



Planning & Zoning Board Meeting

November 16, 2023 at 6:00 PM
Howey-in the-Hills Town Hall
101 N. Palm Ave.,
Howey-in-the-Hills, FL 34737

Join Zoom Meeting: <https://us06web.zoom.us/j/87268900631?pwd=HPBfGIY0qwO7nF9I5AFRkbnN780F32.1>
Meeting ID: 872 6890 0631 | **Passcode:** 862705

AGENDA

CALL TO ORDER ROLL CALL

CONSENT AGENDA

Routine items are placed on the Consent Agenda to expedite the meeting. If a Planning & Zoning Board Member wishes to discuss any item, the procedure is as follows: (1) Pull the item(s) from the Consent Agenda; (2) Vote on the remaining item(s); and (3) Discuss each pulled item and vote.

- 1.** Consideration and Approval of the October 26, 2023, Planning and Zoning Board Meeting minutes.

PUBLIC HEARING

OLD BUSINESS

NEW BUSINESS

- 2.** Discussion: **Amending the Future Land Use Element of the Comprehensive Plan**
- 3.** Discussion: **Population Information**

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Any person wishing to address the Planning and Zoning Board and who is not on the agenda is asked to speak their name and address. Three (3) minutes is allocated per speaker.

BOARD COMMENTS

ADJOURNMENT

To Comply with Title II of the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA):

Qualified individuals may get assistance through the Florida Relay Service by dialing 7-1-1. Florida Relay is a

service provided to residents in the State of Florida who are Deaf, Hard of Hearing, Deaf/Blind, or Speech Disabled that connects them to standard (voice) telephone users. They utilize a wide array of technologies, such as Text Telephone (TTYs) and ASCII, Voice Carry-Over (VCO), Speech to Speech (STS), Relay Conference Captioning (RCC), CapTel, Voice, Hearing Carry-Over (HCO), Video Assisted Speech to Speech (VA-STS) and Enhanced Speech to Speech.

NOTICE: ONE OR MORE COUNCILORS MAY BE PRESENT TO HEAR OR PARTICIPATE IN DISCUSSION REGARDING MATTERS WHICH MAY COME BEFORE TOWN COUNCIL FOR ACTION.

Howey Town Hall is inviting you to a scheduled Zoom meeting.

Topic: Planning & Zoning Board Meeting

Time: Nov 16, 2023 06:00 PM Eastern Time (US and Canada)

Join Zoom Meeting

<https://us06web.zoom.us/j/87268900631?pwd=HPBfGItY0qwO7nF9I5AFRKbN780F32.1>

Meeting ID: 872 6890 0631

Passcode: 862705

Dial by your location

+1 646 558 8656 US (New York)

+1 720 707 2699 US (Denver)

+1 346 248 7799 US (Houston)

Meeting ID: 872 6890 0631

Passcode: 862705

Find your local number: <https://us06web.zoom.us/u/kbdIXf6RTJ>

Please Note: In accordance with F.S. 286.0105: Any person who desires to appeal any decision or recommendation at this meeting will need a record of the proceedings, and that for such purposes may need to ensure that a verbatim record of the proceedings is made, which includes the testimony and evidence upon which the appeal is based. The Town of Howey-in-the-Hills does not prepare or provide this verbatim record. Note: In accordance with the F.S. 286.26: Persons with disabilities needing assistance to participate in any of these proceedings should contact Town Hall, 101 N. Palm Avenue, Howey-in-the-Hills, FL 34737, (352) 324-2290 at least 48 business hours in advance of the meeting.



