



Consolidated Review Comments

Record Number: [DCI2026-00008](#)

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: 03/25/2026

Record Type: Planned Development

Address: 0 CORNER LOT, FORT MYERS, FL 33908

Project Name: Grande Calusa CPD

Record Description: Rezone 22.6 acre parcel from CC to CPD to add hotel/convention center and other commercial uses and to memorialize the existing Live Local Act approval.

The Zoning Section has reviewed the submission package for the above-referenced application in accordance with the submittal requirements contained in the Lee County Land Development Code (LDC). Please be advised that the application is insufficient at this time. The application cannot be deemed sufficient for public hearing until the deficiencies provided in the attached comments are addressed.

If you are unable to resubmit within thirty (30) days of this letter, you may request an extension and waive the statutory review deadlines set forth in F.S. 125.022 by completing and returning the [Request for Waiver Form](#).

If you have any questions prior to resubmitting, please contact the lead reviewer for a meeting to discuss the attached comments.

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 Development Services has reviewed the plans provided and offers the following comments. These comments are intended to make the applicant aware of issues with the design that may cause delays or possible changes at time of the development order submittal. INFORMATIONAL COMMENT: The previously approved development order for the site (DOS2024-00090) will need to be modified to reflect the proposed changes. Pursuant to LDC Section 34-373(a)(6)b. if a subdivision is proposed, the MCP must also show the general location of all proposed internal street rights-of-way or easements and the general location of all points of vehicular ingress and egress from the proposed internal rights-of-way or easements into multiple-family, commercial, or industrial use lots. It is not clear if the parcel will be subdivided. If so, please provide the internal street rights-of-way or easements on the MCP. Pursuant to LDC Section 34-373(a)(6)c. the MCP must indicate the general location, configuration, and approximate dimensions of the lots or	Allyson Hall	Open	5

<u>Corrections</u>	<u>Review Comments</u>	<u>Reviewer</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Comment ID</u>
	parcels (including subdivided parcels and outparcels). The proposed use of the lots or parcels must be keyed to the list of proposed uses submitted with the application. It is not clear if the parcel will be subdivided. If so, please provide this information on the MCP. Please demonstrate compliance with LDC Section 34-373(a)(6)d. which states that the MCP must show individual development areas (i.e., residential, retail, office, manufacturing, mixed-use-listed, etc.) with detail showing the boundary of each development area within which buildings, parking or other uses will be located. Pursuant to LDC Section 34-373(a)(6)e. the general location of service areas for delivery of goods or services must be shown on the MCP for all developments that are not residential subdivisions.			
<u>DOT Review</u>				
Yes	DOT Sufficiency requirement: Please demonstrate the previous and proposed access spacing on the Master Concept Plan. Dimensions should include driveways on both east and west sides of McGregor Blvd. Sufficiency Requirement: Access spacing for McGregor Blvd (Arterial, Posted Speed >45mph, Future Urban area) is minimum 440'. The proposed access points may require deviation from LDC Sec. 10-285, connection separation distance. Informational: Turn lane analysis will be required at the time of DO application for each phase of the project.	John Podczerwinsky	Open	9
<u>Environmental Review</u>				
Yes	Environmental Comments: 1. For deviation 3, please clarify if there will be efficient space for maintenance for lakes. 2. Please provide more information on the proposed 15-foot alternate betterment buffers depicted on MCP. 3. DOS2024-00090 shows a 15-foot Type D buffer within an easement to the south with no plant material where the Type D is depicted. 4. Please note no required buffer plantings may be planted in any easements per LDC Section 10-421(a)(5) unless a letter of no objection from the easement holder has been obtained. 5. The applicant is not providing the correct landscape buffer depiction as approved on the DO. 6. Staff have found inconsistency between approved DO and MCP included in this submittal. Please depict easements on MCP. 7. Please note any loading areas/docks, trash collectors, and/or air conditioning units must be fully shielded per LDC Section 10-610 (c)(2) 8. Please note building perimeter plantings are required one three sides for new development in a commercial zoning district per 10-416(b). 9. Please note all internal parking areas must provide landscaping for shading per LDC Section 10-416(c)(2). 10. Please provide an open space exhibit. Commercial portion requires 30% open space for a large development and residential requires 40% open	Paige Carroll	Open	10

