

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: 239-533-8372

Jeremie Chastain, AICP

Hole Montes, Inc. 950 Encore Way Naples, FL 34108

July 5, 2023

Re: Arborwood Village CPD Amendment DCI2023-00024 - Amendment

Dear Jeremie Chastain, 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or corrections within 30 calendar days of this letter, the Code requires that this application be considered withdrawn.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 7/5/2023 by Chahram Badamtchian, Planner, Senior

Planning Review:

Please analyze Lee Plan Policy 6.1.3.

Please contact Joseph Sarracino at JSarracino@leegov.com or by calling 239-533-8984 with any questions regarding the above review comments.

Legal Description Review:

Sec. 34-202(a). Submittal requirements for applications requiring public hearing.

- (6) Please provide a boundary survey in accordance with the requirements of Lee County LDC §34-202(a)(6).
- The survey must be based upon the title certification submitted in accord with section 34-201(a)(7). When the Title Certification is submitted, the legal description on the boundary survey must match that which is shown on the title.
- (7) Please provide a title certification in accordance with the requirements of Lee County LDC §34-202(a)(7).
- Document submitted needs to be one of the forms listed in LDC §34-202(a)(7)(a) with required content included. A title commitment is not one of the acceptable forms.

Please contact Hunter Searson at HSearson@leegov.com or by calling 239-533-8585 with any questions regarding the above review comments.

Environmental Review:

Please carry over the past deviations to the newly amended Planned Development for consistency.

Please indicate if any of the past conditioned buffers are being impacted with the proposed amendment.

Please contact Camryn Siverson at CSiverson@leegov.com or by calling 239-533-8313 with any questions regarding the above review comments.

TIS Review:

- >> The applicant submittals do not appear to describe the highest number of employees per shift that are estimated to be working at the proposed site. Please provide this information for staff consideration. (7/5/2023 ME)
- >> The applicant submittals do not appear to indicate whether or not a caretaker residence will be housed within the proposed building. Please provide this information for staff consideration. (7/5/2023 ME)
- >> The applicant submittals do not appear to indicate whether or not the site will have gated customer access(es). Please provide this information for staff consideration. (7/5/2023 ME)
- >> The study does not appear to indicate how rented units in the proposed building will be accessed: internally, externally, or both. Please review and revise the study accordingly. (7/5/2023 ME)
- >> The parking study does not appear to indicate how many proposed building entrances will be accessible by customers. Please review and revise the study accordingly. (7/5/2023 ME)
- >> The study does not appear to describe the rationale that was used to determine the days and times that the survey was conducted, and what data was used in this determination. Please review and revise the study accordingly. (7/5/2023 ME)
- >> The study does not appear to describe if all vehicles, including those not parked in marked stalls were included in the counts. Please review and revise the study accordingly. (7/5/2023 ME)
- >> The study does not appear indicate whether or not historic use of the facilities may have in any way been affected by recovery work associated with Hurricane Ian. Please review and revise the study accordingly. (7/5/2023 ME)
- >> Staff has concern with the applicant's approach in the study of not parking vehicles parked behind existing facility gates. Due to this concern, please consider re-counting at least one of the City of Fort Myers sites or another similar site without gates, and revise the parking study such that only sites that consider total parking demand of the entire site are included. Vehicles parked in front of overhead doors for loading/unloading purposes should be included in the counts, but should be accounted for separately. (7/5/2023 ME)
- >> Since no adjustments for seasonal fluctuations in facility use were considered in the study, please consider providing annual gate use data that validates that no seasonal adjustments are necessary. If annual gate use data is unavailable, please consider applying adjustment factors to the data to account for potential higher peak season facility use. Please revise the study to address this potential concern. (7/5/2023 ME)
- >> In staff's review of the latest architectural plan for the SR 82 site, it appears that the building houses 878 units with a total building gross floor area of 119,952-SF, which differs from that described in the study. Please verify this, and review and revise the study accordingly.

(7/5/2023 ME)

- >> In staff's review of the latest architectural plan for the Colonial Boulevard site, it appears that the main building houses 654 units with a total building gross floor area of 96,077-SF, which differs from that described in the study. The study also appears to indicate that no parking spaces are provided behind the gated area, whereas an aerial photo of the site appears to show 2 delineated spaces. In addition, the study does not appear to include the RV storage building located on the site. Please verify this, and review and revise the study accordingly. (7/5/2023 ME)
- >> In staff's review the Colonial Boulevard site, it appears that some parking associated the site may be in an area shared with an adjacent use immediately west of the site. Please clearly describe how the counts took into consideration this shared parking area and how the surveyor was able to clearly identify parking demand solely associated with the mini-storage use. Please review and revise the study accordingly. (7/5/2023 ME)
- >> In staff's review of the latest architectural plan for Champion Ring Road site, it appears that the main building houses 657 units with a total building gross floor area of 92,535-SF, which differs from that described in the study. The study also appears to indicate that there are 12 marked parking spaces on site, whereas the aerial photo appears to show 11 spaces. In addition, the study does not appear to include three other mini-storage buildings located on the site. Please verify this, and review and revise the study accordingly. (7/5/2023 ME)
- >> In staff's review of the latest permit for the building located at the Estero Oaks Boulevard site, it appears that the building's total gross floor area is 85,898-SF, which differs from that described in the study. The study also appears to indicate that there are 33 marked parking spaces on site, whereas the latest site plan appears to describe 30 spaces. Please verify this, and review and revise the study accordingly. (7/5/2023 ME)
- >> The building gross floor area of the building located at the Champion Ring Road site as referenced in some places within the report do not appear to correlate with that described in other places within the report. Specifically see references on pages 3 and 5, and the count summaries. Please review and revise the study accordingly. (7/5/2023 ME)
- >> One of the mid-afternoon 11/28 count times for the Tiburon Way site as referenced in the summary sheet appears different that that described on the raw count sheet. Please review and revise the study accordingly. (7/5/2023 ME)
- >> The building gross floor area of the building located at the Estero Oaks Drive site as referenced in some places within the report do not appear to correlate with that described in other places within the report. Specifically see references on pages 4 and 5, and the count summaries. Please review and revise the study accordingly. (7/5/2023 ME)
- >> The 1 p.m. count on 11/15 at the Estero Oaks Drive site as described in the count summary does not appear to correlate with that described in the raw count sheet. Please review and revise the study accordingly. (7/5/2023 ME)

- >> The study does not appear to indicate why daily counts weren't consistently taken when ITE indicates 80% or more of peak parking demand is expected for the proposed use. Please review and revise the study accordingly. (7/5/2023 ME)
- >> Since many parking observations were not made at time when ITE indicates 80% or more of peak parking demand is expected for the proposed use, the study does not appear to indicate if any adjustments to the data may be needed. Please review and revise the study accordingly. (7/5/2023 ME)

Please contact Marcus Evans at MEvans@leegov.com or by calling 239-533-8355 with any questions regarding the above review comments.