Planning & Zoning Board Meeting

October 26, 2023 at 6:00 PM
Howey-in the-Hills Town Hall
101 N. Palm Ave.,
Howey-in-the-Hills, FL 34737

MINUTES

CALL TO ORDER ROLL CALL

BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT:

Board Member Alan Hayes | Board Member Richard Mulvany | Board Member Shawn Johnson | Board Member Frances Wagler | Vice-Chair Ron Francis III | Chair Tina St. Clair

BOARD MEMBERS ABSENT:

Board Member Ellen Yarckin

STAFF PRESENT:

Sean O'Keefe, Town Manager | Tom Harowski, Town Planner

CONSENT AGENDA

Routine items are placed on the Consent Agenda to expedite the meeting. If a Planning & Zoning Board Member wishes to discuss any item, the procedure is as follows: (1) Pull the item(s) from the Consent Agenda; (2) Vote on the remaining item(s); and (3) Discuss each pulled item and vote.

1. Consideration and Approval of the September 28, 2023, Planning and Zoning Board Meeting minutes.

Board Member Wagler requested two amendments to the September 28, 2023, Planning and Zoning Board Meeting minutes. The first requested change was under Agenda Item # 3 (Consideration and Recommendation: Ordinance 2023-009 Comprehensive Plan FLU Amendment and Rezoning - ASMA Parcel). Board Member Wagler requested that the sentence, "Board Member Wagler admitted that she was employed by the Howey Mansion, and that she was the Manager of the Howey Mansion" be changed to, "Board Member Wagler stated that she was employed by the Howey Mansion, and that she was the Manager of the Howey Mansion."

Board Member Wagler's second requested change was under Agenda Item #5 (Consideration and Approval: Fiscal Year 2023-2024 Planning & Zoning Board Meeting and DRC Meeting Schedules). Board Member Wagler requested that the sentence, "Board Member Wagler voiced her frustration that the November Planning and Zoning Board Meeting date would not be moved even though the March date had been moved" be changed to "Board Member Wagler stated that the November Planning and Zoning Board Meeting date would not be moved even though the March date had been moved".

Motion made by Board Member Wagler to approve the September 28, 2023, Planning and Zoning Board Meeting minutes with the amendments that she had requested; seconded by Board Member Mulvany. Motion approved unanimously by roll-call vote.

Voting

Yea: Board Member Hayes, Board Member Mulvany, Board Member Johnson, Board Member Wagler, Vice-Chair Francis III, Chair St. Clair

Nay: None

PUBLIC HEARING

None

OLD BUSINESS

None

NEW BUSINESS

2. Consideration and Approval: **Elevation Approval - 559 Via Bella Ct.**

Town Planner, Tom Harowski, introduced and explained this item. Mr. Harowski explained that the builder for the Talichet Subdivision was requesting an exception to the rule not allowing two of the same models of home to be built next to each other. Dream Finders LLC, the builder of Talichet, was requesting this exception for the 559 Via Bella Ct., with the model **Avalon with Bonus – Elevation A**, to be used on this lot. Mr. Harowski explained that the builder is allowed to ask for this exception when the builder is down to its last 10% of houses being built within the community. Mr. Harowski explained that Talichet has a total of 113 lots and 111 homes are already built or permitted currently. Mr. Harowski stated that his staff recommendation was to allow the approval of this model being built due to the builder being within the last 10% of homes to be built.

Chair St. Clair open Public Comment for this item only.

Tom Ballou, 1005 N Tangerine Ave. – Mr. Ballou stated that, it was his understanding that the builder was supposed to have built a park in this neighborhood and had not. Mr. Harowski stated that this was not the case; no park had been planned for this development.

Tim Everline, 1012 N. Lakeshore Blvd. – Mr. Everline stated that, once the builder was allowed to build this house, there was no going back. Mr. Everline stated that he thinks all the houses look the same and that he thinks the developers are taking advantage of the Town.

Lynne Husemann, 671 Avila Pl. – Mrs. Husemann said that, as a property owner in Talichet, she would like to see this exception allowed so that the builder would hurry up and finish building within the community.

Chair St. Clair closed Public Comment and opened Board Comment.

Board Member Johnson stated that, as a resident of Talichet, he could assure everyone that a park was never in the plans for the Talichet neighborhood.

Board Member Wagler wanted to know if this house would be a spec house, or a buyer-designed house. Town Manager, Sean O’Keefe, said that he did not know.

