Consolidated Review Comments

Record Number: DCI2026-00005

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: 05/21/2026
Record Type: Planned Development
Address: 11735 PLANTATION RD, FORT MYERS, FL 33966
Project Name: New Life Church Expansion Community Facilities Planned Development
Record Description: Request to rezone 18.13± acres from Agricultural (AG-2) to Community Facilities Planned Development (CFPD).

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 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. 1. INFORMATIONAL COMMENT: For all lakes deeper than 12 feet, a Deep Lake Management Plan must be submitted and approved prior to development order issuance in accordance with LDC Sec. [10-329(d)(3)]. 2. 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.	Allyson Hall	Open	1
DOT Review				
Yes	TIS: Informational note: No revised TIS was included in the resubmittal. Review comments pertain to the January 16, 2026 TIS by W.E. Oliver, P.E., LLC. 1. A discrepancy exists between the application narrative requesting a 100-student expansion and the TIS, which models a 350-student facility. The	John Podczerwinsky	Open	22

Corrections	Review Comments	Reviewer	Status	Comment ID
	TIS data tables, impact analyses, and microsimulation must be calibrated to the requested 100-student capacity. Alternatively, the application narrative must be revised to request a 350-student capacity. 2. An unauthorized modification of ITE data is noted on Page 3, where baseline church traffic was manually reduced by subtracting childcare trips. This violates Lee County Administrative Code AC-13-17 and standard engineering practice. The weekday AM peak hour traffic must be recalculated utilizing unadjusted ITE 12th Edition equations for Land Use Code 560. 3. The resubmittal lacks a Peak Hour distribution map and a driveway turning movement graphic. Appendix E tabular data is insufficient because it isolates inbound/outbound totals rather than directional turning movements, and the volumes do not reconcile with the total projected trip generation. A standard Peak Hour Traffic Assignment Diagram showing cumulative AM, PM, and Sunday turning movements at both driveways and the Plantation Road/Arc Way intersection is required. Additionally, the queuing analysis must be updated to model the 15-to-30-minute peak drop-off and afternoon dismissal windows. Localized data indicates K-8 private schools frequently exceed internal storage capacity during these staging periods, which must be evaluated to prevent public Right-of-Way impacts. 4. The TransModeler simulation utilizes unrealistic routing parameters by assuming a 100% perfect binary split (all northbound traffic uses the south drive; all southbound traffic uses the north drive), failing to account for driver non-compliance or internal re-routing. The microsimulation must be re-run using a realistic passive distribution split (e.g., 80/20 or 70/30) and updated with 95th percentile queue graphs. Internal intersections must be evaluated to ensure no off-site spillover occurs. If a future expansion to 350 students is intended, internal staging must accommodate that intensity now, or a site redesign will be required upon future expansion. 5. Deferring the southbound left-turn lane warrant analysis at the southern driveway to the Development Order (DO) stage is premature. Because a turn lane directly impacts County Right-of-Way and conflicts with the existing northbound left-turn lane at Arc Way, access configurations must be finalized during zoning. A formal turn lane warrant analysis must be conducted for this movement. If warranted, the lane must be shown conceptually on the Master Concept Plan (MCP); if it cannot be accommodated, the driveway must be restricted to Right-In/Right-Out (RI/RO) via a zoning condition.			
Yes	DOT: Awaiting resolution of SB Left Turn Lane analysis before final review determination can be made. A restriction of RI/RO may be necessary upon submittal of complete in formation. A condition of approval will be stated upon final review: "No Parking, Stopping, or Standing" signage will be required along the right(s) of way fronting this parcel on both Penzance and Plantation to prevent parent pick-up/drop-off from staging offsite.	John Podczerwinsky	Open	23
Environmental Review				
Yes	Environmental Comments: 1. Please revise acreage breakdown in paragraph two of applicants Request Statement. Acreage breakdown provided equals to 17.75. The Overall acreage is 18.13, please provide more information on the difference. 2. Environmental Assessment document is also inconsistent with Request Statement for FLUCFCS acreage breakdown. Please revise. 3. Please provide a new deviation from LDC Section 10-416(d)(4) for 15-foot Type D right of way buffer. The MCP depicts a 20-foot utility easement and existing utility easement on the northeast corner that may interrupt the required buffer plantings. 4. Please note LDC Section 10-421(a)(5) for all required	Paige Carroll	Open	18

