



Lee County
Southwest Florida

Board of County Commissioners

Writer's Direct Dial # (239) 533-8542

Kevin Ruane
District One

Cecil L. Pendergrass
District Two

David Mulicka
District Three

Brian Hamman
District Four

Mike Greenwell
District Five

Dave Harner, II
County Manager

Richard Wm. Wesch
County Attorney

Donna Marie Collins
County Hearing
Examiner

February 7, 2025

Vince Cautero/ Kelly Liscum
2271 McGregor Blvd
Fort Myers, FL 33901

RE: 94 4th Street CPD
Case No. DCI2024-00024

Dear Mr. Cautero:

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 the sufficiency review comments contained herein within thirty (30) calendar days of the date of this letter. A public hearing date will not be scheduled until a complete application is submitted. This application may be considered withdrawn if no response is received within this timeframe.

Please feel free to contact me at KMuhammad@leegov.com or (239) 533-8542 if you have any questions.

Sincerely,
DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT
Zoning Section

Electronically signed on 2/7/2025 by
Khalil Muhammad, Planner (Zoning)
Lee County Department of Community Development

Khalil Muhammad
Planner
KAM

Zoning Review

A. Master Concept Plan

1. Please clarify the purpose of the triangles on the MCP with the letter "R". It is unclear if these markers correspond to proposed deviations or indicators that the areas are to be included in the open space calculation. If it is the latter, please remove the additional triangles as the bubble annotation communicates the correlation well enough.
2. Please revise the MCP to show clear distinction between property lines and the masonry wall as well as chain link fence as proposed with alternate hatch marking.
3. Will the ingress/egress be gated? If so, the gate will need to be depicted to show a setback to accommodate the width of the right of way buffer. The gate, if proposed, must also be designed consistent with LDC Section 34-1748.

B. Narrative

1. The setbacks included in the Narrative includes setbacks established by LDC Section 34-935 and is noted as a "Minimum Setback" of 15 feet; however, this is not consistent with the Property Development Regulations provided, which lists "Minimum Setbacks" as 20 feet. Please clarify and make the necessary modifications for this document for consistency.

Environmental Sciences

- A. The cross section to show line of sight indicates plantings on the external side of the wall. The MCP does not show the same plantings. If a chain link fence is proposed for compatibility, then plantings are required to shield and buffer the adjacent use. If an 8-foot opaque fence is proposed, then no plantings are needed for compatibility.
- B. The MCP calls out an 8-foot masonry wall and an 8-foot chain link fence, but these are represented by the same feature (black line) on the MCP. The same feature is on the west parcel line, yet no wall is referenced on the MCP on that boundary. Clarify the location of walls on the MCP.

Development Services

INFORMATIONAL COMMENT: If there are any necessary deviations to be requested that pertain to (sidewalks/paths/crosswalks), pedestrian ways to provide access between parking areas, building entries, surrounding streets, external sidewalks, transit stops, other uses, and out parcels, along with cross section details of all of the onsite (sidewalks/paths/crosswalks), inclusive of the structural course, base and subgrade, per LDC Section 10-610(d)(1)a. Please provide annotation on the proposed MCP and in your deviation requests/justification

- NOTE: At time of development order the applicant must demonstrate compliance with this requirement.