Motion made by Board Member Johnson to approve; seconded by Vice-Chair Francis III. Motion approved by roll-call vote.

Voting

Yea: Board Member Hayes, Board Member Mulvany, Board Member Johnson, Vice-Chair Francis III, Chair St. Clair

Nay: Board Member Wagler

3. Discussion: **Comprehensive Plan Evaluation and Appraisal Review (EAR) Process**

Town Planner, Tom Harowski, introduced and explained this item. Mr. Harowski stated that he had recently recommended to the Town Council that the Town should begin the Comprehensive Plan Evaluation and Appraisal Review (EAR) process. The State of Florida requires that all municipalities undertake the EAR process every seven years. The Town of Howey-in-the-Hills last started the EAR back in 2017, adopting the new Comprehensive Plan from it in 2018. Mr. Harowski then explained the steps involved in the EAR.

Mr. Harowski stated that he was looking for a consensus from the Planning and Zoning Board that the schedule of items to be reviewed during the EAR be approved by the Board. Mr. Harowski explained that, in November, the Board would review Data Updates (like population data and trends) and in December the Board would review the Future Land Use element and the Public Participation Property Rights element. The schedule for the EAR would conclude in April 2024. After the Planning and Zoning Board will have concluded its review, the Comprehensive Plan would move to the Town Council for review and adoption.

Chair St. Clair open Public Comment for this item only.

David Miles (Town Councilor), 500 E Camelia Way – Mr. Miles wanted to know if the schedule for the EAR was available for the public to view and comment on. Mr. Miles explained that, in June 2023, the Town Councilors make numerous recommendations for changes to the Town Comprehensive Plan. Mr. Miles stated that he had proposed 6 pages of type-written comments (mainly for the Future Land Use [FLU] element). Mr. Miles would like the FLU element to be reviewed first. Mr. Miles urged the Planning and Zoning Board to move quickly. Mr. Miles then reviewed changes that the Town Council had made to the Land Development Code Omnibus amendment package that the Planning and Zoning Board had submitted to the Town Council.

Chair St. Clair closed Public Comment and opened Board Comment.

Chair St. Clair asked how this would go together with the changes that the Town Council had already suggested. Mr. Harowski explained that those suggestions would act as additional input into the discussion.

Board Member Wagler asked if developer's submittals would be put on hold during the EAR process. Mr. Harowski stated that this would not happen unless the Town Council adopted a moratorium.

Mr. Miles asked how the Town Council could adopt a moratorium. Mr. Harowski said that Mr. Miles would have to check with the Town Attorney about that process.

Board Member Francis wanted to know how many hours Mr. Harowski would have to put into the process. Mr. Harowski stated that he did not know, but it would be substantial. Chair St. Clair suggested that Mr. Harowski look to get an intern from a local college to assist with the process and cut down on costs.

Motion made by Chair St Clair to update the schedule for the EAR and move the Future Land Use element to November and Traffic Circulation element to December; seconded by Board Member Wagler. Motion approved unanimously by roll-call vote.

Voting

Yea: Board Member Hayes, Board Member Mulvany, Board Member Johnson, Board Member Wagler, Vice-Chair Francis III, Chair St. Clair

Nay: None

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Any person wishing to address the Planning and Zoning Board and who is not on the agenda is asked to speak their name and address. Three (3) minutes is allocated per speaker.

Tim Everline, 1012 N Lakeshore Blvd. – Mr. Everline stated that he understood that the Talichet developer had said that they didn’t have the paperwork for the Talichet Wastewater lift station pump and that this was an example of the Town being taken advantage of by developers.

BOARD COMMENTS

Chair St. Clair said that she thought that the Board was getting their packets for the meetings too late and wanted the Town Manager to see if they could get them sooner. Board Member Wagler stated that she wanted the minutes from the prior meeting sooner, so that she would have more time to evaluate them.

David Miles (Town Councilor), 500 E Camelia Way – Mr. Miles gave a recap of the Town Council’s decision to continue the Hillside Groves Development to their next meeting.

