



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

Comments

MEMORANDUM

TO: Howey-in-the-Hills Development Review Committee
CC: J. Brock, Town Clerk; S. O'Keefe, Town Administrator
FROM: Thomas Harowski, AICP, Planning Consultant
SUBJECT: Howey Self Storage Site Plan
DATE: May 4, 2021

This review is based on the plans submitted April 5, 2022 and the original concept plan set prepared by Boyer Singleton which remains the approved concept plan for the project. The proposed Howey Self Storage project is part of the master development agreement which encompasses all of The Reserve project, and the parcels included in the master plan but owned by other entities.

Planning Considerations

1. Please provide a survey as a separate page. It was very difficult to review the survey when it was used as a base for other pages.
2. Please make sure the plans include the following required site plan data. Dimensions of all buildings, parking calculations, stop signs and stop bars, etc. Review Section 4.03.18 to check that all applicable items have been included.
3. The plan set shows intersection improvements on SR 19 at the Florida Avenue/Venezia Boulevard intersection. Are these improvements part of the proposed project? Is FDOT requiring these improvements?
4. The plan set shows a building concept that follows the design component of the development agreement. Verification of the building design details will be done with the application for the building permit. The applicant needs to be careful to include the detailed design elements with the building construction plans.
5. The construction of the sidewalk on SR-19 is required by the project. Section E on page 4 covers the sidewalk area but does not show the sidewalk as part of the cross-section. Please update the cross-section to show the sidewalk. (This same cross-section appears with the landscape plans and needs to be corrected in all locations.)

6. The sign needs to be setback at least 10 feet from the south property line. Landscaping should be included around the base of the sign.
7. It looks like one of the pole-mounted lights at the front of the project is located in the driveway entrance. Please move the pole to a safer location.

Landscaping and Irrigation Considerations

1. The landscape plans need to be sealed by a qualified landscape architect unless the applicant can document an exception to this requirement.
2. Buffer requirements per code are a minimum of 15-feet when adjacent to a street and 10-feet when adjacent to an interior property line. The Boyer Singleton Plan called for a 10-foot buffer on the south side of the property, and the Boyer Singleton plan will be applied. The most recent plans have eliminated the planting in the buffer, and the plantings need to be restored consistent with the buffer content requirements. Section A on page 4 shows trees, but these are not shown on the landscape plans. As shown the trees are too close to the wall and need to be moved outboard.
3. The applicant should dimension the front buffer and document the specified width of the buffer on SR-19. The application of the 75-foot setback from the SR-19 centerline was based on increased landscaping, and this consideration should be included in the front buffer analysis. The applicant needs to document the plant content in the front buffer meets the code requirements.
4. The SR 19 buffer should present more of a free-flow layout. Mass some of the shrubs into planting beds and place some of the understory trees into groupings.
5. The swales in the front buffer and the side buffer are negatively impacting the landscape design, the swales need to be removed.
6. The code for non-residential buffers requires one canopy tree, two understory trees and 30 linear feet of shrubs per each 50 linear feet of buffer. The planting plan needs to be amended to conform to these requirements.
7. Landscaping for the parking area with the office needs further modification. The landscaped islands require ground cover and shrubs per 7.05.01 B. Just showing mulch is insufficient.
8. The Town has recently adopted revised irrigation standards, and the plan is being reviewed for compliance with these standards.
9. Is there another feasible water source for irrigation other than potable water?

10. Earlier reviews noted at least one large tree (30-inch camphor) near the perimeter of the retention area. Is this tree still present on site? Do the plans show preservation of the tree?