<u>Corrections</u>	<u>Review Comments</u>	<u>Reviewer</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Comment ID</u>
	space for a large development per LDC Section 10-415(a). Please revise.			
<u>Legal Review</u>				
Yes	LDC §34-202(a)(6) Boundary Survey. - The survey must be tied to the state plane coordinate system for the Florida West Zone (the most current adjustment is required) with two coordinates, one coordinate being the point of beginning (POB) and the other an opposing corner.	Larissa Narkiewicz	Open	7
Yes	§10-154(1) Legal description and sketch to accompany legal description. - The highlighted call in the legal description does not match the highlighted call in the sketch. Please review the distance for correctness.	Larissa Narkiewicz	Open	8
<u>Natural Resources Review</u>				
Yes	Provide an analysis of Lee Plan Policy 101.1.2.	William Lange	Open	1
Yes	Pursuant to Lee Plan Policy 126.1.4., how has the development been designed to maintain or improve surface water flows.	William Lange	Open	3
Yes	Identify the location of all surface water outfalls and identify any areas where adverse offsite impacts might occur.	William Lange	Open	4
Yes	Pursuant to Lee Plan Polic 125.1.2, please provide an analysis of this policy as it pertains to essential services facility group 2.	William Lange	Open	6
<u>Zoning Review</u>				
Yes	1. Provide a completed Disclosure Affidavit. The copy submitted is incomplete. See LDC Section 34-201.	Adam Mendez	Open	12
Yes	2. The two-page Master Concept Plan (MCP) omits information required by LDC Section 34-373(a)(6). At this stage, staff are not requesting Development Order-level detail drawings for the subject property. However, the MCP must be revised to address the following required elements: •Depict individual development areas (for example, residential, retail, office, and mixed-use areas), including the boundaries of each development area within which buildings, parking, or other uses will be located. •Show the general location of service areas for the delivery of goods or services for all development that is not residential subdivision development. •Remove the reference to a "Landscape Betterment Plan" and instead identify a proposed deviation seeking the appropriate relief through the planned development rezoning process. •Depict any additional deviations discussed in the deviation section of this review response.	Adam Mendez	Open	13
Yes	3. Schedule of uses (See LDC Section 34-373(a)(8)): • Provide additional analysis supporting the inclusion of Essential Services Group II and Heliport/Helistop uses. • Convention Center: Clarify whether the proposed convention center counts toward the maximum commercial floor area or is intended to be accessory to the hotel and not generally open to the public. If it is proposed as an accessory use to the hotel, establish a maximum floor area. • The schedule of uses includes timeshare units. Please establish a maximum number of timeshare units consistent with the remainder of the application.	Adam Mendez	Open	14
Yes	4. For group quarters facilities, including dormitories, provide the maximum number of beds. See LDC Section 34-373(a)(8).	Adam Mendez	Open	15
Yes	5. The request includes references to development order approval under the Live Local Act and attempts to incorporate development attributes such as parking reduction, landscaping betterment, building height, and building separation standards that do not comply with the Land Development Code. Within the planned development rezoning process, relief from applicable LDC requirements must be requested through deviations in order to align the planned development with the proposed Live Local Act	Adam Mendez	Open	16

<u>Corrections</u>	<u>Review Comments</u>	<u>Reviewer</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Comment ID</u>
	development approval. At a minimum, the following LDC sections appear to require deviation requests: • Section 10-416 (Buffering) • Section 34-2020 (Parking) • Section 34-935(b)(1)e. (Perimeter Setback) • Section 34-935(e)(4) (Building Separation) • Sections 34-935(f) and 34-2175 (Building Height) This initial review may not identify every inconsistency between the application, the Land Development Code, and the local development order referenced as the basis for this rezoning request. Please conduct a comprehensive review of all applicable development standards and determine whether additional deviations are necessary to facilitate the proposed local development order approval.			
Yes	6. Deviation No. 3, which requests a 0-foot waterbody setback, is not consistent with the proposed property development regulations. Please revise the proposed development regulations for consistency.	Adam Mendez	Open	17

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	-
Larissa Narkiewicz	lnarkiewicz@leegov.com	-
Adam Mendez	amendez@leegov.com	239-533-8325
William Lange	wlange@leegov.com	-
Paige Carroll	pcarroll@leegov.com	-
Allyson Hall	ahall@leegov.com	239-533-8553