

MEMORANDUM

TO: Howey-in-the-Hills Development Review Committee
CC: J. Brock, Town Clerk
FROM: Thomas Harowski, AICP, Planning Consultant
SUBJECT: Lake Hills Commercial 1/11/24 Resubmittal
DATE: January 29, 2024

The following comments are offered in response to the resubmittal package for the Lake Hills Commercial preliminary site plan.

1. Response to Town Comment 3: The Town's engineer will need to evaluate the proposal excluding the noted lane omissions.
2. Response to Comment 6: This plan needs to show the proposed connection, even if the location needs to be revised once the development proposal for Outparcel A is submitted. This is the most effective way to keep track of the access commitment.
3. Response to Comment 11: The tree information is still unreadable. Enlarging the drawing did not result in a layout that can be reviewed. As noted in the last set of comments, the tree data is needed with the preliminary site and not deferred to a future submittal. In this case the trees seem to be at the periphery of the parcels, so preservation should be relatively easy. A calculation of historic and specimen trees is required and not provided. A tabulation is cited in the comment, but could not be located in the submittal package.
4. Response to Comments 12 and 13: As noted in the earlier staff review comments, the Town's sign code is limiting in terms of signage allowed. The applicant should evaluate the current code in comparison to the project proposals so that any differences between the desired signage and the signage allowed by code can be addressed. Deferring this analysis to a future submittal will likely contribute to future problems with plan approvals.
5. Response to Comment 17: While the detailed landscaping design may be deferred to the final site plan submittal, the designation of the landscaped buffer areas cannot be deferred (Section 7.01.01 B). The requested buffer along the rear property line is not identified on the plan and needs to be shown. This requirement applies to the exterior property lines of the outparcels as well.

6. Response to Comment 18: This response is inadequate. Deferring the required buffer until after a determination is made on the sale of the outparcel(s) is likely to result in there being no room for the buffer. Reading Section 7.02.02 requires a ten foot buffer along the property line of the primary parcel and the outparcels.
7. Response to Comment 21: The Town engineer will need to participate in decisions on site grading and retaining wall construction. Site grading should not result in the elimination of trees that could otherwise remain with the use of a retaining wall.
8. Outparcel A includes a 50-foot ingress/egress easement and a access from SR-19. Why are these proposed? To maintain traffic flow on SR 19, access points should be kept to a minimum.
9. The access to Outparcel C is too close to SR-19 and needs to be relocated.
10. The sidewalk on the SR-19 frontage needs to be extended across the front of Outparcel C.
11. Traffic Impact Assessment:
 - a. The widening project for SR-19 is not funded for construction in the current 5-year plan. An alternative solution to “wait for the widening” needs to be proposed.
 - b. The road segment on SR-19 between Citrus Avenue and Florida Avenue is considered constrained in the Town’s comprehensive plan. This segment will not be widened. How does this factor impact the traffic study findings and recommendations?
 - c. The roundabout at SR-19 and CR-48 appears to be the preferred solution for the intersection impacts. How does the applicant(s) propose to consider funding for the implementation?
 - d. Who is responsible for the traffic signal at SR-19 and the east driveway? Between the commercial and residential project, how is funding to be guaranteed?
 - e. The applicant(s) need to provide an assessment of the fair share cost for a signal at SR-19 and Central Avenue.