City Council
Regular Meeting
February 24, 2026

The City Council of the City of Titusville, Florida met in regular session in the Council Chamber of City Hall, 555 South Washington Avenue, on Tuesday, February 24, 2026. Mayor Connors called the City Council meeting to order at 6:30 p.m. Present were Mayor Andrew Connors, Vice-Mayor Herman A. Cole, Jr., Col USAF Retired, and City Council Members Jo Lynn Nelson, Megan Moscoso, and Dr. Sarah Stoeckel. Also present were City Manager Thomas Abbate, City Attorney Andriene Treasure, and City Clerk Wanda Wells.

Pre-recorded procedures for public comment, participation, and orderly conduct were played for all individuals that were in attendance or watching the meeting.

Chaplain Brienne Robertson from the Titusville Fire Department gave the invocation.

Mayor Connors led those present in the *Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag*.

xxx

Member Stoeckel addressed the reason or concerns of a large group of citizens in the audience. She and individual Councilmembers indicated they had no plans to use *City Council Rule No. 13* (*Code Sec. 2-26*) to reconsider a particular Council vote at the last regular City Council meeting, in which Council did not approve the transmittal of Comprehensive Plan Amendment (CPA) Application No. 2-2025 to the State. The group left the meeting a short time later.

xxx

MINUTES

<u>Motion</u>:
Member Nelson moved to approve the minutes of the regular City Council meeting on January 13, 2026 and the special City Council meeting on February 7, 2026, as submitted. Vice-Mayor Cole seconded the motion and it carried unanimously.

xxx

SPECIAL RECOGNITIONS & PRESENTATIONS – None.

xxx

BOARDS AND COMMISSIONS

<u>Student Advisory Council</u> – Per *Code of Ordinances*, Section 2-53. - *Removal of Members*, memos from the Co-Chairperson were included in the City Council agenda packet. The required memos notified City Council that the 9th and 11th grade representatives from Astronaut High School automatically forfeited their seats, due to failing to attend three consecutive, regular meetings on

November 18, 2025, December 16, 2025, and January 20, 2026. These students also desired to continue serving on the board and requested City Council's consideration.

The 9th and 11th grade representatives of Astronaut High School commented on their desire to continue serving on board.

Motion:
Member Nelson moved to excuse the absences and reinstate the appointments of the 9th and 11th grade representatives of Astronaut High School as members of the 2025/2026 Student Advisory Council. Vice-Mayor Cole seconded the motion and the roll call vote was:

Member Moscoso	Yes
Member Nelson	Yes
Mayor Connors	Yes
Vice-Mayor Cole	Yes
Member Stoeckel	Yes

The motion carried unanimously.

xxx

City Manager Abbate announced that the applicant of Public Hearing Agenda Item No. 9 A - *Conditional Use Permit (CUP) Application No. 9-2025, Parcel ID # 21-35-28-00-279*, withdrew the item from this City Council agenda.

xxx

Resolution No. 4-2026 Affordable Housing Advisory Committee (AHAC) Appointments – City Manager Abbate highlighted the request provided in the Council agenda packet. The request was to approve Resolution No. 4-2026 reaffirming and appointing members to the Affordable Housing Advisory Committee (AHAC). Reaffirming seven (7) current members was requested, as well as the removal of one member due to lack of attendance and appointing one new member.

The membership proposed in Resolution No. 4-2026 included:

- Reappoint Members: William "Bill" Gary, Jose "Joe" Mantecon, Brian Clark, Elizabeth Ross, Kayla Manning, Principal Planner (City staff), and City Council Vice-Mayor Herman A. Cole, Jr. Col. USAF Retired.
- Remove Member: Kody Coles.
- Appoint New Member: Monifa Watson.

There was no additional discussion.

Motion:
Member Nelson moved to approve Resolution No. 4-2026 appointing members to the Affordable Housing Advisory Committee (AHAC), as recommended. Vice-Mayor Cole seconded the motion and the roll call vote was:

Member Nelson	Yes
Mayor Connors	Yes
Vice-Mayor Cole	Yes
Member Stoeckel	Yes
Member Moscoso	Yes

The motion carried unanimously.

xxx

North Brevard County Hospital District Board - No action was requested. North Brevard County Hospital District Board Vice-Chairperson Robert Jordan joined by John Gachago, Vice-President of Digital Innovation, presented the Board's Semi-Annual Report.

