



LEE COUNTY
SOUTHWEST FLORIDA
BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS

John E. Manning
District One

Cecil L. Pendergrass
District Two

Larry Kiker
District Three

Brian Hamman
District Four

Frank Mann
District Five

Roger Desjarlais
County Manager

Richard Wm. Wesch
County Attorney

Donna Marie Collins
Hearing Examiner

March 24, 2014

ALEXIS CRESPO
WALDROP ENGINEERING, P.A.
28100 BONITA GRANDE DR
SUITE 305
BONITA SPRINGS, FL 34135

Re: HIDEAWAY COVE
CPA2014-00002
CPTM Application (Text/Map)

Dear ALEXIS CRESPO:

Planning staff finds the above mentioned submittal is insufficient and further information is needed. The following comments pertain to the section of the application indicated.

II A. b. 1. TYPE, Future Land Use Map Series Amendment, Map amendments require the submittal of a complete list, map, and two sets of mailing labels, for all property within 500 feet of the perimeter of the subject parcel.

An additional set of mailing labels is required because this request includes a change to the Future Land Use Map. Please provide an additional set of labels.

III E. 1. a. Potential development of the Subject Property, Calculation of maximum allowable development under existing FLUM, Residential Units/Density

The Application provides that the maximum allowable development under existing FLUM is 90 dwelling units. The subject property is located in the Sub-Outlying Suburban future land use category of the Lee Plan. This land use category is limited to a maximum of 2 dwelling units per acre. See POLICY 1.1.11. At 32 acres, the maximum units permitted for the 32 acre parcel is 64. The additional density that appears to be referenced is only permitted if the adjacent parcel is designated as preserve/open space. As indicated in the application materials, this is no longer an option for the Applicant. As a standalone parcel, without the benefit of the adjacent property, the maximum density is 2 units per acre. Therefore, please provide an amended application that does not include the potential 30 units from the adjacent property in the currently permitted total.

III E. 2. a. Potential development of the Subject Property, Calculation of maximum allowable development under proposed FLUM, Residential Units/ Density

The applicant has listed a total maximum allowable density of 96 units under the proposed FLUM. The FLUCCS map provided with the application identifies potential jurisdictional wetlands on the subject site. Normally, it is possible to preserve these uplands as part of the development process and receive the normal upland density. However, the concurrent Planned Development application, DCI2012-00056, shows those wetlands being impacted and therefore not able to be calculated at the upland density. Please revise proposed density calculations to reflect impacted wetland acreage at 1 unit per 20 acres.

IV A. 6. General Information and Maps, The legal description(s) for the property

The legal description closes but does not follow the path indicated by the applicant. Please provide a corrected legal description that accurately follows the boundaries of the subject property.

IV B. 2. Public Facilities Analysis

This analysis incorrectly lists the currently permitted maximum units as 90. Per item III.E.1.a, provide an analysis for items a through e (sanitary sewer, potable water, surface water/drainage basins, parks, recreation and open space, and public schools) based on the 64 units currently allowed on the property.

IV B. 3. c. Public Facilities Impacts, Provide a letter from the appropriate agency determining the adequacy/provision of existing/proposed support facilities, including, Law enforcement

Please provide a letter from the service provider of law enforcement.

IV B. 3. e. Public Facilities Impacts, Provide a letter from the appropriate agency determining the adequacy/provision of existing/proposed support facilities, including, Mass Transit

Please provide a letter from the service provider of mass transit service.

IV C. 5. Environmental Impacts, A map delineating wetlands, aquifer recharge areas, and rare & unique uplands

Provide a revised habitat assessment to address if there are any rare and unique uplands on the subject property.

IV E. 1. Internal Consistency with the Lee Plan, Discuss how the proposal affects population projections, Table 1(b), and the population capacity of the Lee Plan Future Land Use Map.

Table 1(b) is insufficient. The 32 acres listed by the applicant in the Outlying Suburban column for the proposed density increase is not reflected in the balance of the table.

Please provide a corrected Table 1(b) to address this issue.

ALEXIS CRESPO
HIDEAWAY COVE
CPA2014-00002
March 24, 2014
Page: 3

IV E. 2. Internal Consistency with the Lee Plan, List goals and objectives of the Lee Plan. Include an evaluation of all relevant policies under each goal and objective.

Please provide analysis to demonstrate consistency with the Goals, objectives and policies of the Conservation and Coastal Management Element of the Lee Plan.

If I can be of any assistance or if you have any questions, please do not hesitate to call me at (239) 533-8312.

Sincerely,
DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT
Planning Division



Peter Blackwell, Planner

Cc: *Planning file: CPA2014-00002*