



September 28, 2023

Thomas A. Harowski, AICP
Town of Howey-in-the-Hills
101 N. Palm Ave., P.O. Box 128,
Howey-In-The-Hills, Florida 34737

RE: Mission Rise PUD

Dear: Mr. Harowski

Enclosed please find responses to Staff's comments below in bold. The following items are resubmitted in response to Staff's comments:

1. Revised Conceptual Land Use Plan
2. Revised Development Agreement
3. Revised Traffic Impact Analysis

PLANNING REVIEW COMMENTS:
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).

RESPONSE: Please see page 4 of the Conceptual Land Use Plan, which provides distinct details of the non-residential land area proposed within the development. Stormwater areas have been excluded from the calculation. An additional park area is proposed in the southern part of Phase 2.

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.

RESPONSE: The "regional" park has been renamed to "neighborhood" parks. In turn, the previous "neighborhood parks" have been renamed to "mini" parks. The mini parks are planned as recreational space for the use of the residents of the community. The neighborhood parks are intended to serve the larger community and facilitate access and use of the multiuse trail system.

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.

RESPONSE: The proposed park areas have been detailed, in terms of the proposed features/amenities on page 3 of the Conceptual Land Use Plan.

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.

RESPONSE: Acknowledged.

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.

RESPONSE: Active recreational amenities may be provided in the park area in the southern part of Phase 2. The planned facilities/amenities and design of the park areas are intended to be further detailed at the subdivision/site plan process.

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.

RESPONSE: The double-frontage lots will have a 10' landscaped buffer along the Collector Road to protect views from this roadway.

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.

RESPONSE: In accordance with LDC Section 4.06.02.A.3., at least 25% of the lots in the development will have to provide recessed garages. Further, side-loaded garages are encouraged, as stated in the proposed Development Agreement.

8. The unit totals provided for the phase allocations do not add correctly on the table provided.

RESPONSE: The unit totals have been revised on the Phase Development Table. Please see page 2 of the Conceptual Land Use Plan.

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.

RESPONSE: Acknowledged. The note has been removed and language related to movement of units between phases will be added to the Development Agreement.

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.

RESPONSE: Please see the revised Development Agreement.

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.

RESPONSE: Please see page 2 of the Conceptual Land Use Plan where the phase line type has been updated for better readability.

PUD/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.

RESPONSE: Please see the revised Development 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.

RESPONSE: Please see the revised Development Agreement.

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.

RESPONSE: Please see the revised Development Agreement.

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.

RESPONSE: Please see the revised Development Agreement.

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.

RESPONSE: Please see the revised Development Agreement.

6. On page eleven, the termination language related to sewer service acquisition should be modified to include other options than the CLCDD.

RESPONSE: Please see the revised Development Agreement.

TRAFFIC IMPACT ASSESSMENT:

1. Defer to the Town engineer comments

RESPONSE: Acknowledged.

ENGINEERING REVIEW COMMENTS:
TRAFFIC STUDY:

1. The conceptual land use plan states the maximum number of lots is 499. The traffic study and the development agreement states 592 lots. All three need to be the same.

RESPONSE: The Traffic Impact Analysis and Development Agreement have been revised to state a maximum of 499 units.

2. The methodology states that Lake Hills & Watermark are to be included in the background traffic projection. The submitted study left these developments out.

RESPONSE: Please see the revised Traffic Impact Analysis.

3. For the future condition intersection analysis for SR 19 & Revels Rd. include right & left turn lanes on SR 19 and a right turn lane on revels.

RESPONSE: Please see the revised Traffic Impact Analysis.

4. For the future condition intersection analysis for the Spine Rd. and Number 2 Rd., include right & left turn lanes on Number 2 Rd.

RESPONSE: Please see the revised Traffic Impact Analysis.

5. Per the MPO TIS Guidelines the study needs to include a section for Mitigation Strategies. This needs to address the road segments and intersections with deficiencies. For unsignalized intersections, side streets with deficient delays need to be evaluated for mitigation. Also, the narrow width of Number 2 Road needs to be addressed in this section. While capacity is not an issue, operational safety is.

RESPONSE: Please see the revised Traffic Impact Analysis.

6. There is no proposed widening of SR 19 at Central Avenue as stated in the study.

RESPONSE: Please see the revised Traffic Impact Analysis.

7. Based on Lake County's requirement for turn lane widening on Number 2 Road (all on the south side) the length of tapers will need to be twice the standard length.

RESPONSE: Please see the revised Traffic Impact Analysis.

CONCEPT PLAN:

1. The main N-S spine road and realigned Revels Road should not have driveway connections or on-street parking. They should have full pedestrian accommodation including the multi-use trail and raised crosswalks/speed tables at key points along its length connecting the trail and sidewalks to amenity, open space, and park areas.

RESPONSE: On-street parking/driveway connections along the Collector Road have been removed from the plan. All lots abutting the Collector Road will have access from another local street or alley.

2. The curb & gutter for the neighborhood roads should 2' wide Type F or Drop Curb.

RESPONSE: Please see page 6 of the Conceptual Land Use Plan, where the curb and gutter has been updated to 2' width.

Development Agreement

1. Section 1. (f) Wetlands: Wetland impacts and buffering shall also be subject to the Town's land development regulations as well as the St Johns River Water Management District.

RESPONSE: Please see the revised Development Agreement.

2. Section 1. (j) Transportation, Streets and Sidewalks: Revels Road and the Spine Road must have a minimum 90-foot right-of-way, 2' curb and gutter, and a minimum 32-foot-wide pavement with 12-foot travel lanes and 4' curb lanes.

RESPONSE: Please see the revised Development Agreement.

Thank you in advance for your consideration of the above information. If you require further information, please do not hesitate to contact me at 607.216.2390 or rlopes@rviplanning.com

Sincerely,

RVi Planning + Landscape Architecture



Rhea Lopes, AICP
Project Manager

Enclosures

cc: Alexis Crespo, RVi Planning + Landscape Architecture
Jason Humm, ASF TAP FL I LLC
Jonathan Huels, Lowndes Law Group