the negative impacts as best the regulatory agency can. The burden has been passed on to the permitting staff rather than dealt with as a land use policy and a natural resource protection policy in the comprehensive plan and implemented through local government land development regulations.

Titusville’s land use planning policies should not duplicate permitting policies of regulatory agencies. Land use decisions should not involve evaluating whether wetland impacts can be considered due to “**significant site constraint and/or practical design modification constraint.**” Therefore, this phrase is not appropriate in FLUE Policy 1.16.4.

TEC Suggested Edits

FLUE Policy 1.16.2 (Motion made on 11.12.26)

As of 2009, the wetlands shown as Conservation Land Use on the Future Land Use Map were established using the National Wetlands Inventory Map of 1988. These wetlands shown on this map have not been ground truthed. In order to provide more accurate mapping of wetlands, when the City receives a wetland delineation on specific sites, the delineations will be accepted by the City of Titusville and the Future Land Use Map will be amended accordingly. The Conservation Land Use shall be amended to include all wetland areas on the site to be preserved, ~~unless such wetlands are preserved by a conservation easement as part of a Planned Development (PD) or other master-planned development, and any other~~ along with any upland areas to be permitted for preservation for state and/or federal listed wildlife species.

Rationale for proposed changes to FLUE Policy 1.16.2

The wording in strike-through was added in 2017 to accommodate clustered development patterns, including conservation subdivisions, using Planned Development (PD) zoning. At that time, PD zoning was not was not allowed in Conservation land use. This was changed on February 27, 2018 with the passage of Ordinance 6-2018, rendering the language in strike-through no longer needed to accomplish its original purpose. Since 2017, problems with the language have surfaced. First of all, it is inconsistent with Conservation Element Strategy 1.16.3.2 (“Five Acre Rule”). Second, SJRWMD conservation easements are no longer guaranteed to be permanent, and the amendment aims to head off potential problems resulting from that fact.

FLUE Policy 1.16.4 (Motion made on 1.27.26)

TEC made a motion for Staff to review and comment on the proposed language added to 1.16.4 “Where the wetland degradation or destruction has been permitted or may be permitted in the future by the applicable regulatory agencies, no wetlands shall be impacted by development activities without appropriate review and approval by the City. The City shall apply the land use planning policies and density requirements for protecting wetlands and their functions as stated in the Future Land Use Element Objective 1.16 and the Conservation Element.”

To Read

Impacts to areas designated as Conservation land use designation shall be considered if it is unavoidable due to absence of feasible and/or practical alternatives for reasonable use of the land, or the regulations create an inordinate burden on an existing use of the land or a vested right to a specific use of the land, or due to significant site constraint and/or practical design modification constraint. The allowable impacts shall be based upon site specific evaluation determined through the permitting process conducted by all the regulatory agencies with jurisdiction.

Where the wetland degradation or destruction has been permitted or may be permitted in the future by the applicable regulatory agencies, no wetlands shall be impacted by development activities without appropriate review and approval by the City. The City shall apply the land use planning policies and density requirements for protecting wetlands and their functions as stated in the Future Land Use Element Objective 1.16 and the Conservation Element.

TEC MOTIONS

10/15/2025	Member Miller made a motion to recommend to City Council to have city staff look at Policy 1.16.2 and specifically into the language regarding conservation easements. Seconded by Member Burdette. There was a unanimous voice vote in favor. Member Miller made a motion recommending that city staff review and find the best place within the Comprehensive Plan Future Land Use Element Wetland Policy 1.16 to include the language that decisions on these smaller parcels are made using the best and available appropriate data, I E and GIS or staff reports. Member Tucker seconded.
11/12/2025	Vice Chairwoman Thompson made a motion to recommend removing the following sentence from FLUE Policy 1.16.2 “unless such wetlands are preserved by a conservation easement as part of a Planned Development (PD) or other master-planned development”. Member Young Seconded.
11/12/2025	Member Browning made a motion to recommend changing the following language in FLUE Policy 1.16.2. Delete the words “and any other” and replacing them with “along with any”. Vice Chairwoman Thompson seconded.
11/12/2025	Member Delgado made a motion to recommend that when a wetland touches the property line the delineation continues to be counted beyond that property line until the entire wetland is fully delineated. Chairman Myjak seconded. Vice Chairwoman Thompson suggested that it should be delineated until it is determined to be five (5) acres in size.
1/14/2026	Vice Chairwoman Thompson made a motion to recommend the changes that have been discussed for FLUE Policy 1.16.2 as amended to staff to get their review and opinion. Member Miller Seconded. There was a unanimous voice vote in favor.

1/14/2026	Vice Chairwoman Thompson made a motion that Ms. Galleo pose a question to the GIS staff asking if the latest version of GIS mapping show that wetlands extend beyond a single property boundary to be five acres or more in size. Member Tucker seconded. There was a unanimous voice vote in favor.
1/27/2026	Member Thompson made a motion for Staff to review and comment on the proposed language added to 1.16.4 "Where the wetland degradation or destruction has been permitted or may be permitted in the future by the applicable regulatory agencies, no wetlands shall be impacted by development activities without appropriate review and approval by the City. The City shall apply the land use planning policies and density requirements for protecting wetlands and their functions as stated in the Future Land Use Element Objective 1.16 and the Conservation Element.
2/11/2026	Vice Chairwoman Thompson made a motion to reaffirm their previous motion from January 14, 2026 in removing the following sentence from Policy 1.16.2, <i>unless such wetlands are preserved by a conservation easement as part of a Planned Development (PD) or other master planned development, and any other.</i> Member Tucker seconded
2/11/2026	Member Miller made a motion to accept the rationale that Mary Sphar provided in her handout to better clarify the removal of the sentence in Policy 1.16.2. Member Delgado seconded.