



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

MEMORANDUM

TO: Howey-in-the-Hills Development Review Committee
CC: J. Brock, Town Clerk
FROM: Thomas Harowski, AICP, Planning Consultant
SUBJECT: Mission Rise Development August 2023 Resubmittal
DATE: September 6, 2023

These comments are based on the resubmittal package for the Mission Rise proposed development submitted August 23, 2023 and the staff comments from the August 10, 2023 Development Review Committee meeting.

Concept Plan

1. The project still fails to meet the 15% non-residential land area requirements of the Village Mixed Use land use classification. The stormwater areas allocated to the non-residential use calculation are in fact engineering elements of other land uses. The civic land use, the amenity centers and the park areas can count toward the non-residential land use as proposed. Staff is willing to include the major trail area that falls outside the central collector road right-of-way (so long as this area is not already counted as park area).
2. The proposed recreational facilities have been better detailed, but the “regional” park still fails to meet the definition included in the comprehensive plan. Perhaps revising the name to a neighborhood facility is more appropriate given that the park is unlikely to draw significant interest from residents outside the neighborhood.
3. The area in the center designated as regional park is a bonafide park area. The highlighted areas in Phase 3 and at the south end of Phase 2 are just open space and should not be counted as park area.
4. The applicant has elected to retain stormwater retention areas within the central core area which staff recommended for tree preservation and green space. As noted in our comments last time, the retention ponds are part of the residential land use and should be located there. Be advised this item will be a comment in the staff report.

5. The park area developments have been detailed but outside of the amenity centers are essentially passive designs. As an additional item, the applicant could consider including some court activities as part of the overall program. We renew our suggestions for repurposing the small residential development at the southeast corner of Phase 2 as a central community facility.
6. The applicant needs to address how the double-frontage lots located in Phase 2 and Phase 3 will be addressed. These lots have access from a parallel street so that the rear yards of these properties will front on the central collector road. Perhaps some sort of buffer such as a landscaped berm or wall is appropriate.
7. For the 55-foot wide lots where no alley access is proposed, what design options are suggested to reduce the impact of a garage-dominate streetscape.
8. The unit totals provided for the phase allocations do not add correctly on the table provided.
9. The note to the table needs to be removed. Movement of units between phases will be considered a major amendment of the development agreement. As an alternative the applicant could propose language in the development agreement allowing for a specific level of shifting units between phases for Town Council consideration.
10. At the last DRC meeting the applicant was requested to provide a timing proposal for construction of the central collector road. The agreement needs to include a proposed timing.
11. Map 2 seems to be unclear. Phase lines are similar to the symbols for pathways, parking, non-residential areas etc. Perhaps the information can be divided into more maps that will present a clearer summary.

Development Agreement

1. On page two the development agreement states the project is 592 units while the concept plan has 499. These documents need to be in agreement.
2. On page three the minimum lot width at the building line needs to be 75 feet for the 75 x 120 lot size.
3. On page three the wetland buffer needs to reflect the town requirements in Sec. 3.02.03C as well as the water management district and DEP requirements. The Town's requirements vary in some respects from the state requirements.
4. On page four, the language setting the timing for the Town to ask for utility upgrades is still not satisfactory. The proposed 270 days from approval of the plan is still not what we need. The timing should be triggered by the application for final subdivision approval for the phase of the project proposed. The final subdivision approval gives authorization to construct subdivision improvements.

The Town should be required to make its needs and commitments at this point. If final subdivision approval is sought by phase, then the Town's opportunity to seek utility line upgrades should attach to each phase.

5. On page 6, the Town is not requiring all roads to be public. The applicant has the choice to use gated access for the project or for sub-areas within the project. While the collector road should remain with full public access, the applicant may wish to revise the proposed language to preserve the option for gated areas.
6. On page eleven, the termination language related to sewer service acquisition should be modified to include other options than the CLCDD.

Traffic Impact Assessment

Defer to the Townengineeer comments.