



MADDEN

MOORHEAD & STOKES, LLC

CIVIL ENGINEERS

March 20, 2025

Howey-in-the-Hills Town Hall
Attn: John Brock
101 N. Palm Ave.,
Howey-in-the-Hills, FL 34737

RE: Lake Hills – Main Boulevard & Mass Grading

Dear John:

Below please find our responses to those comments.

General Comments

Comment 1: The intersection on SR 19 created by this project, Lake Hills Commercial, and Thompson Grove will most likely require a traffic signal in the future. The need for the signal is fully due to the traffic generated by these developments. Accordingly, the costs for the construction and the ongoing operation and maintenance of the traffic signal should be the responsibility of the developments.

Response 1: *Acknowledged. TMC has performed a Sensitivity Analysis for the residential only portion of Lake Hills (up to 571 AAC units) which is the scope of the Main Boulevard & Mass Grading plans (and future overlay phases). This attached memo confirms the residential only traffic does not create the warrant for a traffic signal at SR 19. This signal will be triggered by the traffic related to the commercial portion of Lake Hills (Publix). As such the commercial owner will be the lead property owner to advance the construction and funding of the signal. HR Lake Hills, LLC work separately on any private contributions to the construction cost.*

Comment 2: This project should provide a proportionate share contribution towards the construction of the roundabout at the intersection of SR 19 & CR 48.

Response 2: *Acknowledged. TMC will work in coordination with the Lake Hills Commercial (Publix) and Lake Hills Residential (HR Lake Hills, LLC) owners and Lake County to determine the collective allocation of the proportionate fare share for*

the roundabout. Lake Hills Residential will contribute its proportionate fare share as confirmed by Lake County.

Comment 3: Lake Hills PUD should be designed as a Complete Streets, pedestrian friendly community. The intersections of the residential streets in subsequent phases need to provide full pedestrian accommodation. Pedestrians need to have clearly designated means (crosswalks & signage) to safely traverse an intersection from any corner to any other corner or side.

Response 3: Acknowledged. Future phases proposing residential homes will be designed to accommodate pedestrian transit throughout the development.

Comment 4: Provide a copy of the latest edition of the Y.E.S. report referenced in the construction plans.

Response 4: Additional testing is ongoing. The report will be provided under a separate cover prior to site construction.

Comment 5: The construction of the side streets along the boulevard should be built with a full turnout as depicted below. Adjust the plans to reflect that configuration.

Response 5: Full turnouts are depicted on the geometry plans sheets C100-C103.

Comment 6: The outbound left turn arrow at CR 48 is not needed.

Response 6: Outbound left turn arrow at C.R.48 has been removed. See sheet C600.

Comment 7: The pedestrian advance warning and location signs for the crosswalk at Sta 114+00 are shown on the signage plan for a crossing at Sta 119+25. Recheck the signage along the boulevard for accuracy.

Response 7: Signage associated with a previous location for a raised crosswalk has been removed from sheet C601.

Comment 8: Provide an eastbound pedestrian advance warning sign at Sta 125+00.

Response 8: Eastbound pedestrian advance warning signs has been provided near Sta 125+00 on sheet C601

Comment 9: Provide greater detail for the construction of the raised crosswalk at Sta 147+00, particularly at the curb line and the median refuge island.

Response 9: Additional linework has been provided for the raised crosswalk at Sta 147+00 on sheet C103 and C602. The median will stop short of the raised crosswalk and the curb transition is identified with linework consistent with the town detail R-1B for raised crosswalk.

Comment 10: Stripe storage lanes and left turn arrows for the commercial connections between 148+00 and 150+00.

Response 10: A storage lane and turn arrow has been striped on sheet C602.

Comment 11: Provide plans & details of the irrigation water supply system.

Response 11: State use permit is being negotiated with WMD. Rob Ern with Half and Andreyev Engineering are currently designing the intake system for this project, design and permitting is ongoing. The final irrigation design will be provided with the submittal of the Phase 1 plans.

Comment 12: The town's water master plan calls for a 12" water main along CR 48. The offsite utility plan needs to show a 12" main.

Response 12: The offsite water main has been revised to denote a proposed 12" water main extension along CR48. The required water main for this project is 8". Impact fee credits will be applied for based on the construction costs of the upsize.

Comment 13: Lift stations pumps need to be Hydromatic.

Response 13: Lift station report has been revised to show a Hydromatic pump. See revised report for additional pump details.

Comment 14: Adjust the configuration of the Yard Plan on sheet C920 to show an emergency bypass pump consistent with town detail WW-10.

Response 14: Yard plan configuration has been revised to show an emergency pump. We are in a discussion with Thompson pumps, the manufacturer, to get the proper pump selected for our project specific demands.

Comment 15: All valves along the force main are to be plug valves. The plan calls out gate valves in some locations.

Response 15: All valves along the force main have been revised to show plug valves. See sheets C754-C759.

Comment 16: Drop manholes are to be 5' diameter and lined per town detail WW-5. Adjust the table on C205 accordingly.

Response 16: Drop manholes have been revised on the structure table on sheet C205.

