



TMHConsulting@cfl.rr.com
97 N. Saint Andrews Dr.
Ormond Beach, FL 32174
PH: 386.316.8426

MEMORANDUM

TO: Howey-in-the-Hills Development Review Committee
CC: J. Brock, Town Clerk
FROM: Thomas Harowski, AICP, Planning Consultant
SUBJECT: Mission Rise 2023 Development Proposal
DATE: April 6, 2023

The applicant has submitted a development proposal for a 243-acre parcel known as the Mission Rise property. The property is designated as Village Mixed Use on the future land use plan and zoned as planned unit development. The previously approved planned unit development agreement has expired and, therefore, a new development agreement is required. The Village Mixed Use (VMU) land use classification requires developments to be approved using PUD agreements. The applicants have submitted a concept plan which will be used to evaluate the proposal and provide comments. The applicants intend to develop the property under the VMU land use classification, so an amendment to the comprehensive plan is not required.

Mission Rise Parcel Data

The subject parcel is reported as being 243 acres, with wetlands accounting for 60.3 acres of the property. There are no surface waterbodies reported. The property is accessed from SR 19 at Revels Road and from Number Two Road east of Silverwood Lane. Revels Road extends through the southern portion of the subject property eventually connecting to Orange Blossom Road. The property also abuts the Hillside Groves development (The Reserve) which has proposed interconnections with the subject property.

The concept plan submitted with the application package calls for a residential development of 592 units with amenity centers and a civic use parcel. All development is proposed as single-family residences with lot widths proposed at 75 feet and 50 feet. The 50-foot-wide lots are the predominant lot type with the 75-foot lots proposed at the project perimeter along Silverwood Lane and along the southern part of the parcel. The breakout in the actual number of 50-foot and 75-foot lots is not specified. The plan includes a proposed bicycle path extending through the project from SR 19 to Number Two Road. Supplemental pedestrian paths are proposed at locations throughout the project.

Village Mixed Use Criteria

The Village Mixed Use classification has a set of specific criteria the development must meet. These are set out in Policy 1.1.1 and Policy 1.1.2 of the Future Land Use Element. Policy 1.1.4 includes essential information on open space and density calculation and Policy 1.2.2 sets out the minimum open space requirements. The criteria for VMU are reviewed below:

1. Residential development can occupy a maximum of 85% of the net land area of the project. (Net land area is the total land area of the project less wetlands and waterbodies. In this case the net land area is reported as 153 acres.) The maximum allowable land area to be devoted to residential development is 130 acres. Actual acreage assigned to residential use is not declared.
2. Non-residential development must occupy 15% of the net land area but not more than 30% of the net land area. In previous development plans for the subject property, it was accepted that the property does not have reasonable commercial development potential, but other options for non-residential use are available. For example, a church site could be proposed. In one previous submittal the Town agreed to allow the land area devoted to a regional bicycle facility to count towards the non-residential component, and the current submittal appears to be offering that option again. In total the non-residential area of the plan must occupy 22.9 acres. The documentation submitted by the applicant claims a total of 23 acres of non-residential land, but a portion of the area claimed for non-residential use is ineligible. The proposal claims stormwater area (4.7 acres) and other open space (10.4 acres). Non-residentially qualified area must be for an actual use and not for site activities that are required for engineering compliance or miscellaneous area that is not suitable for other use. The concept plan as submitted has 4.2 acres of qualified non-residential use of the 22.9 acres required. If the applicant proposes to submit the bicycle trail as a Town-wide civic and recreational use to meet the non-residential land component and this proposal is accepted as the non-residential component, the bicycle facility may not be applied to meet any of the open space or recreation requirements.
3. A minimum of 5.0% of the non-residential land area of the project needs to be devoted to public/civic buildings. The conceptual plan shows a 1.2-acre civic tract but does not specify the intended use or uses for the site. The site is located at the periphery of the project and therefore is less likely to be integrated into the project for use as a clubhouse or other resident-based facility. The site does have potential access from SR-19. The tract size meets the minimum requirement for civic area.
4. Public recreation area is required at a minimum of 10% of the usable open space. (Open space that is not wetland or waterbodies). This requirement is calculated at a minimum of 3.0 acres. The concept plan shows public recreation at 7.2-acres, but the recreation sites are not clearly delineated on the plan as to what

areas are calculated. The plan shows four amenity areas totaling 4.6-acres, but the plan does not provide details on how the amenity areas are to be used.

5. Total open space is required to be a minimum of 25% of the project area. Wetland areas may account for only half of this requirement. Required open space is calculated on the gross project area or 60.8 acres in this case. Total open space is reported as 65.6 acres or 27% of the project area.

