November 22, 2022

Engineering

Landscape Architecture

Griffey Engineering, Inc. 406 N Center St. Eustis, Fl 32726

RE:

Howey-in-the-Hills

Response to Comments dated October 12, 2022

CWI Job # 21-04-0008

To whom it may concern:

Thank you for your time in reviewing the above project. Please find enclosed copies of the following information for your review and approval of the above referenced project:

- 1. Revised Phase 1 Engineering Plans
- 2. Revised Phase 1 Landscape Plans
- 3. Revised Lift Station Calculations

In addition to the above information, we offer the following responses to the comments provided on the last submittal. Each comment is listed below (**bold**) followed by our response in *italics*.

Landscape Comments

1. A subdivision screening wall and landscape plan is required along the Number Two Road frontage. See Section 7.02.01 B for the requirements.

Response: Please see notes on sheet L201, sheet 4 of the pdf. This section is a future phase and will be designed with that phase's construction plans.

2. The plan needs to provide a more complete entrance design where Road A enters the residential portion of the project. There is ample area to provide a substantial entry feature with landscaping beyond the proposed shade trees and bahia grass.

Response: Please see sheet L408, sheet 14 of the pdf. The sign is on the right side of the road with 5 palm trees and large shrub and groundcover plantings.

3. No entry feature or project sign is proposed at the Number Two Road entrance, and this entrance should have a substantial entrance feature. The required screening wall can contribute to this design.

Response: Please see sign on sheet L201, sheet 4 of the pdf. This section is a future phase and the required screening wall will be designed with that phase's construction plans.

4. Where shrubs and ground cover are shown on the plans, there is no information on the type of plant material proposed and sizes to the material to verify it complies with town code.

Response: Please see plant list on sheet L400, sheet 6 of the pdf.

5. I noted that the project sign at the Number 2 Road entrance is basically visible to westbound traffic but not eastbound traffic on Number 2 Road. I understand that there is no project area on the east side of the right-of-way to work with, but if there is a desire to provide some identification signage for eastbound traffic, we might look for a way to incorporate a project identification sign in the screening wall that will come with phase 2.

Response: This sign design will be coordinated with phase 2 plans.

6. On page 403 I noted a lift station tract for the sewer system. I wonder if we shouldn't consider a little screening of the lift station from the houses nearby. I am sure that public works will want the lift station to be fenced, which is not called out on the plan, but a little hedge along the fence may help screen the site from the nearby homes. This was the only pump station I saw in Phase 1, but we should consider screening for other stations as well depending on the location relative to housing.

Response: A hedge is added to the lift station. It also includes a fence.

7. I noted that the drawings at the intersections do not have crosswalks at all the intersection legs. The Town does require the full crossing (four crossings for a standard intersection and three for a tee intersection) Examples are for Road A and Road B on L406 and Road B and Road H on the same page. Sidewalks need to carry to the pavement edge with proper striping and curb ramps. I don't know how this might affect landscaping other than somewhat less sod, but the engineering and landscape design should be on the same base.

Response: Additional pedestrian crossings have been added per conversations with the town engineer with pedestrian safety and pedestrian mobility in mind. Crosswalk designs meet the FDOT Standards referenced and all crossings not at stop conditions include special emphasis markings. The landscape plans are updated to match the civil engineering plans.

8. The Town has been having issues with the street trees on the residential lots in a couple of newer neighborhoods. People seem to dislike the trees and want to uproot them. We need to find a place in the plan set or the documents that will clearly state for the homeowner, that the street trees are required and cannot be removed without permit and approval according to local code and state requirements.

Response: The portion of the note which is underlined is added to the plans.

9. What is your opinion about using root barriers with the street tree program to limit potential damage from tree root spread? These seem to calm some of the residential fears that the tree roots will consume their homes. How can we best include this in the landscape plans?

Response: Please see the Large Canopy Tree Planting Detail containing a root barrier note.

10. We will be looking for an extension of the bike/ped trail along Number 2 Road to the west end of the project. We expect this extension to tie into a trail coming from the project to the west when it develops. This can be in the county right-of-way, but it may need to be considered with the intersection permit from Lake County. To the extent that the trees required with the screening wall can also shade the path area, that would be a benefit.

Response: With the design of phase 2, we will coordinate trees with the Town as the trail and wall are added.

General Comments

1. The typical road sections provided do not match the latest versions including the multiuse path.

Response: The typical road sections are included on the Paving and Drainage Plan (sheet 13A) and are the latest versions.

2. The set of geometry plans need a key map to help understand how these maps fit together.

Response: A key map is included on each of the plans.

- 3. Items which are required (Section 4.05.20) as part of the final subdivision drawings that were not located include:
 - a. Soils information (Subsection O). Was this previously submitted?

Response: The soils information is included on the Pre Development Drainage Plan and Post Development Drainage Plan (sheets 5A-6B).

b. Wetlands survey (Subsection P).

Response: The wetlands are shown on each of the plan sheets. A detail of the wetland impacts is included on the Wetland Impact Map (Sheet 21A-21B).

c. 100 Year Flood Plain Elevation Information (Subsection Q). Was this previously submitted?

Response: The 100 Year Flood Plains are shown on the Neighborhood Grading Plan (Sheets 8A-8H) and the Flood Compensation Map (Sheet 20).

d. Open Space (Subsection T). Needs to be clearly marked and labeled.

Response: The Open Space is clearly labeled on the Site Plan and a table added (Sheets 4A-4H, 4K, 4S).

e. Street signs (Subsection EE). The Town standard sign is not included. FDOT and Lake County standards are used for their right-of-way areas.