Planning Staff Review Comments

Comment 1: The following items are conditions of approval of the March 11, 2024 Town Council approval of the Preliminary Site Plan:

- a) In areas where existing trees are to be retained, no grade change or only minor grade change be allowed to support the tree preservation. Tree preservation areas are along the east side of Outparcel A and the south property line of Outparcel C, so preservation should be reasonably completed. The applicant is proposing removal of seven trees to allow for the driveway construction alongside Outparcel C. The applicant has agreed to this condition.
- b) The sidewalk on SR 19 in front of Outparcel C be constructed with any improvements to Outparcel C. The sidewalk is required of the applicant, but the timing is being adjusted to allow for the final resolution of the SR-19 and CR 48 intersection. The applicant has agreed to this condition.
- c) The applicant needs to calculate the “fair share” cost of its impact on the SR-19 and CR- 48 intersection and provide the payment for use in intersection improvements. Design and construction will be coordinated with FDOT and Lake County.
- d) The applicant needs to provide an adequate guarantee for improvements to the east entrance of the project from SR 19. This guarantee can be done in conjunction with the residential development component. These improvements are solely project related and the funding contributions need to be assured if the intersection upgrades do not occur with the initial construction. The traffic study recommendations suggest signalization may not be warranted with the initial project phases. The minutes from the March 11, 2024 Town Council approval of the Preliminary Site Plan indicate that this is to be resolved during the Final Site Plan submittal.
- e) The applicant will provide at its cost the access controls required by FDOT for SR-19 and Lake County for CR-48 as part of their respective permitting process. These items will include turn lanes, deceleration lanes, and other access controls and, if necessary, right-of-way required by the permitting agencies.

Response 1: Outparcel C is not included in the residential development and not associated with the mass grading to be done for the Lake Hills Residential Project. Regarding the items associated with the driveways as stated in previous comments, TMC will work in coordination with the Lake Hills Commercial

(Publix) and Lake Hills Residential (HR Lake Hills, LLC) owners and Lake County to determine the collective allocation of the proportionate fare share for the roundabout. Lake Hills Residential will contribute its proportionate fare share as confirmed by Lake County.

Comment 2: Please confirm that the tree survey has been overlaid with the tree save plans C009-C012 so that all onsite and ROW trees are accounted.

Response 2: The Tree Save Plan denotes all trees that are intended to be saved with this development. No trees are proposed to be saved within the development area. An additional column on sheet C013 has been provided to show the reason for the removal of a particular tree.

Comment 3: Based on the Tree Removal Table (Sheet C013) it appears that 268 trees are to be removed. Please provide the total number of trees on site and any replacement data consistent with the Land Development Code (LDC). Please revise the Table to indicate which are Specimen Trees and which are Heritage Trees and provide the replacement data in concert with the LDC. LDC Section 7.11.03 requires 50% of all specimen trees be preserved on a parcel. LDC Section 7.11.02 requires protection of all Historic Trees unless one of the following conditions is met:

- a) The tree is not suitable for preservation as determined by a certified arborist.
- b) The tree is a threat to a principal structure or otherwise constitutes a hazard requiring removal as determined by a qualified arborist or professional engineer.
- c) The placement of the tree prohibits the economic use of the property for permissible development.

Response 3: As discussed at the DRC on 03/13/25, an image is provided of the historic tree being removed to identify the tree as being dead.

Comment 4: Please indicate why the trees are being removed on the Tree Removal Table (Sheet C013) and whether any proposed to be removed are on the Town's prohibited plant list. If they are plant species that are prohibited by the Florida Department of Environmental Protection or the Florida Department of Agriculture, or listed as invasive by the Florida Exotic Pest Control, this information needs to be provided on the Tree Removal Table for each tree listed.

Response 4: No trees are proposed to be saved within the development area. An additional column on sheet C013 has been provided to show the reason for the removal of a particular tree.

Comment 5: Please provide data and evaluate, consistent with LDC Section 7.11.04, if any trees can be saved by redesign.

Response 5: Stormwater management areas were extensively designed in an effort to save trees where possible. The geometry of ponds being irregular was done to provide tree save for particular historic trees.

Comment 6: Tree Protection Detail needs to be provided on the plans to comply with LDC Section 7.11.01.

Response 6: Tree protection detail is provided on sheet C930.

Comment 7: Please ensure that any development entitlement data listed on the plans is consistent with the approved ordinance and approved Development Agreement Conceptual Land Use Plan (CLUP).

Response 7: Acknowledged. The data is consistent with the PUD.

Comment 8: Please provide details on any hardscape elements consistent with LDC Section 7.07.00 as applicable:

Please provide cross-sections and a data table of the proposed buffers and landscaping demonstrating and listing how they are consistent with the requirements of the Development Agreement Conceptual Land Use Plan (CLUP) and the LDC requirements in Chapter 7. A copy of the CLUP Building Style and Landscape Buffers details are attached to this review document.

Response 8: A detailed hardscape plan will be provided with the construction plans associated with phase 1. Buffers and landscaping will not be pertinent with the mass grading.

If you have any questions, please don't hesitate to contact our office.

Sincerely,

David A. Stokes

David A. Stokes, P.E.

President

DAS/ja

H:\Data\23MMS0190-Lake Hills PD(howeyin the Hills)\Cor\Comment & Response Letters\Howey-in-the-Hills Response - 3.doc