



Consolidated Review Comments

Record Number: [CPA2025-00006](#)

Department of Community Development
 Planning
 P.O. Box 398
 Fort Myers, FL 33902

Click the record number to open it in the eConnect/ACA portal.

Report Date: 11/20/2025

Record Type: Comprehensive Plan Amendment

Address: 14800 ALICO RD, FORT MYERS, FL 33913

Project Name: Alico Tradeport Text Amendment

Record Description: A request to amend the text in Goal 33 to allow for the development of industrial uses when developed in complimentary locations within Southeast Lee County.

Staff has reviewed the application submittal for the Lee Plan Amendment, CPA2025-00006, originally received 2025-07-01 00:00:00. Planning Staff finds that the application materials are insufficient and further information is needed. A public hearing date 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not provide the requested supplements of corrections within 90 days of this letter, this application will be considered withdrawn. Please feel free to contact Planning at (239) 533-8585 if you have any questions.

GENERAL COMMENTS:

The information below is an advisory summary of any significant issues identified for the project.

| <u>Corrections</u> | <u>Review Comments</u> | <u>Reviewer</u> | <u>Status</u> | <u>Comment ID</u> |
|-----------------------------|---|--------------------|---------------|-------------------|
| <u>Environmental Review</u> | | | | |
| Yes | Please provide analysis of Lee Plan policies 33.1.7, 60.1.1, 60.1.2, 60.4.3, 123.1.5, 123.2.10, 123.4.1, 123.11.4, 123.12.1, 125.1.2, 125.1.4, 126.1.1, 126.1.4, and 127.1.1. | Nicholas DeFilippo | Open | 1 |
| Yes | The FLUCCS map for 14700 Alico Rd prepared by Synecological Analysts calls out Mangrove habitat. Staff suspects this is an error. Please review for accuracy. | Nicholas DeFilippo | Open | 10 |
| Yes | Please provide an environmental analysis detailing how the proposed text amendment will both positively and negatively impact the environment. The analysis should address protected species, wildlife habitat, wetlands, and water resources. The analysis must account for all eligible properties developing in accordance with the request. | Nicholas DeFilippo | Open | 11 |
| <u>Planning Review</u> | | | | |
| Yes | UPDATED -- The application materials do not include an analysis of the proposed text amendment's impact on Lee Plan Table 1(b). Add this analysis to the Lee Plan Analysis. Contact Rick Burris at rburris@leegov.com for current Table 1(b) allocation allowances. The application materials, specifically Exhibit T11, state that Table 1(b) needs to be updated. Provide a strikethrough and underline version of the updated table with the text amendment. | Katherine Burgess | Open | 30 |
| Yes | Provide a revised Lee Plan analysis per the comments provided in the first round of review. Comments will remain open until addressed in the application package. | Katherine Burgess | Open | 31 |
| Yes | Schedule a meeting with staff to discuss the review comments. | Katherine Burgess | Open | 32 |

CORRECTIONS NEEDED:

Items marked Yes must be resolved before the plan review can be approved. Items marks "No" may be deferred to subsequent submittals and are not required to be addressed prior to approval of plans and documents.

Document: Exhibit T3 - Community Meeting.pdf

| <u>Corrections</u> | <u>Page Ref</u> | <u>Review Comments</u> | <u>Reviewer</u> | <u>Status</u> | <u>Comment ID</u> |
|------------------------|-----------------|--|-------------------|---------------|-------------------|
| <u>Planning Review</u> | | | | | |
| Yes | 1 | Lee Plan Objective 17.3 requires a public input meeting for privately initiated text amendment applications within a Community Plan Area. Provide the information required per Policy 17.3.4 for a public input meeting within the boundaries of Southeast Lee Community Plan Area and consistent with the other requirements of this objective. | Katherine Burgess | Open | 12 |

