ATWELL

CONSULTING. ENGINEERING. CONSTRUCTION.

December 30, 2022

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

RE: Thompson Groves PUD
Resubmittal of Applications
DRC Comments

This letter has been prepared to address the Request for Additional Information ("RAI") issued by Howey-in -the Hills Development Review Committee. Please see our responses in bold text below each comment.

General:

1. The applicant needs to provide the general application form and supplemental applications for amendment of the comprehensive plan and amendment of the land development code. The zoning map amendment is an amendment to the LDC.
   Response: All three (3) applications were previously submitted on August 26, 2022 and have been reincluded within this resubmittal.

2. The applicant needs to include authorization to act as the agent for the property owner in the requested actions.
   Response: The three (3) fee simple property owners have executed the Owner Authorization/Consent which is included.

3. The applicant needs to provide a legal description of the subject parcels. The legal descriptions may be individual for each of the three component parcels if necessary, and the parcel proposed for annexation needs to be an individual legal description. Please provide the legal descriptions as a word document.
   Response: All three (3) parcels have their own individual legal description. Each legal description has been included with a word document.

4. Town notice requirements require an individual notice to all property owners within 300 feet of the subject property. The applicant is requested to provide this listing including name and mailing address. Again, this should be a word document.

Response: **We have contacted Joe Ward (mapping) at the Lake County Property Appraiser to obtain the fee simple owners within 300 feet. That list will be provided upon receipt.**

5. The applicant should review the application forms for the comprehensive plan amendment and rezoning to verify that all required items are included.

   Response: **Applicant has reviewed and acknowledged.**

6. A boundary survey of the subject property is required.
   Response: **A signed and sealed survey of all three (3) parcels is included.**

Annexation:

- Please include a letter application stating the request for voluntary annexation of the 10.7-acre parcel along with the legal description and survey of the parcel. The authorization documentation noted in the general comments will serve as the directive to work with the applicant on the annexation.
  Response: **A voluntary annexation letter is attached to the Town's Annexation application.**

- The parcel requested for annexation is designated as Urban Medium Density by the Lake County comprehensive plan which allows development up to seven units per acre. (Policy 1-1.3.3 of the Lake County Comprehensive Plan.)
  Response: **The annexed parcel, when combined wit the overall PUD will result in an overall PUD density of approximately 3.09 DU/AC.**

- The subject parcel is zoned R-1 Rural Residential. This zoning supports the "transition between agricultural and conservation areas and more urban communities." The zoning allows one unit per acre with single-family dwellings as the primary permitted use.
  Response: **The applicants request, in addition to the annexation, is to designate the parcel with a Medium Density FLUMP and a concurrent rezoning to PUD. Thus, the Thompson Groves project will be consistent and in character with the surrounding PUDs.**

Future Land Use Map Amendment

The applicant is requesting a future land use map amendment from Low Density Residential to Medium Density Residential on the Town's future land use map. The annexed parcel should follow the same land use designation as the larger parcels.

1. The proposed future land use map is inconsistent with the project narrative and the revised site plan.

a. The documents reference a tract size 88.85 acres as the total tract area and 85.40 acres as the area requested for designation as medium density residential. Presumably the 3.5-acre difference is the conservation area. These areas need to be verified as correct and adjusted for any revision to the conservation area as noted below.
Response: The overall PUD is 87.95 acres per the survey. All has been revised.

b. The revised site plan includes a parcel identified as commercial, but the proposed future land use map does not include and commercial land designation.
Response: No commercial uses are intended or proposed.

c. The project narrative discusses a parcel to be dedicated to the Town for park and/or utility use, but this parcel is not identified on the revised site plan.
Response: The +/- 2.45 acres site in not intended or proposed to be a commercial use. Ongoing discussions with the Town will determine the final use and disposition of the parcel.

d. The wetlands and flood prone area maps show some impact area on the 10.7-acre parcel, but the proposed future land use map does not indicate conservation area extending onto the annexation tract. The wetland and flood prone area should be included in conservation.
Response: The applicant has included an Environmental Assessment Report as prepared by Bio-Tech Consulting, Inc., dated February 23, 2022. All updated plans and maps have incorporated Figure 6 (Wetland Delineation Map) into the application. This is the most accurate and up to date data available.

2. The applicant has provided an extensive review of the proposed project relative to the goals, objectives, and policies of the comprehensive plan. The staff report for the Planning Board and Town Council will review the policy statements and provide comments as appropriate. The planning staff position is likely to be that the Town could make the requested amendment to the future land use map and be consistent with the comprehensive plan, but that any amendment is not required by the goals, objectives, and policies.
Response: Acknowledged.

3. The applicant notes that a concurrency analysis is required, but a specific statement by public service is not provided. While recreation and stormwater is expected to be satisfied on site, the application should include a more specific statement on water, sewer, and traffic. The Town has information on the anticipated capacity of the north water treatment facility and commitments for service from that facility. Water demand existing and proposed for the project should be compared to the noted treatment plant capacity. If the proposal for sewer is to provide a package treatment facility, this should be noted at least as an alternative to the current arrangement including an estimate of the anticipated treatment volume.

