



## Board of County Commissioners

June 3, 2022

Kevin Ruane  
District One

Cecil L. Pendergrass  
District Two

Ray Sandelli  
District Three

Brian Hamman  
District Four

Frank Mann  
District Five

Roger Desjarlais  
County Manager

Richard Wm. Wesch  
County Attorney

Donna Marie Collins  
Chief County Hearing  
Examiner

Al Quattrone  
Quattrone & Associates, Inc.  
4301 Veronica Shoemaker Boulevard  
Fort Myers, FL 33916

### **RE: Gator Recreation (Planned Development Rezoning Application) DCI2022-00024**

Dear Al Quattrone:

The Zoning Section has reviewed the information provided for the above-referenced application. The Lee County Land Development Code (LDC) requires additional information for the application to be sufficient. Please respond to each requirement not satisfied on the attached checklist. For your assistance, we have enclosed any additional memoranda from the various Lee County reviewing agencies.

A public hearing date will not be scheduled until a complete application is submitted.

Please respond to the sufficiency review comments contained within sixty (60) calendar days of the date of this letter. This application may be considered withdrawn if no response is received within this timeframe. Please feel free to contact me at [Amendez@leegov.com](mailto:Amendez@leegov.com) or (239) 533-8325 if you have any questions.

### **Zoning Section**

1. Request. The Request Statement, Schedule of Uses and Property Development Regulations, Planned Development Application and Master Concept Plan establish varying thresholds of density and intensity. Please revise the referenced documents to reflect intensity and density consistency.
2. Schedule of Uses.
  - A. Please provide analysis as to how the following uses are to function with the proposed MCP: Automobile Service Station; Business Services Group II; Contractors and Builders, Groups II, III and IV; Convenience Food and Beverage Store with 32 Fuel Pumps; Live-Work Dwelling Units and proposed quantity; Open Storage.

- B. Warehouses types are not specified on the proposed schedule of uses.
  - C. Social Services; how many beds pursuant to LDC Section 34-341(a)(8).
  - D. Accessory Apartments and Accessory Dwelling Units are only permitted when accessory to a single-family residence.
3. Fee: The application was assessed as a Minor Planned Development. Please be advised that the assessment may change to a Major Planned Development based on the projects revised intensity and density in accordance with Comment 1 above. Please evaluate LDC Section 34-341 to distinguish between a minor and major planned development as the application fee will vary.
  4. Existing Agricultural Use Affidavit: The request proposes to maintain agricultural use conditions adopted as part of the current zoning approval. The LDC requires a new agricultural use affidavit. If the property owner intends to continue an existing agricultural use subsequent to zoning approval, an affidavit signed by the property owner and sworn before a notary must be submitted. The affidavit must consist of (1) a statement as to the specific type and location of the agricultural use(s) existing on the property at the time of the application and (2) a sketch of the property, in metes and bounds, identifying the location and type of ongoing agricultural use(s). LDC Section 34-202(a)(13).

### **Development Services Section**

1. The MCP show dots near the distance call outs for the property boundary on all side with overlaying text on the west side. Please remove or clarify.
2. The property development regulations have a minimum rear setback of 15 feet and development perimeter setback of 15 feet. The MCP shows the parking garage in the minimum setback. Please clarify.
3. Please provide a storm water narrative with your resubmittal in accordance with LDC 34-373(b)(1). The MCP does not show any areas reserved for water management.
4. [10-285(a)] The connection separation distances must be determined on both sides of the roadway for undivided roadways. Existing and approved access points must be depicted on both sides of the road along the project frontage and to the nearest access point beyond the project frontage in each direction. The MCP provided does not appear to meet the minimum connection separation on Plantation Rd. Please clarify.
5. 34-373(a)(6)(j) requires the MCP to show any proposed facilities for public transit in accordance with LDC 10-442. Are any improvements anticipated for the existing bus stop and the north west corner of the site on Plantation Blvd?
6. Note: At time of development order LDC 34-2015(2)(e) will require walkways to accommodate safe and convenient pedestrian movement from vehicles and buildings in any parking lot with more than one tier of parking.

7. What is the purpose of the interconnection to the north? Please clarify as it appears the interconnection provides access to a lake and may not be necessary. If the interconnection is not necessary please request a deviation.

### **Environmental Sciences Section**

1. According to the Land Development Code, a large development in the mixed-use overlay is required to provide 20% open space and a small development is required to provide 10% (10-425(a)). Please provide an open space table/exhibit demonstrating the open space calculations.

### **Legal Description**

1. Boundary survey. A boundary survey of the subject property must be submitted, unless the property consists of one or more undivided lots within a subdivision platted in accordance with F.S. ch. 177. The survey must be based upon the title certification submitted in accord with section 34-201(a)(7) and certified to the present owner as reflected in the title documentation submitted in accordance with section 34-201(a)(7). The boundary survey must identify and depict all easements affecting the subject property, whether recorded or unrecorded, and all other physical encumbrances readily identified by a field inspection.

Staff Comment: The survey included is not based on the April 6, 2022 title certification and does not include the required state plane coordinates.

### **Natural Resources**

1. Please provide a written description of the surface water management plan that complies with LDC 34-373 (b)(1).
2. Please provide an analysis of Lee Plan objective 60.3 and policies 125.1.2, 125.1.3, and 125.1.4.

### **Traffic Impact Analysis**

1. The application indicates the project includes 60,000 sf of commercial, 58,000 sf of commercial-recreational (total of 118,000 sf of commercial), 160 hotel rooms, and 210 MF residential units. But, there are 160,000 sf of commercial, 250 hotel rooms, and 210 MF residential units in the TIS analysis. A clarification is required.
2. The project will generate 801 trips in PM peak hour, but the Figure 3 only show 761 trips. A revision is required.
3. Since the project generates 801 trips per hour, the information of intersection level of service (LOS) analysis for project's accesses and the intersections within the area of influence shall be provided for review.
4. Six Miles Cypress Pkwy is a controlled access facility, the service volumes of Controlled Access Facility shall be used in the TIS analysis.

## **Solid Waste**

5. Solid Waste has reviewed DCI2022-00024, the compactor area does not provide 65 feet of unobstructed collection access.

## **Planning Section**

1. The MCP does not seem to match the description provided in the application. Please clarify where the 58,000 square foot commercial recreation will be located on the MCP. Also Please clarify if you are seeking approval for 70,000 square feet of commercial retail (as shown on MCP) or 60,000 square feet of office and retail as shown on the application form. In addition the application form states there will be 160 hotel rooms, whereas the MCP shows 250 beds.
2. The building mass appears to be more than would be required for the intensity of development proposed. Do the proposed buildings all need to be 135 feet tall?
3. It seems this application is trying to preserve the most flexibility for future development. based on the property's location within the Mixed Use Overlay this may be appropriate, but has the applicant considered rezoning the property to the C-1A. Bonus Density could be approved administratively in the C-1A zoning district.

Sincerely,

DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT  
Zoning Section

Electronically signed on 06/03/2022 by  
Adam Mendez,  
Planner

AVM