

MEMORANDUM

TO: Howey-in-the-Hills Development Review Committee
CC: D. Burke, Town Clerk; H. Ramos, Town Attorney; Applicant
FROM: Thomas Harowski, AICP, Planning Consultant
SUBJECT: Mission Rise February 11, 2019 Development Agreement Draft
DATE: February 13, 2019

I am providing this report to offer my initial comments on the revised development agreement draft dated February 11, 2019. I reviewed the draft agreement against the summary comments memo I provided on January 25, 2019 and comments gathered from other sources including the Town Attorney. As additional data is received there may be other comments and there are likely to be comments from other DRC members that will supplement my comments as presented here. The intent in issuing these comments is to assist the DRC members in their review of the project and to provide the maximum notice to the applicant of the items which still need to be resolved.

As the Town's Planning Board is in the process of reforming, I understand the current plan is to have DRC review the plans and development agreement to put them in a form where the DRC can recommend consideration by the Town Council. The Town Council will then act on the application. The current schedule (tentative) is as follows:

February 27, 2019 Development Review Committee
March 25, 2019 Town Council First Reading

If there are issues which remain open following the February 27th DRC meeting, another DRC meeting may be necessary to finalize the review. The Town Clerk will need to coordinate the drafting of the adopting ordinance and advertising schedule with the Town Attorney. Keep in mind advertising requires notice to property owners within 300 feet of the subject property as well as a published notice and posting the property. Posting should be done on both SR 19 and Number Two Road. (Normally this advertising is done before the Planning Board meeting, but now it will need to be done for Town Council.) For notice to adjacent property owners, I suggest having the applicant supply the Town with a certified list of property owners required to be notified. This can be obtained from the Property Appraiser's office.

My comments on the current draft are provided below. Progress has been made in addressing earlier comments, but some additional discussion is needed.

1. The traffic study may yield some road improvements that will need to be added into the development agreement. I noted in a separate e-mail response that I support including the revisions recommended by the Lake Sumter MPO into the study methodology. The Town has been advised that the study will be available for review as of February 18, 2019.
2. The final draft will need to include Exhibits A (legal description) and B Concept Plan prior to presentation to the Town Council. Has a survey been submitted? Has the Town received the most current version of the proposed concept development plan?
3. For Exhibit C on the building design, the applicant should identify the lot sizes that are appropriate for the models shown. It appears that the models presented in the draft agreement are for the 60-foot lots. One of the critical questions that the Town Council will need to debate is approval of the smaller lots at 40- and 50-foot width. The design samples should provide views of the units intended for these lots in order to facilitate the Council's review.
4. The revisions to Section 5.11 on the design treatment address some of the concerns that the DRC has expressed, but the spacing of the unit types still requires some additional analysis, and I expect to have more comments on this provision.
5. At the January 17, 2019 DRC meeting, the applicant agreed to show paved access to lift station sites on the concept development plan. This could not be verified as an updated CDP was not distributed with the most recent development agreement.
6. The Police Department requested the opportunity to use space in the proposed community building for a local contact point. I did not see where this was address as either an inclusion or a rejection of the idea.
7. The lot size table (Section 5.5) was revised, but I would still like the table to show the proposed number of lots in each category. This information will be needed for the Town Council deliberations.
8. The new draft cites a design theme of Southwest/Old Mission style design for the entrance features. Is this intended to be consistent with the Mission Inn design concept? I wonder if Mediterranean Revival might be a more accurate description as this style is a combination of Spanish and Italian influences and is more like the design of the Inn and mansion. The term southwest evokes something more like adobe with different design elements. Mediterranean Revival would include:
 - Low pitched roof with wide eaves and red tile
 - Stucco façade often painted white
 - Design elements such as porches, balconies, bell towers, archways, awnings, decorative columns and arched windowsIs there an intent to extend the design theme to the houses as well?

9. The note on dedication of right-of-way for Number Two Road should assign the dedication to Lake County rather than the Town.
10. This may be a little picky, but should the trail material reference be “hard surface” rather than asphalt. While I understand asphalt is the likely material, having a more general term would avoid any issue if a decision is made to use other materials at some points.