



Consolidated Review Comments

Record Number: [DCI2025-00019](#)

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

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

Report Date: 12/12/2025

Record Type: Planned Development

Address: 19551 ARMEDA RD, ALVA, FL 33920

Project Name: Armeda Property

Record Description: Rezone 561.63±-acres from Agricultural (AG-2) to Residential Planned Development (RPD).

Staff has reviewed the above-referenced application in accordance with the applicable requirements of the Lee County Land Development Code (LDC). Please be advised that the application is insufficient at this time. A public hearing date will not be scheduled until a complete application is submitted.

Please respond to the enclosed sufficiency review comments within 30 days of the date of this letter. This application may be withdrawn if no response is received within this timeframe.

In order to facilitate an efficient review process, Staff is available to the Applicant and the Developer to schedule a meeting to discuss the remaining comments prior to resubmittal of the application. Contact PODZoning@leegov.com.

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>Development Services Review</u>				
Yes	Development Services 1. Please provide a Letter of No Objection from the local fire department (Bayshore Fire District) and emergency services in reference to Deviation (7) from LDC Section 10-296(k)(1). 2. INFORMATIONAL COMMENT: The proposed MCP and Boundary Survey depict an existing 30' ingress egress easement, Armeda Rd (to remain), along the western side of Parcel B. If the site under separate ownership utilizing this easement were to serve anything more than (1) single-family home, the minimum right-of-way width pursuant to LDC Section 10-296, Table 2 is 40'. This road must also meet or exceed the standards in LDC Section 10-296 for a non-urban local street.	Allyson Hall	Open	38
<u>DOT Review</u>				
Yes	DOT: 12/9/2025 Sufficiency Comments: The applicant's response indicates that a 30' ingress/egress easement (Armeda Rd) will be retained as a driveway serving a single family residence, but there seem to be at least three occupied homes served by this existing road. --One property is excepted from the project boundary, and would remain served by Armeda Road (STRAP 08432600000060010; 19500 Armeda Rd) --Three properties are not excluded from the proposed DCI: 19440 Armeda	John Podczerwinsky	Open	34

<u>Corrections</u>	<u>Review Comments</u>	<u>Reviewer</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Comment ID</u>
	Rd., 14500 HIPP CT, and 19501/541 Armeda Rd. These properties appear to be captured in a proposed Preserve designation related generally to Parcel B. The applicant's access spacing deviation request also indicates that Armeda Rd may serve multiple properties. In order to prevent causing non-compliance with either the zoning design standards, or County LDC design standards, please clarify the following: --Will Armeda Road serve one single family parcel, a commercial use, or multiple single family homes? --As it is included within the proposed zoning boundary, is Armeda Road ingress/egress easement to be subject to, or excepted from, the proposed zoning requirements? Note: 30' local roads width may be inadequate to sufficiently meet County design standards in LDC Sec. 10-296 or the RPD's typical roadway section.			
Yes	DOT: Demonstrate the ingress/egress easement recording instruments for Armeda Rd and the easement +/- 729' west of the westerly site access serving the other AG-2 parcel.	John Podczerwinsky	Open	35
<u>Environmental Review</u>				
Yes	7. Please provide a document that demonstrates how the applicant will be controlling the hydroperiods and stormwater to show flow patterns of surface water within the site. 8. The narrative outlines the improvement of wetland hydroperiods within the on-site preserves. The applicant proposes preserving approximately 49 acres of wetlands. Please provide a comparison between the current hydroperiods and the expected conditions after development. Additionally, explain how the preserved areas will be created, restored, or enhanced to improve hydroperiods and support habitats for protected species. This is a repeat comment due to the response. The response referred to Section 3.0 Characterization of Ground and Surface Water Resources Document which is regarding irrigation. Please revise and provide information on pre and post hydroperiods. 9. Please provide separate hatching for existing driveways or easements accessing the excluding parcels. These areas can't be included in open space calculations. 10. Please depict where the remaining 10% of required open space on open space exhibit. 11. Please provide cross sections for areas intersecting wetlands, flow ways, and restoration/preservation zones. While Sheet 3 of the MCP includes typical roadway cross section, please provide a map indicating where each will be applied. Additionally, please label the cross sections according to each specific scenario. 12. Please note indigenous open space minimum dimensions to comply with LDC Section 10-415 (c). Minimum dimensions for indigenous open space are 40 feet in width and 10 feet for open space.	Paige Carroll	Open	37
Yes	Zoning The compensatory storage areas are being proposed within the Upland Restoration Planting Area and surrounded by Trout Creek. The narrative and the hydrological narrative state that the compensatory storage areas will be Created Wetlands. Revise environmental, hydrological and narrative documents, including all maps, to include details of the Created Wetland areas. Clarify how the compensatory storage fits into the overall surface and groundwater design to benefit the habitat for wildlife.	Elizabeth Workman	Open	47