Corrections	Review Comments	Reviewer	Status	Comment ID
	buffers and potential easement overlap. 5. Please clarify and label the dashed line around proposed lake. If it is a lake management easement, please label L.M.E to comply with LDC Section 10-328(a). 6. Please demonstrate compliance with LDC Section 10-418(2) for planted littoral shelf for proposed lake. Please provide a cross section depicting bank slope, planted littoral shelf width, and plants. 7. Please provide a percentage breakdown for required open space. Please note that lakes may only account for 25% of required open space per LDC Section 10-415(d)(2)(c)for open space uses. 8. South Buffer - Indicate why the proposed eight foot wall is proposed in a non-linear design. The existing trees must be saved at full canopy and the installation of the fence must be outside of the tree canopy. 9. South Buffer - Provide a cross section depicting the sport court, retention area width and depth, the wall, and protected trees. 10. East Buffer - The east buffer must be revised to remove the required buffer outside of the 25 foot wide drainage easement. Revise MCP. 11. East Buffer - The applicant may save the on-site trees within the 25 foot wide drainage easement, however they will not be code required due to their location in the drainage easement. Revise MCP.			
LeeTran Review				
Yes	LeeTran has reviewed the proposed development and determined that it is located beyond one-quarter mile of a bus stop or a fixed-route corridor. Based on the current Transit LDC section 10-441, no improvements are required by the developer at this time, but will be reassessed at the time of DO or LDO.	Clarissa Marino-Diaz	Open	17
Legal Review				
Yes	Sec. 34-202(a). Submittal requirements for applications requiring public hearing. (6) Boundary Survey. - The boundary survey does not include the required state plane coordinates, one at the point of beginning (POB). The boundary survey was revised to indicate the correct POB, but the state plane coordinate was not revised for the correct POB. The state plane coordinate is currently the west end of line 1.	Richard Burris	Open	21
Natural Resources Review				
Yes	Repeat Comment: Pursuant to 10-328, identify the location of the drainage and access easements.	William Lange	Open	8
Yes	Repeat Comment: Identify the location of the outfall and analyze the potential for any offsite impacts. If the applicant is proposing to outfall onto a county right of way, the applicant will be required to demonstrate compliance with LDC 10-330 prior to the issuance of a Development Order permit.	William Lange	Open	9
Yes	Repeat Comment: Pursuant to LDC 10-417 and Lee Plan Policy 61.1.6, identify the irrigation source.	William Lange	Open	10
Planning Review				
Yes	REPEAT COMMENT: Compliance with Lee Plan Standards 4.1.1 and 4.1.2 needs to be clearly stated within the Request Statement. Please include a statement in your Lee Plan Analysis that states how the request will adhere to these standards.	Lindsey Karczewski	Open	20
Zoning Review				

Corrections	*Review Comments*	*Reviewer*	*Status*	*Comment ID*
Yes	Zoning Review Revise the Schedule of Uses to remove Recreation Facilities, Private On-Site Groups III, IV, V and replace with Accessory Uses, Buildings and Structures. Revise MCP to remove all references to Places of Worship and Recreation Facilities. If the applicant or successor pursues an ALF, Caretaker's Residence or Day Care, the MCP will be required to be revised because the current design is specific to the Religious Facility, School, and Accessories supporting the principal uses. Indicate if the Religious Facility will have a day care. If so, depict the area/building for pickup/dropoff, hours of operation, and traffic pattern compared to school traffic. Indicate if the area labeled Private onsite group recreation area that also has trees to be protected will remain at grade.	Elizabeth Workman	Open	19

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.

REVIEWER CONTACT INFORMATION:

Reviewer Name	*Reviewer Email*	*Reviewer Phone*
John Podczerwinsky	jpodczerwinsky@leegov.com	-
Lindsey Karczewski	lkarczewski@leegov.com	239-533-8174
Clarissa Marino-Diaz	cmarinodiaz@leegov.com	239-533-0340
William Lange	wlange@leegov.com	-
Paige Carroll	pcarroll@leegov.com	-
Elizabeth Workman	eworkman@leegov.com	239-533-8793
Richard Burris	rburris@leegov.com	239-533-8526
Allyson Hall	ahall@leegov.com	239-533-8553