



BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS

Kevin Ruane

District One

Cecil L. Pendergrass

District Two

Ray Sandelli

District Three

Brian Hamman

District Four

Mike Greenwell

District Five

Roger Desjarlais

County Manager

Richard Wesch

County Attorney

Donna Marie Collins

*County Hearing
Examiner*

Writer's Direct Dial Number: 239-533-8317

January 4, 2023

Daniel DeLisi AICP
520 27th St
West Palm Beach, FL 33407

Re: Alico Crossing
DCI2022-00005 - Major PD

Dear Daniel DeLisi AICP:

The Zoning Section has reviewed the information provided for the above zoning application. The Land Development Code requires additional information for the application to be sufficient. Please respond to each requirement not satisfied on the attached checklists. 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.

If you do not provide the requested supplements or corrections within 30 calendar days of this letter, the Code requires that this application be considered withdrawn. Please feel free to contact me or the staff reviewers if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT
Zoning Section

Electronically signed on 1/4/2023 by
Dirk A Danley Jr, Planner, Principal

Daniel DeLisi AICP

Re: Alico Crossing
DCI2022-00005
January 4, 2023

TIS Review:

1. The study appears to indicate that the Decorum site contains 435 units, whereas the Lee County Property Appraiser website describes 436 units. Please review this and clarify the correct number of units (and the number of units by bedroom count as needed) contained within the site.
2. The study appears to indicate that the Vive site contains four-story residential buildings, whereas the Lee County Property Appraiser website (and referenced aerial photographs) appear to show three-story buildings. Please review this and clarify the correct residential building height on the site.
3. The study appears to describe over a 20% higher average parking demand for the three sites surveyed in late March 2022 as compared to the average parking demand for the three sites surveyed in late April. Please explain in the analysis what factors may have contributed to this difference. Also, please explain why the requested parking rate of 1.75 spaces per unit is less than or equal to the maximum peak parking demand of three of the sites surveyed in late March.
4. Please clarify if the time stated for each survey is the begin or end time of the survey and the duration of time of each survey if available.
5. The unit count by bedroom for the Longitude 81 site does not appear to sum to 260 total units (the total appears to sum to 256 units). Please review this and clarify the correct number of units by number of bedrooms on the site.
6. The Decorum, Vive, and Springs at Cape Coral survey data does not appear to include a full week and includes at least some times before midnight. Please explain why the data collection for this site was different in terms of days of week and survey times than those surveyed in late April 2022.
7. The Vive site data appears to describe one of the survey days as Saturday, March 25. However, this date falls on a Friday. Please review this and clarify the correct day and date of the survey.
8. The Vive site survey appears to indicate that the site contains 288 units, whereas the Lee County Property Appraiser website describes 252 units. Please review this and clarify the correct number of units (and the number of units by bedroom count) on the site.
9. Since sites were not surveyed continuously at least once per hour at times when parking demand was expected to be 80% of peak parking demand as recommended by ITE, please explain why the survey data was not adjusted to account for this if below 100% peak demand using the current ITE "percent of peak parking demand" data tables.
10. For each survey site, please explain what the minimum lease period is, if seasonal leases (i.e. less than 6 months) are allowed, and, if so, the percentage of total units that are rented seasonally per year. Also, for each site, please explain if subletting units is allowed, and, if so, the percentage of total units that are sublet per year.

11. Please provide the maximum expected size of the residential amenity building for the proposed project as well as the number of parking spaces currently required by the Land Development Code for this expected use.
12. Please provide the gross floor area of each residential amenity building for each site surveyed.
13. Please provide data and analysis that demonstrates that additional parking for residential amenity buildings is not justified. If no data and analysis is provided, please revise the request to remove a deviation from required parking for residential amenity buildings.
14. Since the sites appeared to be surveyed late in or after the typical January-March peak visitor season, please revise the study to include data and analysis as to why the periods surveyed sufficiently account for guests that may be visiting building tenants. If no data and analysis is provided, please revise the request to remove a deviation from the required 10% additional parking spaces to allow for visiting guest parking.