Vice-Mayor Cole praised the progress and evolution of Parrish Medical Center, who was continually staying ahead of the curve, championing digital transformation and continual improvements, etc.

xxx

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

Dr. Kathleen O'Rourke thanked Council for making a statement at the beginning of the meeting regarding the Royal Oak Community's concerns for the future of their area, being pleased that Council previously directed a small area study (studies), the neighbors' intentions to stay involved with the future of the community, etc.

xxx

Mayor Connors called for a recess from 7:05 p.m. to 7:07 p.m., while a large group of citizens exited the Council Chamber.

xxx

Stan Johnston distributed information, which he highlighted related to concerns for his freedom of speech and the Elizabeth Oaks project, including concerns for allegations of misconduct by project representatives, etc.

xxx

CONSENT AGENDA

Council Members Moscoso and Nelson pulled Item Nos. 8A and 8B for further discussion. To this, City Manager Abbate read Consent Agenda Item Nos. C and D, as followed:

C. Jess Parrish Medical Foundation Grant for a LUCAS Chest Compression Device - Approve the Jess Parrish Medical Foundation grant in the amount of $21,076.39 for the purchase of one (1) LUCAS 3, v3.1 Chest Compression Device and additional items. Also, approve the associated budget amendment.

D. Titusvillage Section Nine — Fourth Amendment to Declaration of Covenants, Conditions and Restrictions - Act on the Titusvillage Section Nine - Fourth Amendment to Declaration of Covenants, Conditions and Restrictions.

There were no individuals that desired speaking on Consent Agenda Item Nos. 8C and 8D.

Motion:
Member Nelson moved to approve Consent Agenda Item Nos. 8C and 8D, in accordance with the recommendations. Vice-Mayor Cole seconded the motion and it carried unanimously.

xxx

Consent Agenda Item No. 8 A -

City Manager Abbate read the request.

A. 2022-2025 State Housing Initiative Partnership (SHIP) Program Local Housing Assistance Plan (LHAP) Amendment #2 – The request was to approve 2nd amendment to 2022-2025 SHIP LHAP as recommended.

Members Moscoso and Stoeckel discussed questions and information with Neighborhood Services Director Terrie Franklin. One desired goal was for first time homebuyers to be able to qualify for funding and meet federal and other eligibility criteria, as discussed. Mayor Connors commented that the program was federally funded and not funded by local taxes.

Motion:
Member Nelson moved to approve Consent Agenda Item 8A - 2022-2025 State Housing Initiative Partnership (SHIP) Program Local Housing Assistance Plan (LHAP) Amendment No. 2, in accordance with the recommendations. Vice-Mayor Cole seconded the motion.

Staff advised there was an additional request in the Report to Council (a report in the Council agenda packet) and Resolution No. 5-2026 was part of the requested action(s).

<u>Amended Motion</u>:
Member Nelson moved to amend the motion on the floor to include approval of to approve Consent Agenda Item No. 8A - the 2022-2025 State Housing Initiative Partnership (SHIP) Program Local Housing Assistance Plan (LHAP) Amendment No. 2, in accordance with the recommendations. The motion also included authorization to amend the City's Forest Glen Subrecipient Agreement and Land Use Restriction Agreement (LURA) by changing the scope of eligible expenses from utility and permit fees to new construction subsidy, as a result of the amendment to the City's SHIP LHAP and Resolution No. 5-2026, which was included in the agenda packet, in accordance with the recommendations. Vice-Mayor Cole's second held and the roll call vote was:

Mayor Connors	Yes
Vice-Mayor Cole	Yes
Member Stoeckel	Yes
Member Moscoso	Yes
Member Nelson	Yes

The motion carried unanimously.

xxx

Consent Agenda Item No. 8 B -

City Manager Abbate read the request.

B. <u>Water Allocation Permit - Ready Mix Plant</u> – The request was to authorize the issuance of a water supply capacity allocation permit in the amount of 10,300 gallons per day, which is 3.5% of the excess capacity for the development located at 7700 South US Highway 1.

Stan Johnston submitted a public speaking card on Consent Agenda Item No. B, to which he indicated being neutral on the requested action.

Carol Stanton submitted a public speaking card on Consent Agenda Item No. B, to which she was against and opposed to the agenda item for reasons explained.

