



Board of County Commissioners

Kevin Ruane
District One

July 2, 2025

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

Al Quattrone
Quattrone & Associates
4301 Veronica Shoemaker Blvd
Fort Myers, FL 33916
Via E-mail Only: permits@qainc.net

RE: CPA2025-00003

Pugliese Multi-Family

Dear Mr. Quattrone:

Staff has reviewed the information for the Lee Plan Future Land Use Map (FLUM) Amendment resubmittal stamped "received" on May 9, 2025. The application materials are insufficient and require additional information for review.

PLANNING COMMENTS

1. The proposed FLUM needs to show more of the area to provide context to the proposed change. Additionally, the FLUM layers go to the center of the ROW. Amend the proposed FLUM to provide better context for the proposed change.
2. The Lee Plan Consistency Narrative provides one justification for Objective 1.1 and Policies 1.1.5 and 1.1.4. Address each of these separately with data and analysis that support the proposed change.
3. The analysis for Policy 1.6.5 states that District 13 contains 1,318 acres of residential allotment left. The proposed FLUM amendment would permit industrial uses in addition to the existing residential and commercial uses. Provide a more holistic response for all of the potential uses to verify that Table 1b has adequate allocations for all possible outcomes of development on this site.
4. Remove the reference to the Live Local Act in the response to Objective 2.6.
5. The response to Policy 5.1.5 states that the requested increase in density is consistent with the surrounding land uses. The Suburban and Urban Community Future Land Use Categories have the same maximum density of 6 units per acre. Additionally, the response states that the change will support a rezoning when the applicant is not requesting a rezone. Revise this response to more accurately reflect the requested Future Land Use Map amendment. Note that the only density difference between Suburban and Urban Community is in the potential Bonus Density; however, TDUs are prohibited in CHHA, so on-site affordable housing would be the only option for additional density.
6. The response to Policy 37.1.3 includes a reference to a rezoning. The applicant has not requested to rezone this property. Remove the reference to more accurately reflect the process the proposed development will follow.

7. The applicant has restated parts of Policy 101.1.4 as the response to Policy 101.1.4. Provide a response to this policy with the lens that the maximum density of Urban Community and the existing Suburban FLU are the same, with Urban Community allowing Bonus Density when Suburban does not.
8. The response to Policy 101.3.7 references the Live Local bonus density. Remove the reference to Live Local and make a more general statement about how the site is in the Coastal High Hazard Area, and the only bonus density proposed will be through the affordable housing program.
9. Exhibit M15, the existing and future public facilities impact analysis, appears to include an incomplete first sentence, and it is unclear what the relationship is to Forest Utilities. Revise accordingly.
10. Provide copies of the request letters to the various county departments for the letters of availability.
11. The second consistency statement in Exhibit M19 states that the map amendment will allow the development of additional density. The Suburban and Urban Community FLUCs have the same maximum density. Revise the response accordingly.
12. Exhibit M20 does not provide any comparison between the benefits of Urban Community and the existing Suburban designations. Additionally, the justification merely states that the intent is to utilize the FLUM change to support residential uses, which are currently permitted in the Suburban category at the same density. Revise the justification to provide actual justification and reasoning that the proposed change to Urban Community is appropriate in this location and that the existing Suburban designation is no longer appropriate.

ENVIRONMENTAL

13. Please provide analysis of Lee Plan policies 101.1.1, 126.1.4, and Goal 124.
14. Please detail whether the onsite wetland accepts offsite flows. How will potential off-site flows be addressed?

LEGAL DESCRIPTION

15. The certified legal description(s) and certified sketch of the description for the property subject to the requested change. A metes and bounds legal description must be submitted, specifically describing the entire perimeter boundary of the property with accurate bearings and distances for every line. The sketch must be tied to the state plane coordinate system for the Florida West Zone (North America Datum of 1983/1990 Adjustment) with two coordinates, one coordinate being the point of beginning and the other an opposing corner.

The description included on the submitted survey is not a metes and bounds description and does not include state plane coordinates at the point of beginning and one opposing corner.

Public hearings will not be scheduled until the application is found sufficient. Contact Planning staff with any questions at (239) 533-8362 or kburgess@leegov.com.

Respectfully,



Kate Burgess, AICP

Principal Planner, Planning Section

Lee County Department of Community Development

Cc: Case File