



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

MEMORANDUM

TO: Town of Howey-in-the-Hills Development Review Committee
CC: J. Brock, Town Clerk
FROM: Thomas Harowski, AICP, Planning Consultant
SUBJECT: Lake Hills Residential Preliminary Subdivision Plan Resubmittal

DATE: January 4, 2024

These comments are based on the letter and resubmittal package dated December 22, 2023.

1. The applicant has assigned 10.95 acres of the minimum open space to be provided by others. The applicant needs to identify who is providing the additional open space and provide a firm commitment from that source.
2. Total project open space by my calculation is 86.58 acres while the 66 acres refers to the minimum required open space.
3. Net developable land for the residential portion of the project is calculated as 154.37 acres. (220 acres less the 55.05 acres of required open space allocated to the residential portion of the project less the remaining wetlands and water bodies.) The required allocations for other project assigned uses are calculated from this amount.
4. With regard to the alley lot requirements, it appears the applicant can request the Town Council revise the agreement. We will discuss the procedure with the Town attorney, but assume at a minimum a written request will be needed along with a justification supporting the amendment. This request needs to be included in the package to go to the planning board.
5. With regard to the dedication of the access road, it is still not clear which entity is actually dedicating the right-of-way.
6. The sidewalk on CR 48 needs to be extended from its current terminus to the edge of the school district property.

7. The intersection plans for SR-19 and CR-48 seem to be clear in that a roundabout is to be constructed. Timing for the roundabout needs to be coordinated with the traffic impact assessment findings.
8. Town Council will need to accept using the required park to hold stormwater runoff from the entrance road. Be prepared to identify the anticipated volume from the road and from the park as separate totals.
9. The response on the tree protection requirements is inadequate. The applicant was asked to identify the total number of specimen trees and historic trees on the site and the number of trees preserved. As this factor may affect subdivision design, it cannot wait to future phases. A quick scan of the tree table identified the planned removal of at least one historic tree which is not permitted by the code except for specific circumstances.
10. The applicant is requested to calculate the total number of trees on site and the total number of trees protected. This figure is essential as an input to whether additional tree protection is to be requested. No effort was made to modify the proposed retention areas to minimize tree removal.
11. The tree legend was included in the submittal, but either the actual tree layer was turned off or was unreadable through the other information.
12. The proposed language for the pool and accessory structure setbacks needs to include a statement that the owner waives his right to seek a variance to the setback requirement. Alternatively, provide larger rear setbacks.