Member Moscoso commented in response to Ms. Stanton's concerns for a concrete crushing project. Member Moscoso advised the activity at the location of this request was concrete mixing, not concrete crushing. The mixing project was different than another project for concrete crushing. Member Moscoso recommended Ms. Stanton contact the Planning Department following the meeting for more information. Mayor Connors commented on there being many Codes and regulations in place to protect the community. Per Member Nelson's request, Assistant City Manager Kevin Cook gave background information and provided information on the water supply capacity allocation permit to address the concerns and questions.

Motion:
Member Nelson moved to approve Consent Agenda Item No. B to authorize the issuance of a water supply capacity allocation permit in the amount of 10,300 gallons per day, which was 3.5% of the excess capacity for the development located at 7700 South US Highway 1, in accordance with the recommendations. Vice-Mayor Cole seconded the motion and the roll call vote was:

Vice-Mayor Cole	Yes
Member Stoeckel	Yes
Member Moscoso	Yes
Member Nelson	Yes
Mayor Connors	Yes

The motion carried unanimously.

xxx

ORDINANCES – SECOND READING, PUBLIC HEARING AND RELATED ACTION

Conditional Use Permit (CUP) Application No. 9-2025, Parcel ID # 21-35-28-00-279 – Earlier in the meeting, City Manager Abbate advised the applicant withdrew this item from the Council agenda.

xxx

City Attorney Treasure reviewed the *Quasi-judicial Rules of Procedure* with City Council.

Tranquility Development Agreement (DA) Application No. 1-2025 Fifth Amendment – The request was for Council to take action on the proposed fifth amendment to the Tranquility Development Agreement. The applicant, Gary Allen, Jr., on behalf of the Sunbelt Titusville Investments, LLC and Carolina Holdings II, LLC, the owners, was requesting the approval of an amendment to the development agreement for the Tranquility development (formerly known as Antigua Bay). The applicant was requesting amendments to the existing Development Agreement to increase building heights from 100 to 150 feet; reduce required landscape buffers; waive certain small scale plat qualification criteria; allow accessory structures within the 50-foot road right-of-way building setback; and allow phased clearing of land and stormwater drainage improvements.

The Tranquility development was a mixed-use planned community with 2,404 residential units, including single family and multi-family, commercial, preservation and park lands. The planned community would be developed in multiple phases on approximately 340+ acres located between the Indian River Lagoon (IRL) and the U.S. Highway 1 and Columbia Boulevard (SR 405) roadways. The property was designated with the City's Comprehensive Plan Future Land Use of Regional Mixed Use and Conservation and was zoned Regional Mixed Use (RMU).

On February 18, 2026, the Planning and Zoning Commission (P&Z) recommended denial, 6-0. Details were included in the City Council agenda packet on the P&Z's recommendations.

Next, Community Development Director Brad Parrish and Deputy Community Development Director Amanda "Mandy" Lamothe gave a presentation and highlighted the following information on the proposed, fifth amendment to the Tranquility Development Agreement and Development Agreement Application No. 1-2025:

- Summary and background information for the project

  - Regional Mixed Use (RMU)
  - 340 + acres, 2,404 residential units, commercial, open space 20%
  - Sandy Point 2007
  - Antigua Bay 2017
  - Tranquility 2021

- Zoning sub-districts

  - RMU-100 Open Space 20%
  - RMU-200 Single-Family Phase I, II, and III
  - RMU-300 Multifamily
  - RMU-400 Commercial
  - Boardwalk, parks and trails must be constructed prior to certain number of Certificates of Occupancy (Cos)

- Five (5) amendments proposed in the fifth amendment to the development agreement (details or talking points abbreviated for staff presentation purposes)

  a. Increase building heights from 100 to 150 feet
  b. Small scale plat
  c. Max 10-foot-wide buffers between uses
  d. Accessory structures in 50-foot building setback
  e. Class I permit for up to 30% clearing of each parcel to stockpile soil

- Project details related to an engineering drawing or map prepared by Honeycutt & Associates, Inc.

Community Development Director Parrish continued and highlighted a substantive amount of information from the Council agenda packet, Code requirements, etc.

Mayor Connors opened the public hearing.

Cole Oliver, an attorney on behalf of the applicant, distributed information that he highlighted during his comments and request for Council's approval. The information included sections from the City's Codes and *Land Development Regulations*, from Code Supplement No. 18, Update 1, Chapter 29, Article IX. – *Height Overlay*, as well as from Code Supplement No. 18, Update 1, Chapter 34, Division 4. – *Small-Scale Plat*.