Response: **A revised concurrency analysis has been included with the resubmittal as contained with the justification statement.**

4. A traffic impact analysis is needed to look at impacts on road links and intersections. The analysis can review the proposed project relative to committed development and with all anticipated development. A list of committed and prospective projects can be provided along with traffic impact studies done to date.
   Response: **The applicant is evaluating traffic impacts for the subject project and will prepare a traffic statement based on land use determination and peak hour trip generation. This document will be available prior to this project being scheduled for public hearing. A full traffic impact analysis will be conducted based on approved unit count, phasing, and methodology as reviewed by the Town and Lake County. A full report will be submitted for review by the Town during the construction document phase.**

5. A school concurrency analysis is required. The school district has their own application process.
   Response: **The Lake County School Board Concurrency Application and Service provider application has been submitted and currently under review. The results will be provided to the Town upon receipt.**

6. The code also requires an environmental impact analysis per Section4.02.06 J. As most of the property is former grove, the focus of the environmental review should be the fringe wetland area and any species that might be present (gopher tortoise for instance). Given the nature of the parcel the environmental review can focus on avoidance of impacts to the remaining natural area.
   Response: **The applicant has included a n Environmental Assessment Report as prepared by Bio-Tech Consulting, Inc., dated February 23, 2022.**

Proposed PUD Zoning

1. A draft development agreement is required as part of the planned unit development zoning. The Town does not have a formal model agreement, but a copy of a recent agreement can be provided as a format.
   Response: **A draft PUD agreement has been included with this resubmittal.**

2. The legal description will be an exhibit to the development agreement as will the survey.
   Response: **Acknowledged and agreed.**

3. The proposed site plan will be an exhibit to the development agreement.
   Response: **Acknowledged and agreed.**

4. Any development conditions that differ from the Town's land development code should be noted in the development agreement as controlling over the standard code. Items such as lot size,

minimum lot dimensions, setbacks, lot coverage, building height, etc. can be either included in the agreement text or presented with the site plan. The Town standards for a preliminary subdivision plan (Section 4.05.12 in the land development code) will provide a good guideline for the plan content.

Response: **All of the issues raised will be addressed within the PUD agreement.**

5. Because the proposed project is under 300 units, the use of the Village Mixed Use standards is not required.

   Response: **Acknowledged and agreed.**

Comments on the proposed site plan are as follows:

1. The plan proposes a minimum 30-foot buffer where the project abuts existing residential development. Given the anticipated citizen interest in the proposed amendment, a typical cross-section of the proposed buffer plantings should be considered.

   Response: **The applicant has shown as typical lot configuration and will provide a more detailed buffer cross section to the Town during the public hearing cycle.**

2. The Town regulations require a minimum 25-foot buffer adjacent to any wetlands. This requirement is different than the typical SJRWMD buffer requirement and should be noted in development agreement text or the preliminary subdivision plan map.

   Response: **A 25' buffer has been provided.**

3. The Town code requires a residential buffer along the SR 19 frontage. Two options are available and detailed in Section 7.02.01 of the land development code. The development agreement and/or the preliminary subdivision plan map should designate which buffer type is proposed.

   Response: **The buffer along SR 19 will comply with the LDC and will be referenced with the PUD agreement.**

3. Is the stormwater pond anticipated to be a wet retention pond?

   Response: **The on-site stormwater retention areas and presumed to be wet.**

4. Consideration should be given to linking the amenity center and retention pond as a combined facility. With a street arrangement that does not relegate the pond to an area behind the houses, a more substantial community facility can be provided. This arrangement would eliminate property owner concerns about public trails located behind their houses.

   Response: **The applicant has designed, where applicable, a series of walkways and trails to link the internal uses and amenities.**

ATWELL

CONSULTING. ENGINEERING. CONSTRUCTION.

5. If the proposed commercial area is to remain, access should be provided from within the development rather than directly from SR 19. A driveway from SR 19 at this location will likely create issues with the intersection operations. If the tract is to be used as a sewage treatment site, utility access is needed from within the project and a heavy buffer is needed along the SR-19 frontage
   Response: **No commercial uses are proposed or intended with this PUD.**

6. Is the spacing for the two project entrances from SR 19 compliant with FDOT standards? Is one on the entrance points connected to the Lake Hills entrance on the opposite side of SR-19?
   Response: **Once the CAD plans are available for the Lake Hills PUD, the applicant can adjust the western most access to align as requested.**

7. Is it the project intent to propose use of the bicycle/pedestrian connection at Lakeshore Boulevard as an emergency access as well.
   Response: **Yes. Both have been shown and provided on the Master Site Plan.**

Griffey Engineering, Inc.

1. The proposed main entrance is not in the correct location. It needs to be where Lot 1 is located (see attached Intersection Concept Plan).
   Response: **Once the CAD plans are available for the Lake Hills PUD, the applicant can adjust the western most access to align as requested.**

2. The northern entrance doesn't meet FDOT spacing standards for a full access. It needs to be designed as a right-in/right-out only connection.
   Response: **The Eastern most access will be designed as a right-in/right-out only connection.**

3. The project needs to provide internal access to the commercial parcel as well as a right-in/right-out only access on SR 19.
   Response: **No commercial uses are proposed or intended with this PUD.**

4. The project will need to extend water mains to the south to provide connections at Temple Ave. and Lakeshore Blvd
   Response: **Acknowledged and agreed.**

If you have additional comments, requests or need clarification; please feel free to contact me directly. I can be reached at 772-486-1977 or via email at cmillar@atwell-group.com .

ATWELL

CONSULTING. ENGINEERING. CONSTRUCTION.

Respectfully,
ATWELL

Chuck Millar

Chuck Millar
Senior Project Manager