Consolidated Review Comments

Record Number: DCI2024-00042

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: 04/21/2026
Record Type: Planned Development
Address: 0 ACCESS UNDETERMINED, FORT MYERS, FL NA
Project Name: Daniel's Parkway Multifamily
Record Description: Request to rezone ±19.48 acres from Commercial Planned Development (CPD) to Mixed Use Planned Development (MPD)

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.

Corrections	*Review Comments*	*Reviewer*	*Status*	*Comment ID*
Development Services Review				
Yes	Development Services INFORMATIONAL COMMENT: Development order approval is required in addition to this zoning action. Compliance with Chapter 10 of the Lee County Land Development Code will be reviewed further at that time. Regarding Master Concept B, please demonstrate that access shown on Kings Crossing Rd meets the connection separation requirements in LDC Section 10-285 for the accesses located across King Crossing Rd.	Allyson Hall	Open	10
DOT Review				

Corrections	Review Comments	Reviewer	Status	Comment ID
Yes	DOT Without regard for the mix of land uses, Lee DOT expresses preference for the roadway MCP 5.b which promotes street grid interconnectivity. However, the extension of Mall Loop Road to Palomino Lane as shown in MCP 5.b is not currently identified as a system-level roadway on Lee Plan Map 3A or within the Lee MPO's LRTP. As such, the Mall Loop [Extension] would currently be classified as a site-related improvement under LDC Chapter 2, but may be classified otherwise subject to receipt of verified operational data supporting the parallel relief and regional benefits of local grid connectivity as they relate to Daniels Parkway, at the discretion of the Transportation Director and the Board of County Commissioners.	John Podczerwinsky	Open	7
Yes	TIS No TIS (or revised TIS) has provided for the current submission. Based on MCP options 5.a and 5.b, it will be necessary to submit a finalized traffic study reflective of the access points associated with each option (or final proposed option and its associated land use mix), traffic distribution and assignment for each MCP, and respective intersection and roadway impact analyses for each scenario. Likewise, the final TIS must address the scenario(s) proposed under either MCP would be the maximum trip generating scenario for the development. With reference to DOT comments on this topic: In order for the BoCC to consider impact fee credit for Mall Loop [Extension], the applicant must submit a TIS in support of the final MCP that specifically models the "With Mall Loop Extension" vs. "Without Mall Loop Extension" under scenarios applicable to MCP 5.b.	John Podczerwinsky	Open	8
Environmental Review				
Yes	Environmental Comments: 1. Please note that no required buffer planting may be planted in any easement without a letter of no objection per LDC Section 10-421(5) and 10-421(2). 2. If easements and buffers overlap, please provide a new deviation from LDC Section 10-416(d)(3) and 10-416(d)(4) to allow for no required buffer plantings where buffers are required within an easement. MCP depicts multiple locations where easements and buffers overlap. 3. Repeat Comment: Large projects with existing indigenous native vegetation communities must provide 50% open space through on-site preservation. A deviation may be requested, pursuant to 10-415 (b) (5), to reduce the 50% requirement so long as the applicant demonstrates the unique conditions or circumstances that make the property unusable. Staff completed a site inspection and noted areas that appear to meet the indigenous definition. Pursuant to 34-373 (a) (4), provide a FLUCCS map. Additional comments may follow. 4. LDC 10-415 (d) (1) d., existing or proposed bodies of water, including stormwater management areas, may be only used to offset up to 25% of the required open space. Provide a revised open space exhibit and chart that only includes up to 25% of lake area in the open space calculations. 5. Roads or drives associated with residential subdivisions appear to be located less than 125 feet from an existing single-family residential subdivision, therefore a solid wall or combination berm and solid wall not less than eight feet in height must be constructed not less than 25 feet from the abutting property and landscaped per LDC Section 10-416(d)(6). 6. The application calls out a rezone for 19.48 acres, the open space table on MCP's calls out 17.94 acres for project site. Please provide more information. 7. Please demonstrate if the subject property is within 10,000 feet from	Paige Carroll	Open	9

