

TO: Howey-in-the-Hills Development Review Committee
FROM: Red Jacket Development Group
CC: Thomas Harowski, AICP, Planning Consultant
SUBJECT: Responses to Whispering Hills Final Subdivision Plan Comments
DATE: September 20th, 2022

The applicant, Red Jacket Development Group, submits it's responses to the comments issued by DRC regarding the Final Subdivision Plan approval for the Whispering Hills subdivision. The below planning comments are followed by the applicant's responses in bold.

1. The plan requirements listed in Section 4.05.21 have been provided.
NO COMMENT
2. Section 4.05.21 G requires that any subdivision name recorded in Lake County be differentiated from other subdivision names. Since this project started another development using the Whispering Hills name has begun development in the Leesburg area. We recommend the subdivision name be modified to Whispering Hills of Howey-in-the-Hills as the formal name to differentiate the two projects.
THE NAME OF THE PROJECT HAS BEEN CHANGED AND ADOPTED BY LAKE COUNTY TO: WHISPERING HEIGHTS
3. The phasing page is unclear. Distinct colors or patterns were proposed with a key on Page C2, but the colors or patterns were not applied. We assume the pump station and Tract C are part of phase one along with the screening wall, landscaping and lots designated as Phase 1, but the page needs to be clarified.
PLEASE REFER TO THE UPDATED PHASING PLAN SHEET C2
4. Why not add lots 62, 63, 93 -95, 114-116 and 121 to Phase 1 since the streets and utilities to support these lots will be constructed as part of Phase 1.
PLEASE REFER TO THE UPDATED PHASING PLAN SHEET C2, THESE LOTS HAVE BEEN ADDED TO PHASE 1
5. Are lots 117 through 120 intended as Phase 1 or Phase 2?
PHASE 2
6. The swales proposed for Lots S 1 through S 20 need some level of attention in the owner's documentation. Typically, owners will fill in swales once the house is built and they begin to hold water. The owners need to be advised that the swales are part of the drainage plan and environmental protection for the lake and wetlands and cannot be removed.
THE ABOVE UNDERLINED LANGUAGE WILL BE INCLUDED IN THE HOA DOCUMENTATION WITH FURTHER EXPLANATION OF MANDATORY RESTORATION AND PENALTIES FOR INFRACTIONS. A COPY OF THE HOA DOCUMENTS WILL BE SUBMITTED TO THE TOWN

7. The street signs within the subdivision need to match the Town's sign standard. The County signs would only apply on Buckhill Road. Add a detail at D1/C10.
PLEASE SEE SHEET C-10 SHOWING REVISED DETAILS AS PROVIDED BY MUNICIPALITY.
8. Sidewalks need to be a minimum of 5-feet wide. The detail on C-10 shows 4-foot sidewalks. This detail conflicts with other details and plans. To avoid any confusion the detail needs to be revised.
PLEASE SEE REVISED DETAILS
9. There is a detail from Andreyev Engineering on C-12. The detail dates from 2009. Is Unroe Engineering certifying this detail with their seal on the page?
YES, ALL SHEETS ARE CERTIFIED BY UNROE ENGINEERING. THE ORIGINAL SOILS REPORT IS CERTIFIED BY ANDREYEV ENGINEERING
10. The rear yard swale, detail 3/C12 shows a 3:1 slope on the back side of the swale. Is this too steep for rear yard application?
THE DETAIL HAS BEEN CORRECTED. MAX GRADE IN BACKYARD IS 6:1
11. Is the property owners' association maintaining the streetlights? The Town has adopted the Duke Energy Sanibel fixture as its standard. The Sanibel fixture is similar to proposed fixture. The applicant may wish to consider converting the project to the Town's standard fixture design.
THE DEVELOPER AGREES THE DESIGNS ARE SIMILAR AND WILL BE CONSIDERED AS AN OPTION DECIDED UPON WITH DUKE ENERGY
12. Please add a standard street tree typical design showing the Town's requirements to include street trees on each lot between 5-feet and 8-feet from the edge of the right of way. and a minimum of three canopy trees for each lot. Reference Section 7.08.01 for specifics. Also note that each lot will meet the other standards of this section with documentation provided when construction plans are submitted.
PLEASE SEE SHEETS L-300 & L-301
13. The open space and park tracts needs some improvement. Suggestions are:
- Tract A: Add a couple of shade trees and a bench. This tract also shows some tree removal in the area designated as open space. If there is no conflict with grading, these trees should remain.
 - Tract B: Add some shade trees.
 - Tract C: Add shade trees around the walking path. Some trees such as maple trees are fast growing and would add elements of shade for anyone using the walking trail for access.
 - Tract I: The tract table shows landscaping as included but none is provided. Again, shade trees need to be added. A couple of benches would help as well.
PLEASE SEE LANDSCAPE PLANS FOR DETAILED DESIGNS OF OPEN SPACE TRACTS

14. There is no specification as to what landscape treatment is provided in open space areas, park areas and buffers other than the trees and shrubs as noted. Is sod to be provided? If so, this needs to be noted on the landscape plans. If not, what is proposed other than bare earth?

PLEASE SEE LANDSCAPE PLANS FOR DETAILED DESIGNS OF OPEN SPACE TRACTS

15. The tract table shows tracts D-1 through D-4 as being dedicated to the Town. These are proposed as private streets and the roads need to be dedicated to the property owners' association.

THE TRACTS (STREETS) THEMSELVES ARE DEDICATED TO THE HOA HOWEVER, THE EASEMENTS WITHIN THE ROW ARE DEDICATED TO THE TOWN FOR UTILITY MANAGEMENT RIGHTS

16. Tract E, the mail area is shown as being dedicated to the Town. Again, this dedication needs to be to the property owners' association.

THE TRACTS (STREETS) THEMSELVES ARE DEDICATED TO THE HOA HOWEVER, THE EASEMENTS WITHIN THE ROW ARE DEDICATED TO THE TOWN FOR UTILITY MANAGEMENT RIGHTS