Response: The street sign detail is included on the Paving and Drainage Details (Sheet 13E).

f. Traffic signs and markings (Subsection FF).

Response: Traffic signs and markings are shown on the Site Plan (Sheets 4A-4H, 4K, 4S).

4. Is the plan to use alphabet letters for street names or is another plan in place to select street names.

Response: Road names are being selected and will be submitted for approval once received.

5. The master site plan page is not correct as included in the submittal package. Roads C, D and F do not match the amendment proposal. The units on Road H are not correct.

Response: The Master Site Plan matches what was submitted for the PUD modification.

6. Is the plan to include the streetlight location on the landscape plan set? Is the lighting proposal on the landscape plans complete per the design?

Response: Yes, all street lighting proposed is included on the Landscape Plan.

Griffey Engineering, Inc. Construction Plan Review Comments

1. Additional comments may be added to these with the reviews of subsequent submittals.

Response: Comment noted.

2. This work will require various permits from SJRWMD, Duke Energy, Lake County, FDOT, FDEP, FWC, COE. Provide copies of the applicable permits & approvals before commencing work on the site.

Response: Comment noted, copies of permits will be submitted upon receipt under separate cover.

3. Provide hydraulic calculations for the irrigation system.

Response: The wells are currently being evaluated, the design will provide a minimum design of 5 gpm at 20 psi for each lot within the development when watering simultaneously.

4. Provide lift station calculations.

Response: Lift Station Calculations for Phase 1 are included with this submittal.

5. Add lift stations to the master utility plan.

Response: The pump stations are labeled on the revised Master Utility Plan.

6. Provide design data for the pumps and wet well on the lift station detail page.

Response: The pump and design data is added to the lift station detail sheet.

7. The driveway on SR 19 opposite from the project entrance needs to be 24' wide and paved.

Response: The driveway opposite the entrance is 24' wide and paved per comment.

8. Provide a plan for improvements to No. 2 Rd. Per Lake County standards, this connection should require turn lanes.

Response: A commercial driveway connection permit application was made to Lake County on 11/3/2022.

9. Provide details on how the roadside drainage on No 2 Road will be handled at the new road connection.

Response: The entrance to the development is at nearly the high point of the roadway, there is an existing trail road connection and no culvert. No culvert is proposed. Very little water drains from Number 2 Road towards the development. Drainage inlets are anticipated behind the future lots adjacent to Number 2 Road; any water draining to the development will be accepted into the stormwater system in future phases.

10. Modifications to the FEMA flood lines due to the proposed grading will need a LOMR submitted to change the flood maps.

Response: All lots within a designated FEMA Special Flood Hazard area will be removed from the floodplain through fill. A LOMR-F will be submitted to FEMA after fill activities are completed. In addition, a CLOMR and subsequent LOMR will be submitted to FEMA as a part of this project to also revise the mapping.

11. The No 2 Road utility plan is lacking information and detail. Show the proposed project improvements along with the existing utilities and right-of-way. A cad file of an as-built survey of this corridor will be provided as a follow up to the DRC meeting.

Response: The additional information provided is shown on the revised plans which includes the existing utility mains.

12. ALL legs of ALL intersections need to provide full pedestrian accommodation including ADA curb ramps & crosswalks. Crosswalks are to be per FDOT Design Standards 2017-18 Index 17346 Sheet 12 of 17. The crosswalks at stop conditions should be standard crosswalks. The crosswalks not at a stop condition should be special emphasis. The crosswalks depicted on the plan should accurately reflect the marking widths & spacings shown in the standard.

Response: Additional pedestrian crossings have been added per conversations with the town engineer. Crosswalk designs meet the FDOT Standards referenced and all crossings not at stop conditions include special emphasis markings, all of which drawn to scale.

13. The roadway cross sections refer to a detail for the Pavement Section, but the detail seems to be missing.

Response: The pavement sections are added to the revised plans.

14. Identify on the plans the locations where sidewalks are to be constructed with the subdivision construction. Add a note that all curb ramps are to be constructed with the subdivision.

Response: Notes, labels and joints in the sidewalk are added to the Site Plan defining which sidewalks are to be constructed with the subdivision construction or with the lots.

15. Extend the new 12" water mains along SR 19 and No. 2 Rd to a point beyond the project entrances. Terminate with a fire hydrant for flushing and a gate valve for future main extensions.

Response: The water main is extended past the entrance and terminated with a fire hydrant, valve and plug for future connection.

16. Call out air release valves at the high points of the potable water, irrigation, and sanitary force mains.

Response: Air Release Valves are shown on the plans where more than 2' drop occurs and air can be trapped per FDEP criteria.

17. Adjust the depiction of the valves on the plans to show them outside of curbs and curb ramps.

Response: The valves are adjusted so they are depicted outside of curbs and ramps per comment.

18. An easement down a lot line is not practical maintenance access for stormwater ponds unless there are enforceable restrictions against placing fences and landscaping within the easements.

Response: Drainage pipes between lots are placed in tracts.

19. Provide site improvement details for the lift stations that show driveway access, backup power generator, and security fencing.

Response: A detailed pump station site plan is included in the revised plans.

20. Provide site improvement details for the irrigation supply well that show driveway access and equipment & controls. This area should be fenced for security.

Response: The wells are currently being evaluated for viability of use and a design underway for equipment and controls by Halff. The site design including access, controls and equipment will be provided under separate cover upon completion.

Thank you for your time in reviewing our response. We trust the above responses and included information is sufficient for your review and approval. Please do not hesitate to contact me if you have any questions, I can be reached at jwilliams@cwieng.com or 904-265-3030.

Sincerely,

Connelly & Wicker Inc.

Justin Williams, P.E.

Vice President