Corrections	Review Comments	Reviewer	Status	Comment ID
	Airport operations, if so, Deviation 1, 2 and 3 are not needed per LDC Section 10-418(5). 8. Please note that any uses listed in LDC Section 10-424(a) are required to meet the buffers and screening for that use. 9. Additional comments may follow pending applicants' response.			
Legal Review				
Yes	LDC §34-202(a)(5) Legal description and sketch to accompany legal description. - The L-12 distance in the sketch conflicts with the L-12 distance in the legal description. Please review the highlighted discrepancies.	Larissa Narkiewicz	Open	4
Yes	LDC §34-202(a)(6) Boundary Survey. -The boundary survey is based on the incorrect title. The most recently submitted boundary survey is based on the Title Commitment dated January 6, 2026. The survey should be based on the Title Certification dated March 13, 2026. - The boundary survey and Title Certification describe a different property than the Legal Description and accompanying sketch. The East 75 feet of the subject parcel should not be included in the Boundary Survey and Title Certification.	Larissa Narkiewicz	Open	6
Planning Review				
Yes	Part 7,D of the Application requests a narrative of how the proposal meets the requirements of LDC Section 2-146 for Bonus Density. Please include in next submittal.	Lindsey Karczewski	Open	3
Yes	Planning will not consider the DCI sufficient until later in the review process of the concurrent CPA (CPA2026-00002).	Lindsey Karczewski	Open	5
Solid Waste Review				
Yes	Solid Waste: Trash enclosure appears to have an accessibility obstruction. Its recommended to provide 65' of unobstructed collection access. See LDC 10-261 for further details.	Justin Lighthall	Open	1
Zoning Review				
Yes	Please be advised that although there is a Comprehensive Plan Amendment (CPA2026-00002) currently in review staff must review the case based on the subject property's current condition and Future Land Use Category designation. Future comments may be made once CPA2026-00002 has been found sufficient.	Brianna Schroeder	Open	11
Yes	Please be advised that with the request now being classified as a "Major planned development" in accordance with LDC Section 34-341(b)(1), additional fees have been invoiced and must be paid prior to resubmittal.	Brianna Schroeder	Open	12
Yes	Please be advised that although the current property is zoned Commercial Planned Development (CPD) by Resolution Z-03-020, the request is to rezone the current CPD to Mixed Use Planned Development (MPD), which requires staff to review this case as a new Development of Community Impact (DCI) as set forth in LDC Section 34-380(d). Please provide or adjust the following: a. The "Type" section located at the top of the application page states this project is a "Minor PD", please be advised that due to the proposed development parameters changing and including the 175,000 square-feet of commercial development, this project is now a "Major PD" request in accordance with LDC Section 34-341(b)(1), please revise. b. Staff unfortunately cannot utilize Resolution Z-03-020 as a point of reference for what is being proposed in this zoning action. Please provide	Brianna Schroeder	Open	13

Corrections	Review Comments	Reviewer	Status	Comment ID
	a proposed list of commercial uses. c. Although the property is currently zoned Commercial Planned Development (CPD) by Resolution Z-03-020 and the request is proposing to keep the commercial entitlements as an option for development for the new zoning district being requested, an analysis on the proposed commercial development and how it complies with LDC Section 34-145(d)(4) must be provided.			
Yes	The request statement states that the proposed zoning action will be changing the zoning designation from “commercial to residential”, please be advised that the new zoning designation being proposed in this request is a Mixed Use Planned Development (MPD), which also proposes two different development options, one being commercial development. Although the end goal is residential development, please adjust the request narrative to also address the potential commercial development option.	Brianna Schroeder	Open	14
Yes	Please be advised that to be in compliance with Lee Plan Policies 4.1.1 and 4.1.2 and LDC Section 34-202(a)(10), an analysis on these Lee Plan Policies and letter of availability from the appropriate utility provider must be provided for the commercial development being proposed as an option in this request.	Brianna Schroeder	Open	15
Yes	The analysis provided for Lee Plan Policy 5.1.7 indicates that parallel parking and a sidewalk will be provided for the safety of pedestrians, staff has received a concern regarding if bicycle paths will be provided to help provide additional safety. Please indicate in the narrative and depict on the MCP the interconnectivity within the MPD to include multi-use or bicycle paths.	Brianna Schroeder	Open	16

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: 6. Request Statement.pdf

Corrections	Page Ref	Review Comments	Reviewer	Status	Comment ID
Planning Review					
Yes	2	Please clarify the type of TDU's intended for this proposal within the Request Statement.	Lindsey Karczewski	Open	2

REVIEWER CONTACT INFORMATION:

Reviewer Name	Reviewer Email	Reviewer Phone
John Podczerwinsky	jpodczerwinsky@leegov.com	-
Lindsey Karczewski	lkarczewski@leegov.com	239-533-8174
Larissa Narkiewicz	lnarkiewicz@leegov.com	-
Justin Lighthall	jlighthall@leegov.com	239-533-8007
Brianna Schroeder	bschroeder@leegov.com	239-533-8350
Paige Carroll	pcarroll@leegov.com	-
Allyson Hall	ahall@leegov.com	239-533-8553