PUD/Development Agreement

The applicant states that they are seeking approval of the concept plan and will provide a development agreement at a later date. The Town policy is to include a development agreement as part of the zoning action with the conceptual plan included as an exhibit to the agreement. The Town Clerk can provide some example agreements (The Reserve and/or Watermark are useful examples.) Section 4.10.09 of the land development code lists the minimum items that need to be included in the conceptual plan package. A review of this code section notes the following deficiencies:

- 4.10.09 N Residential: The plan lacks almost all this information.
- 4.10.09 O Non-Residential: As noted above the plan falls short of the non-residential land area. If the bike trail is proposed, the trail should look for opportunities for development outside the collector road right-of-way as is currently identified.
- 4.10.09 S Phasing schedule or note there are no phases.
- 4.10.09 U Will any of the project be gated.
- 4.10.09 V Proposed architectural style of the buildings.
- 4.10.09 AA Additional information that should be provided includes:
 - Typical cross-section for the collector road
 - Typical cross-section for local roads
 - Typical cross-section for the bike trail when not included in the road right-of-way.
 - More specific designation of the amenity areas as parks, courts, buildings, etc.

Please review the code section in its entirety to verify that all items have been provided either on the plan or in supplemental materials.

Traffic Impact Assessment

It does not appear that the traffic consultant followed the procedures for the traffic impact assessment. The town has no record of a methodology submittal prior to undertaking the TIA. Please note the following concerns:

- The TIA is structured based on the net traffic increase for the parcel from a prior development proposal. The site has no concurrency commitment and there is no

approved plan. Therefore, the TIA should be based on the full traffic generation of the proposed development.

- The impact of the proposed project needs to include other projects that have been approved including The Reserve, Like Hills, Drake Point, Watermark and Talichet Phase 2. The Town can provide traffic studies for at least some of these projects.
- A methodology letter needs to be submitted for review and approval by the Town.
- The balance of the traffic review will be suspended pending submittal of a revised TIA.

Environmental Considerations

In reviewing the proposed plan, the Town will need to consider whether the full clear zone around the eagle's nest should be preserved rather than allowing residential development within the 660-foot area.

Concept Plan Comments

1. Actual lot sizes are a policy decision for the Planning Board and Town Council to approve. Please note that the Town has not been approving lot widths below 75 feet across recent project submittals, and at least some members of Council will have difficulty with 75-foot wide lots.
2. The Town Council has been seeking more space between units than typically provided with 50-foot lots. The Council appears to be supporting unit spacing of 15 to 20 feet which would yield a sideyard setback of 7.5 to 10 feet. The applicant should consider this factor as well.
3. The proposed bike trail will need to be extended along Number Two Road to the eastern property boundary to connect to another trail segment. This extension may be within the Number Two Road right-of-way if acceptable to Lake County.
4. The plan could take better advantage of the terrain by locating the multi-use trail outside of the collector road right-of-way when possible.
5. Lake County will require additional right-of-way for Number Two Road and will be the permitting agency for the intersection and other external road improvements.
6. The county may require additional right-of-way for Silverwood Lane.
7. A proposed buffer along Silverwood Lane is noted. This buffer needs to be in a separate tract to prohibit direct lot access to Silverwood Lane. The full plan should provide a conceptual design for the buffer including width, proposed plantings and any fence or wall that might be proposed.

8. Town code requires a buffer with a wall and landscaping along arterial and collector roads. Number Two Road will require this treatment as will the frontage on SR-19. (See Section 7.02.01.)
9. Access points for vehicular use are appropriately located, with the following notes.
 - Revels Road will need to be improved from the project boundary to the intersection with Orange Blossom Road. This is a public road and cannot be restricted to emergency use only.
 - The connection with The Reserve will need to be coordinated with the Hilltop Groves development plan to ensure the connection is in the proper location.
 - Can the southerly connection to Silverwood Lane be located so that it is not on the curve.
 - The Revels Road connection at SR 19 will need to be coordinated with The Reserve development plan.
10. The design of the major collector needs to plan for a median and turn lanes at intersections. The requested cross-section will cover this item.
11. Can the layout be modified to eliminate or limit the number of residential lots that directly access from the primary collector road? Where double frontage lots are proposed, these should be screened from the primary collector road and a separate tract provided to prevent access connections to the collector road.
12. Where a lot must access from the central collector road, the lot sizes need to be larger than 50-foot wide to minimize the number of driveways in this segment.
13. Will the road cross-section be wider where on-street parallel parking is proposed. What is the need for the on-street parking if the off-street parking requirements are met?
14. Where 50-foot lots are proposed, access should be from an alley to avoid a continuous garage-scape street view. Paired one-way alleys may be workable.
15. Is there any intent to consider housing options such as assisted living or nursing home?
16. The parcel has an opportunity to create a significant park area in the open space adjacent to Wetland Area 1 and link with bicycle and pedestrian trails.
17. Each neighborhood area should contain some type of appropriate park facility.
18. The amenity areas will need to be better defined to verify compliance with VMU standards.
19. Does the plan propose phasing of the development. If so, please locate the proposed phases.

20. What is the intended civic use? How does the location at the SR 19 end of the project benefit the overall project?