Mr. Oliver commented on behalf of the application and five (5) separate amendments he was seeking Council's approval, the rationale for each, City Code requirements, discussing the Code with staff, he and City staff interpreted some areas of the Code differently from one another, seeking clarity from Council on how to apply some section(s) of Code to the proposed amendments, etc.

Mr. Oliver commented on utilizing Code procedures for the small scale plat, no new streets or rights-of-way were being proposed, no public facility improvements were being requested but rather these were being handled privately, the project would access existing public streets, one road was however in the permitting phase and would have to be built and accepted by the City before other procedures for the small scale plat could be completed, the intent of the Code sections, one specific variance requested was related to criteria for water, sewer, and reuse and could be provided by the addition of service laterals only for each slot being proposed, no main extensions were required and private mains were being requested to the extent that a main(s) was needed, items would still come to City staff for technical review to ensure Code compliance for items like public facilities, that any proposed plat had "the connections" that tied-in, to evaluate if any items were not in compliance, then the applicant would have to go back to the regular plat process again, etc.

In short and to the above, the Mr. Oliver advised he was not really changing the technical specifications of "what was being put-in", only he was not extending public facilities into the property.

Next, concerning Subsection B, the ask was to utilize joint stormwater ponds in the small scale plat process, all of which would be conducted under a master stormwater permit from the St. Johns River Water Management District (SJRWMD) that showed the outfall areas that were necessary, rather than utilizing the current process that required individual retention on each pond to show positive outfall.

Next, concerning Subsection E, the ask was to "not" have driveway connections onto the spine road or to U.S. Highway 1 from every single lot. Instead, Mr. Oliver requested leeway and in lieu of driveway connections, he requested asking for the right to use private easements across neighboring properties, so that he could control and reduce the number of access points onto the public roads and offset safety issues of pedestrian and vehicle conflict points.

Mr. Oliver continued and discussed landscape buffers. The request was to reduce the landscape buffers down to 10-feet minimum, for the reasons and rationale explained. If landscape buffers of 30-feet were used that was also possible, but the request was for 10-feet minimal landscape buffers. This would provide any developers coming into the project in the future flexibility, in case more connectivity and less screening was desired. Mr. Oliver also advised that he put in 125% of the landscape requirement to go above and beyond the requirement; however, per Mr. Oliver, staff had asked Mr. Oliver to revise the language to indicate such and so that the concept could be implemented by staff, only Mr. Oliver was unclear how to implement the language. Additionally, Mr. Oliver advised this particular language had been in the development agreement since 2017 (anywhere landscaping would be put-in).

In addition, Mr. Oliver discussed a request to allow ancillary uses in the backyards of the single-family homes and his agreement to install masonry wall(s) abutting the 25-feet landscaping and abutting the U.S. Highway 1 right-of-way and sidewalks area, due to staff's concerns for safety and noise. He and his client agreed to complete these requests. The purpose for this request was to facilitate future homeowners being allowed to have tool sheds, mosquito enclosures, and BBQ grills, etc.

The final item requested concerned the pond and balancing the dirt on the site. Mr. Oliver advised that approximately 250,000 cubic yards of fill (dirt) would be moved in the development of the pond. His rough calculations indicated that at 18 yards of dirt per truck, this roughly would result in having 2,800 to 3,000 dump trucks that would be needed to haul this much dirt offsite and that would require trucks driving onto U.S. Highway 1, etc.

Oppositely, if the pond's dirt were to stay onsite, Mr. Oliver proposed conceptual ideas and areas to stockpile dirt, including in the use of berms (one along the spine road at 8-feet high, once the spine road was permitted, etc.). There were also two other major fill areas that were close as possible to U.S. Highway 1 and mature vegetation and which would keep them as far away as possible from existing single family lots in the back. There was a concern from City staff on "these" being left there, to which Mr. Oliver advised he/they would be willing to "bond it" for two (2) years beginning with "when" stockpiling the dirt began and within this amount of time the dirt would need to be removed. Otherwise, if this 2-year timeframe was not met, he/they would have to ask City Council for forgiveness and if Council did not grant forgiveness, then the bond would be utilized and he/they would have to bring the land back to natural grade to "the way it was".

Moreover, Mr. Oliver advised that he/they agreed to conduct tree surveys and mitigation that the Code required for the areas proposed to be cleared. The "30% number" was used or given as a safety margin for them, in case a lesser amount was approved and to avoid having to revise the development agreement. He also commented on not clear-cutting trees and attempts would be made to not impact mature trees as explained, etc.