<u>Corrections</u>	<u>Review Comments</u>	<u>Reviewer</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Comment ID</u>
	It is unclear if the compensatory storage area (Wetland Creation) will utilize the density incentives. Provide clarification of the preservation, restoration, and creation areas that are utilizing the density incentives. As previously stated, provide the two public information documents. Deviation #1 is being requested to provide one access per residential pod. Staff does not support this deviation due to the public health and safety of the future residents. The applicant is proposing roads that cross Trout Creek and FEMA floodways that present hazards internally if the road was impacted. Staff suggests eliminating the eastern residential pod and preserve, restore, or create indigenous areas. Redesign the western residential pod to cluster/varying lots size to move density to the west and provide two access points. It is still unclear why lakes that are surrounded by residential development need a 4:1 lake bank slope. The justification focuses on the indigenous which some lakes abut, however Deviation #3 applies to all lakes. Revise. Staff requires a letter from the Fire Marshall for Deviation #1 and #7. Provide details in the form of cross sections and separate narratives regarding the bridge impacts to the wetlands, flowways, preservation, restoration, and creation. Provide how much of an impact the supporting structures proposed to impact the natural areas will impede flow. This deviation will require multiple cross sections to support the deviation and coincide with the one access per Deviation #1. They are tied together.			
<u>Natural Resources Review</u>				
Yes	Please revise Table 1 within the Ground and Surface Water Resources Report to indicate a Quarterly Sampling Frequency to align with the sampling frequency outlined in "6.3 Surface Water Quality Monitoring" section of the Report.	Nicholas DeFilippo	Open	39
Yes	Please revise the Ground and Surface Water Resources Report to include the following Surface Water Quality Laboratory Parameters: •☐Total Nitrogen •☐Nitrite + Nitrate as Nitrogen (NOX) •☐Nitrite •☐Nitrate •☐Total Phosphorus •☐Chloride •☐Total Dissolved Solids •☐Copper •☐Zinc •☐Lead •☐E. coli •☐Total Hardness •☐Biological Oxygen Demand	Nicholas DeFilippo	Open	40
Yes	Who is the responsible maintenance entity for the compensating storage areas depicted on the MCP? How will the maintenance entity access these areas? Please indicate access easements on MCP as they have potential to impact restoration areas.	Nicholas DeFilippo	Open	41
Yes	Please revise the Water Quality Monitoring to indicate that the "After five years of meeting/exceeding State surface water quality standards, the Developer may amend water quality monitoring and reporting after written request, review, and approval by Division of Natural Resources."	Nicholas DeFilippo	Open	42
Yes	Please provide a cross section at the proposed Trout Creek bridge crossing location demonstrating how County will be able to access the drainage and access easements.	Nicholas DeFilippo	Open	43

<u>Corrections</u>	<u>Review Comments</u>	<u>Reviewer</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Comment ID</u>
Yes	Please provide a 20ft drainage and access easement along Trout Creek. The width and winding nature of the Creek in this location will not allow maintenance vehicles to navigate within the proposed 10ft drainage and access easement.	Nicholas DeFilippo	Open	44
Yes	Please revise the "6.4 Groundwater Level Monitoring" section of the Ground and Surface Water Report to indicate that the Sandstone Aquifer monitoring wells will be equipped with electronic water level transducers programmed to record data every six hours.	Nicholas DeFilippo	Open	45
Yes	The only proposed access to Development Pod A requires a bridge to be constructed over Trout Creek. Will the bridge be designed to accommodate construction equipment? Will the bridge receive a CC prior to commencement of construction within the remainder of Pod A? How will the developer access Pod A during construction? Staff is asking because of potential impacts to FEMA Floodway.	Nicholas DeFilippo	Open	46
<u>Planning Review</u>				
Yes	The Armeda RPD must stay consistent with the proposed CPA, as changes to the CPA may necessitate changes to the rezone. Planning may add additional comments to the RPD as the CPA progresses.	Katherine Burgess	Open	24
Yes	Planning will not find the proposed RPD sufficient until the CPA has been found sufficient.	Katherine Burgess	Open	25

CORRECTIONS NEEDED:

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

REVIEWER CONTACT INFORMATION:

<u>Reviewer Name</u>	<u>Reviewer Email</u>	<u>Reviewer Phone</u>
John Podczerwinsky	jpodczerwinsky@leegov.com	-
Nicholas DeFilippo	ndefilippo@leegov.com	239-533-8983
Paige Carroll	pcarroll@leegov.com	-
Elizabeth Workman	eworkman@leegov.com	239-533-8793
Katherine Burgess	kburgess@leegov.com	239-533-8362
Allyson Hall	ahall@leegov.com	239-533-8553