Document: Exhibit T4 - Proposed Text Changes.pdf

| <u>Corrections</u> | <u>Page Ref</u> | <u>Review Comments</u> | <u>Reviewer</u> | <u>Status</u> | <u>Comment ID</u> |
|------------------------|-----------------|---|-------------------|---------------|-------------------|
| <u>Planning Review</u> | | | | | |
| Yes | 1 | The Tradeport FLUC allows for non-industrial uses. Clarify whether Tradeport within SE Lee would be limited to industrial uses. If non-industrial uses are intended as well, clarify how those uses would work with Policy 33.2.5, which has already been exceeded. | Katherine Burgess | Open | 13 |
| Yes | 1 | Provide information on the basis of how 1.0 FAR was determined as the appropriate intensity for this area. | Katherine Burgess | Open | 14 |
| Yes | 1 | #1 and #2 appear to conflict with each other. Provide some analysis or justification regarding these geographic limitations. | Katherine Burgess | Open | 15 |
| Yes | 1 | There are a lot of properties that would meet the 4-acre requirement. Provide some justification on how this number was determined. | Katherine Burgess | Open | 16 |
| Yes | 1 | Provide an analysis, including a map, of the potential impact this acreage threshold may have on SE Lee. | Katherine Burgess | Open | 17 |
| Yes | 1 | SE Lee requires many of these as the general requirements of the Community Plan Area. Remove the requirements that are already included in Objective 33.1. | Katherine Burgess | Open | 18 |
| Yes | 1 | The wording appears to suggest that mining would be considered an industrial development. Clarify the intent of this statement. | Katherine Burgess | Open | 19 |
| Yes | 2 | This policy appears to conflict with other Lee Plan policies regarding MUDs on non-residential properties. Provide information on the reasoning of why this was included. | Katherine Burgess | Open | 20 |

Document: Exhibit T5 - Impact Analysis.pdf

| <u>Corrections</u> | <u>Page Ref</u> | <u>Review Comments</u> | <u>Reviewer</u> | <u>Status</u> | <u>Comment ID</u> |
|------------------------|-----------------|---|-------------------|---------------|-------------------|
| <u>Planning Review</u> | | | | | |
| Yes | 2 | The locational standards in the proposed text amendment appears to include areas between the existing Alico Rd and SR 82 that could be considered "South of the Alico Road extension" that are not included in the Private Rec Facilities Overlay. Additionally, Private Rec Facilities would be significantly less intense than industrial uses. Consider revising this section, as it does not appear to directly support the requested amendments. | Katherine Burgess | Open | 26 |
| Yes | 3 | The proposed amendment's locational standards would apply to numerous properties in SE Lee. Provide an analysis of all properties that could become eligible for Tradeport with the proposed amendment. | Katherine Burgess | Open | 27 |

| <u>Corrections</u> | <u>Page Ref</u> | <u>Review Comments</u> | <u>Reviewer</u> | <u>Status</u> | <u>Comment ID</u> |
|--------------------|-----------------|---|-------------------|---------------|-------------------|
| Yes | 3 | This map is not the only map/area of SE Lee that may be impacted by the proposed text amendments. Maps 1-D and 2-D may also be impacted. Verify and provide explanation on the impact of the proposed text amendments on the other SE Lee Maps. | Katherine Burgess | Open | 29 |
| Yes | 4 | Provide information on the impact the text amendment could have on utilities and services, including the number of properties which could qualify for Tradeport based on the locational standards and the required infrastructure based on the proposed FAR, consistent with Objective 4.1. | Katherine Burgess | Open | 28 |
| Yes | 5 | Add a statement regarding the justification of the requested text amendment. Include data and analysis where necessary to support the request. | Katherine Burgess | Open | 25 |

Document: Exhibit T6 - Lee Plan Analysis.pdf

| <u>Corrections</u> | <u>Page Ref</u> | <u>Review Comments</u> | <u>Reviewer</u> | <u>Status</u> | <u>Comment ID</u> |
|------------------------|-----------------|--|-------------------|---------------|-------------------|
| <u>Planning Review</u> | | | | | |
| Yes | 5 | Provide an analysis on the potential impacts to the other special treatment areas in SE Lee such as the the existing acreage subdivisions, mixed-use communities, and EEPCO. | Katherine Burgess | Open | 23 |
| Yes | 5 | Consider whether there are any policies in the other elements of the Lee Plan, such as the Economic Development Element, that could support the text amendment request. Add those policies to the Lee Plan analysis. | Katherine Burgess | Open | 24 |

REVIEWER CONTACT INFORMATION:

| <u>Reviewer Name</u> | <u>Reviewer Email</u> | <u>Reviewer Phone</u> |
|----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| Nicholas DeFilippo | ndefilippo@leegov.com | 239-533-8983 |
| Katherine Burgess | kburgess@leegov.com | 239-533-8362 |