On erosion and mitigation measures, Mr. Oliver advised his client was willing to seed the piles as needed or place hay on them as needed, in case requested or required by the City.

Gary Allen, Jr., on behalf of the applicant, was indicated to be present or available to answer questions.

Mayor Connors suggested Council discuss the proposed amendments one-at-a-time to which all Council agreed. Staff advised the Council agenda packet contained two versions of the proposed development agreement---a strikethrough and underline copy and a clean copy with only with the proposed changes. Section numbers were also outlined in the proposed agreement.

Council discussion ensued with Mr. Oliver and staff on five (5) amendments proposed in the fifth amendment to the Development Agreement (numbered A through E in the staff report and staff presentation, but which were numbered 1 through 5 in the Planning and Zoning Commission's recommendations).

A. Amend Section 3.4 "Maximum Overall Height". Staff presentation noted as - Increase building heights from 100 to 150 feet.

- Development Agreement Section No. 3.4
- Whether the applicant would agree to develop 100,000 feet of commercial space
- The intent of having two uses and whether two uses could be located in one building
- Where the two uses would be most beneficial
- A public walkway would be installed along the waterfront
- How the State *Live Local Act* could affect development in the City
- The layout of the development was not yet formalized
- The intent to put a high-end hotel on the site that would tie into the public network of roads
- An apartment complex would not likely be placed adjacent to multimillion-dollar homes
- Council consideration of prior amendments to the development agreement and being cautious about making changes
- The City putting a height-overlay on the property
- Clarifying definitions and criteria in the City's Codes to offset future disputes
- The developer indicated the 150-foot height was already allowed (per Mr. Oliver). Receiving clarity on whether two uses could be in one building
- The applicant presently did not have plans for 150-foot-high buildings and was willing to withdraw this component for now. The rest of the components were time sensitive to the developer
- Pausing or setting aside the current request related to building height

The applicant withdrew the request to amend Section 3.4 "Maximum Overall Height".

xxx

Next, City Council went on to discuss and approve four additional components (Item Nos. B, C, D, and E) and approved the fifth amendment to the Tranquility Development Agreement, but as specified in the following formal actions taken by City Council.

B. Adds Section 3.6.8.1(d) related to the Platting process to the "Variances and Waivers". Staff presentation noted as - Small scale plat**.**

- If or when the developer presented a plan for access to private utilities; Understanding any concerns by staff for administratively approving what came before staff, if the land use and zoning designations were already in place, and the developer could show staff utilities were there
- Information on page nos. 174-175 of this Council meeting agenda packet
- Section 34-143 of the City's *Land Development Regulations* (Code)
- There was an indication the developer wanted to get a plat approved in a one-step, streamlined, process; however, staff was not provided and did not have an *Exhibit* from the developer that clearly illustrated what the developer wanted to do. Staff had spoken to Mr. Oliver about this and per staff, per the developer, based on the *master plan* that was approved and exhibits attached to the *fourth amendment*, this was "what" the developer

was using with the intent to subdivide. Staff was not clear about this idea or concept. The map shown during the staff presentation reviewed this subject

- The indication was the developer desired approval to waive several Code requirements or qualifications, such as waiving any main extension, waiving that each lot could have its own positive outfall and instead only install a master stormwater system (noted was a requirement in the City's two-step process), waiving the building area, waiving not having to put in driveways for parcels that may not be on the frontage of roads to which staff's understanding of the developer's thinking may be due to there was a permit presently in review for the spine road, etc.

Mr. Oliver advised that he was not asking for the waiver of any of the aforementioned qualifications, but that he/they desired following the qualifications with added criteria, to include that he/they could utilize private mains in section A, utilize joint stormwater ponds in section B for the legal outfall and drainage that would all be shown on the site plan and permit(s), and utilize something other than a driveway connection in section E and utilize private easements to get over to any other roads or cross other properties, etc. Additionally, Mr. Oliver highlighted items that he/they had no intent on changing.

