



# Lee County

Southwest Florida

## Board of County Commissioners

Kevin Ruane  
District One

January 23, 2024

Cecil L Pendergrass  
District Two

Ray Sandelli  
District Three

Brian Hamman  
District Four

Mike Greenwell  
District Five

Roger Desjarlais  
County Manager

Richard Wm. Wesch  
County Attorney

Donna Marie Collins  
County Hearing  
Examiner

Fred Drovdlc, AICP  
RVI Planning and Landscape Architecture  
1514 Broadway, Suite 201  
Fort Myers, FL 33901  
**Via E-mail Only:** fdrovdlc@rviplanning.com

**RE: CPA2023-00011**

### Royal Palm Map Amendments

Dear Mr. Drovdlc:

Staff has reviewed the application submittal for Map Amendment CPA2023-00011, stamped "received" on December 8, 2023. Planning staff finds that the application materials are insufficient and further information is needed.

#### PLANNING COMMENTS

1. Letters of Availability:
  - a. The Fire Letter of Availability was missing. The application materials only included the request letter, not the agency's response.
  - b. Provide the Letter of Availability request letters for EMS, Schools, Solid Waste, Law Enforcement, archaeological, and parks.
2. The application materials need to provide direct support for the Comprehensive Plan Amendment, not the rezone. Exhibit M11 also includes analyses and discussion relating to the rezone which are not relevant to the FLUM amendment. Revise the analyses for Policies 2.2.1, 5.2.4, 61.3.6, 61.3.7, 125.1.2, and 125.1.3 so that they directly relate to the FLU map amendment.
3. The analysis provided for Policy 101.1.4 in Exhibit M11 states to see an attached report which was not included in the FLUM amendment application. Include this report and summarize the findings to verify compliance with the Lee Plan policy.
4. Exhibit 18, State Policy and Regional Policy Plan, #22 states that the map amendment from Central Urban to Intensive Development does not alter the density or allowance for population to occupy the parcel; however, this map amendment does increase the density allowed on the parcel. Additionally, as stated in other places in the application, this property flooded during hurricane Ian which conflicts with the statement, "This is an ideal place for quick and effective evacuation and a proper place for density as it is inland out of most major dangers such as flooding or tidal surges." Reword this consistency statement to better reflect the conditions on site.

5. The following typos need to be addressed:
  - a. Page 1 of Exhibit M11, the Lee Plan Analysis, part II, paragraph 2 references designating the property as part of the Lee County Utilities service area. This property is already within the LCU service area. Provide clarification of this request or remove the statement.
  - b. The analyses for Standard 4.1.3 and Policy 54.1.6 state that Reuse is available on site; however, the utilities availability letter stated that no reuse lines were in the vicinity. Clarify where this reuse is coming from or revise to be consistent with the LCU availability letter.
  - c. Exhibit 14, page 1, Comprehensive Plan Amendment (Maps), paragraph 2 includes a reference to the General Interchange FLUC.
  - d. Exhibit M18, Page 4, last paragraph includes another reference to General Interchange.
  - e. Exhibit M19, Page 3, paragraph 1 states, "the difference lies in the fact that the Intensive Development allows for bonus density." The existing Central Urban FLUC allows for Bonus Density too. Clarify that the proposed FLUC allows more bonus density.
  - f. The analysis for Policy 95.1.3(3) states that the property "is intended to be developed as part of the existing CPD, as amended." The companion rezone is to RPD. Revise.
  - g. The analysis for policy 5.1.1 states that this is an application to rezone the property. This application is for a FLUM amendment.

#### **LEGAL DESCRIPTION/SURVEY COMMENTS**

6. The sketch of the subject property does not include a state plane coordinate at the point of beginning (POB) and a second point at an opposing corner. The legal description of the property does not include the directional call for the centerline of Phillips Creek as it shows in the sketch, the sketch does not include the length of the first call (POC to POB) as it does in the description, and several other directional calls within the legal description are inconsistent with the sketch.

#### **TRANSPORTATION COMMENTS**

7. Tables 1A and 3A require revision, as the LOS standard for Winkler Rd. (North of College Pkwy) appears inaccurate. Additionally, kindly make any necessary updates in the Transportation Impact Study (TIS) to reflect this change.
8. Table 2A also requires revision, specifically concerning the accuracy of the K-factor and D-factor for most segments. Please refer to the Lee County Traffic Count Report and the Florida Traffic Online Webpage for accurate information. Furthermore, the estimation of Peak Hour Peak Directional Project Traffic should be based on the peak directional count (133) generated from the development.

Public hearings will not be scheduled until a complete application is submitted. If you do not provide the requested supplements of corrections within 90 days of this letter, this application will be considered withdrawn. Feel free to contact planning staff at (239) 533-8362 or [kwoellner@leegov.com](mailto:kwoellner@leegov.com) with any questions.

Respectfully,

**Lee County Department of Community Development**

  
Katie Woellner, AICP, Principal Planner, Planning Section

CC: case file