Discussion continued on the following:

- If Council approved the amendments, the theory was it would reduce the amount of time required of normal processes and accomplish the same goals in a different way, as discussed and requested by Mr. Oliver
- Staff concerns. Staff gave an example and drew attention to Code Section 34-142 that gave staff a time limit of 15 days to review. This was concerning as there were many infrastructure requirements, reviewing a plat took a longer time to review, etc.
- If the request was approved, staff was unclear whether this approval would apply to only one process or this one project alone, or whether it set a precedent and was the new process to subsequently be used for now on for any subdivision of land
- Mr. Oliver believed the process could not be used indefinitely and that it was capped at 10 lots (or at least for his project)
- Perception that the State Legislature was presently working to create legislation that would remove local bureaucratic policies perceived to hold up or delay development
- Staff did not have an *Exhibit* to illustrate what the developer intended to subdivide
- The State Legislature adopted law in 2025 requiring jurisdictions to adopt an ordinance making their plat process administrative. Staff was presently drafting this ordinance to amend the City's Codes
- A concern for subdividing land now with no infrastructure and utilities in place to service the parcels or tracts sold to subsequent property owners
- A hypothetical example for the old Sears town mall property---a local project located on a large tract. If the property owner were to hypothetically sell pieces (smaller tracts) of the big tract, new owners of the smaller tracts may not (unknowingly) have access to utilities and may force the smaller property tract owners to pay large sums of money to remedy or cure these issues. Having staff administratively approve could protect future property owners from potentially experiencing this unintended consequence or scenario

- Differing Councilmember viewpoints, such as one that desired assisting the developer and not be an obstacle in the way, another that expressed concerns for "greenlighting" projects and instead treating every project the same, etc.
- Staff had done a good job. Staff also had 49 meetings with the applicant thus far. A lot of work had been completed on all sides.
- Concern for height and 10-foot buffers (separate components to be addressed individually)
- Time for staff to review and process - recommendations

Motion:
Vice-Mayor Cole moved to approve the small-scale plat amendment.

Member Nelson suggested approval with "the 30 days". Vice-Mayor Cole agreed to add 30 days and indicated this was also part of his motion.

> *Motion Formalized: The motion was to add and approve Section 3.6.8.1(d) to the Tranquility Development Agreement related to the Platting process to the "Variances and Waivers" section of the agreement as requested by the applicant and allow a 30-day review.*

Member Nelson seconded the motion.

Per Member Moscoso's request, staff reviewed their concerns on the proposed small-scale plat to which Mr. Oliver rebutted and addressed. Member Moscoso also suggested a friendly amendment to the motion on the floor to require the applicant provide the exhibit(s) or illustration(s) discussed by staff. Mr. Oliver shared why he did not want to provide this item at present time, but at later point in time, the illustration(s) discussed and desired by staff would be provided. No action was taken on Member Moscoso's suggestion to amend the motion on the floor.

Mayor Connors called the vote and the roll call vote was:

Member Stoeckel	Yes
Member Moscoso	Yes
Member Nelson	Yes
Mayor Connors	Yes
Vice-Mayor Cole	Yes

The motion carried unanimously.

xxx

C. **Adds Section 3.6.8.1(e) related to Landscape Yards (buffers) to the Variances and Waivers"**. Staff presentation noted as - Max 10-foot-wide buffers between uses**.** **"**Max" was a scrivener error. The correct verbiage as discussed was "Minimum".

Discussion ensued on:

- Ideas on where having a 10-foot buffers may be more acceptable and intentional

- The areas where the developer was requesting flexibility on the buffers and in relationship to the various zoning or land use categories of the Regional Mixed Use (RMU)
- Council's viewpoints on the buffers, not all were in agreement and compromises were debated and discussed
- Providing staff clarity so that calculations were carefully completed
- Language and definitions already in the development agreement
- Places in downtown Titusville where 10-foot buffers were used
- A future developer of the property could always choose to increase the buffer size
- Not piecing the buffer requirements together, but having a governing plan for a master plan community

<u>Motion</u>:
Member Nelson moved that in Areas 2, 3, 5, and 6 that it would be a 20-foot buffer between residences/residential and commercial, and a 10-foot buffer within the commercial areas.

Mr. Oliver advised there was no buffer between commercial areas now. Staff advised that commercial developments by themselves were required to have minimum 10-foot buffers regardless of what was next to them. This was per the City's Code. For a plaza, and if the plaza's site plan was approved, parcels could be created, the developer could submit or complete the minor division planning process, then potentially no landscape buffers may be required, only screening. There were (various) scenarios in the City's Codes.

The motion died for the lack of a second.

<u>New Motion</u>:
Vice-Mayor Cole moved to approve the minimum 10-foot-wide buffers between uses. Member Stoeckel seconded the motion stipulating and clarifying approval as written in the proposed amendment. Vice-Mayor Cole indicated yes, as written and requested by the applicant. The second held.

> *New Motion Formalized: The motion was to add Section 3.6.8.1(e) related to Landscape Yards (Buffers) to the "Variances and Waivers" section of the Agreement as requested by the applicant.*

Member Nelson clarified with staff how the proposed motion related to Areas 2, 3, 5, and 6. Council confirmed approval of the motion would allow "minimum" 10-foot-wide buffers between uses. The powerpoint presentation presented by staff earlier in the meting referenced "maximum" 10-foot buffers between uses, which was a scrivener's error. "Minimum" was the correct verbiage. The motion and the second held for a second time and the roll call vote was:

Member Moscoso	No
Member Nelson	Yes
Mayor Connors	Yes
Vice-Mayor Cole	Yes
Member Stoeckel	Yes

The motion carried and was approved, 4-yes to 1-no.

xxx

D. Adds Section 3.6.8.1(f) related to Accessory Structures within the RMU perimeter 50-foot setback to the Variances and Waivers". Staff presentation noted as - Accessory structures in 50-foot building setback.

Discussion ensued on:

- Per Mr. Oliver, the applicant was agreeable to the Planning and Zoning Commission's recommendation of a masonry wall, which was not in the proposed agreement language
- Staff recommended that if Council approved this component, that Council specifically "tie it" to the lots in Phase 3 adjacent to U.S. Highway 1 only. Mr. Oliver, for the applicant, was agreeable with this staff suggestion
-

Motion:
Member Nelson moved to approve accessory structures in Phase 3 or Area 3 next to U.S. Highway 1 with the addition of the wall along U.S. Highway 1. Vice-Mayor Cole seconded the motion.

> *Motion formalized: The motion was to add Section 3.6.8.1(f) related to Accessory Structures within the RMU perimeter 50-foot setback to the "Variances and Waivers" section of the Agreement. The motion included that this section only apply to Phase Three next to US Highway 1. Applicant also agreed to install a wall along US Highway 1 as a buffer.*

Mayor Connors advised or clarified the proposed written amendment already included the language intended by the motion presently on the floor. Member Stoeckel discussed with staff whether the developer could build the development (project) "as-is" and right now, only the developer would not be allowed accessory structures. This "as-is" concept was correct indicating what the developer could do now if Council were not inclined to approve the pending motion under consideration.

The roll call vote was:

Member Nelson	Yes
Mayor Connors	Yes
Vice-Mayor Cole	Yes
Member Stoeckel	Yes
Member Moscoso	Yes

The motion carried unanimously.

xxx

E. **Adds a new Section 3.6.9 "Phased clearing and stormwater drainage improvements"**. Staff presentation noted as - Class I permit for up to 30% clearing of each parcel to stockpile soil.

Discussion ensued on:

- Mr. Oliver indicated there was a typo and incorrect reference to Code Section 24-214, which he advised should be Code Section 34-214 (the correct reference to City Code)
- Mr. Oliver proposed adding a bonding requirement to this section to alleviate any concerns. So, the City or future stakeholders did not inherit issues later on
- Ways to mitigate wind from blowing dirt into the nearby area
- Dirt piles would be as far away from the street as possible. Dirt may be visible. Conceptual areas were in the packet
- Minimizing impact to trees and clearing a spot and deciding later whether the developer would plant trees elsewhere or pay into the tree mitigation fund
- Staff could not enforce regulations on trees yet because the City was not yet in receipt of a proposed development. This was part of a landscape plan. The option would be to pay into the fund, if trees could not be put back on the property
- Per staff, the concept plan that was presented was not binding with the development agreement
- The site development permit process
- Dirt for the development of the pond---add stipulation into development agreement, such as a bond requirement, timeframe and extension if needed, the location will hopefully match the conceptual idea discussed by the applicant during this meeting and hearing
- The applicant's agreement he/they will follow the tree mitigation rules currently in place (set by City Code)

<u>Motion:</u>
Member Stoeckel moved to approve the Class I Permit for up to 30% clearing of each parcel, to stockpile soil with those conditions of the bond requirement and with a timeframe of two years with the potential option to extend as needed, the locations as presented before the City Council, and continuing to follow the City's tree mitigation rules as outlined in the City's policies. Member Nelson seconded the motion.

> *Motion formalized: The motion was to add a new Section 3.6.9 "Phased Clearing and Stormwater Drainage Improvements with the conditions of adding a bond requirement, adding a two-year time frame for storage of soil with the provision to apply for an extension if needed and soil being located as conceptually presented, and follow the tree mitigation rules as outlined in the City's Policies.*

Staff had questions and desired more clarification on the timeline and how to implement the language provisions about dirt or soil, as discussed. Mr. Oliver advised the time frame for the dirt was from the time digging began and it was piled up. It was not two years for the dirt (soil) to "be there" after the close-out of the development permit, questioned and clarified by staff. The roll call vote was:

Mayor Connors	Yes
Vice-Mayor Cole	Yes
Member Stoeckel	Yes
Member Moscoso	Yes
Member Nelson	Yes

The motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Oliver, for the applicant, reiterated he/they withdrew the request to amend Section 3.4 "Maximum Overall Height".

xxx

ORDINANCES - FIRST READING – None.

xxx

OLD BUSINESS

Christian Court Townhomes - Preliminary Plat – The request was to take action on the Preliminary Plat for Christian Court Townhomes. On January 29, 2026 (6:30 p.m.), the City Council continued this agenda item to the regular City Council meeting of February 24, 2026 (6:30 p.m.).

Mayor Connors gave a brief overview of the Council meeting of January 29, 2026, specific to this agenda item, including initial questions on whether the request was in compliance with the City's Codes. Mayor Connors advised that City staff knew the Codes. With Council having one month to consider the request since January 29, 2026, Mayor Connors called on whether the City Council or public had any further questions, debate, etc. There was none.

Jason Seal, applicant, was available to answer any questions.

Motion:
Member Nelson moved to approve the Preliminary Plat for Christian Court Townhomes, as recommended. Vice-Mayor Cole seconded the motion and the roll call vote was:

Vice-Mayor Cole	Yes
Member Stoeckel	Yes
Member Moscoso	Yes
Member Nelson	Yes
Mayor Connors	Yes

The motion carried unanimously.

xxx

NEW BUSINESS – None.

xxx

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

A gentleman, name not clear, indicated he was a resident of the Royal Oak Golf Course Community, and he frequently walked the neighborhood and areas along U.S. Highway 1 for exercise. His concern was for randomly placed holes or depressions in turf caused by wireless telephone or internet cable providers that had installed underground infrastructure, the safety of residents, the holes causing individuals to suffer serious injuries, etc.

Mayor Connors was familiar with the concern. He indicated that many internet companies had a Statewide permit to dig-up any easement they liked and it was causing concerns from communities. There was also a concern these companies might damage underground pipes, etc. City staff were working to collect data to hold these companies accountable, resolve the issues, etc.

xxx

MAYOR AND COUNCIL REPORTS

Mayor's Report - Mayor Connors submitted written information in the Council agenda packet. He briefly highlighted a letter from the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) and a consolidated annual performance and evaluation report, in relationship to the City being a recipient of grant funds provided by HUD.

xxx

Council Reports -

Vice-Mayor Cole commented on attending several events arranged around the tribute, memorial, and funeral services for the late Joe C. Robinson and former Vice-Mayor of the Titusville City Council. Each of the services and events were well attended by many from the community. The respect shown for Joe Robinson during the events was also heartwarming.

xxx

Member Nelson commented on being out of the country in a remote area of Guatemala during the recent funeral services to which she was not able to attend. Member Nelson added the location had poorly designed water infrastructure. She also described the culture of the Mayan children, chores, schools, and positive attitudes, to which she advised Joe Robinson would have appreciated and supported. The experience was rewarding and she planned to return next year.

xxx

Member Moscoso commented on City Council having individual meetings with the City's Internal Auditor. She obtained the internal audit reports for the last 5-years, which could be made available to all of Council for further Council discussion. City Manager Abbate would provide the information to each Council following this Council meeting. The City Manager would also schedule an item for the next regular City Council meeting agenda of March 10, 2026.

xxx

CITY MANAGER'S REPORT

City Manager's Report - City Manager Abbate submitted his written report.

xxx

City Manager Abbate highlighted information on upcoming events, as provided in his written report. No action was requested.

xxx

CITY ATTORNEY'S REPORT - None.

xxx

With no further business to discuss, the meeting adjourned at 9:25 p.m.

____
Andrew Connors, Mayor

ATTEST:

____
Wanda F. Wells, City Clerk