Board Member Mulvany asked if there was any way for audio recordings of meetings to be placed on the website, rather than having to request copies of them from the Town Clerk.

Board Member Wagler stated that she would like to see developments referred to by the year they were submitted and numbered by the order in which they were submitted (ex. 2023-002), instead of by a name, since the name may change sometime in the future. Board Member Wagler stated that she would like to see a map of proposed development on display at the Town library.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business to discuss, a motion was made by Board Member Mulvany to adjourn the meeting; Board Member Johnson seconded the motion. Motion was approved unanimously by voice vote.

The Meeting adjourned at 7:10 p.m.

Tina St. Clair Chairperson

ATTEST:

John Brock, Town Clerk



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

MEMORANDUM

TO: Howey-in-the-Hills Planning Board
CC: J. Brock, Town Clerk
FROM: Thomas Harowski, AICP, Planning Consultant
SUBJECT: Future Land Use Element Policy Amendments
DATE: November 6, 2023

As a follow-up to the Town Council workshop session held on November 1st, a package of amendments to the future land use element has been referred to the planning board for consideration as required by the Town’s land development code. These proposed amendments result from the ongoing review by the Town Council and the Planning Board of changes needed in both the Town’s comprehensive plan and the Town’s land development code regarding residential development.

The amendments for now address *only* the comprehensive plan, specifically the future land use element. Amendments to the land development code will be more numerous and are a work in progress. The land development code is subordinate, of course, to the comprehensive plan. We therefore should try to finalize amendments to the comp plan, then prepare LDC amendments that conform to the comp-plan amendments.

In addition, the Town is beginning its “evaluation and review” of the comp plan – the “EAR Report” – a periodic requirement under Florida law. That review and any resulting revisions of the plan’s data, analysis, and policies will be provided to you in the coming months. It is correct to say, however, that the attached proposed amendments to the future land use element is the beginning of the EAR process. As the planning board and Town Council continue the review of the full comprehensive plan, whether in this current process or in the EAR process, other amendments are expected to be forthcoming.

This package of amendments addresses issues related to allowable density, minimum open space levels, maximum contribution of wetlands and waterbodies to open space requirements and related actions. The amendments also address a proposed minimum lot size for residential development on land designated for Village Mixed Use.

The town attorney has prepared a draft ordinance for consideration. This report draws on the draft ordinance by excerpting proposed revisions to help focus the

discussion on each proposed amendment. Commentary is shown in italics. The complete future land use element with the proposed amendments (added words underlined, deleted words struck through) is also included in the agenda packet so the board and others can understand the full context of the proposed amendments.

In this staff report the discussion of individual amendments will follow in the order that they appear in the ordinance.

Proposed Plan and Policy Amendments

The first revisions are to Table 4 which summarizes the analysis of density and intensity for each land use classification. This table is the predicate for Policy 1.1.1. The revisions will change the maximum density for medium density residential land use and Village Mixed Use land use from four to three units per acre. The reduction in project density has been a primary suggestion across the board for suggestions received from the Town Council and planning board members.

Table 4: Permitted Maximum Density/Intensity within Land Use Categories
(as of amendments approved _____, 202__)

Future Land Use	Maximum Density/Intensity	Description
Rural Lifestyle (RL)	Must have a minimum of 2 acres for this land use. 1 dwelling unit per 2 acres; all buildings not to exceed .15 FAR; 20% max. impervious surface coverage; 50% open space required.	Primarily single-family detached homes with agricultural uses.
Low Density Residential (LDR)	2 dwelling units per acre	Primarily single-family detached homes.
Medium Density Residential (MDR)	<p>4 <u>3</u> dwelling units per acre; 25% minimum open space required.</p> <p>Developments with 100 units or more shall be required to have a public recreation component.</p> <p>Developments with <u>either</u> more than 300 proposed <u>dwelling</u> units <u>or more than 100 acres</u> must use the Village Mixed Use designation.</p>	Single-family detached homes, townhomes, etc.; this category may also include support community facilities and elementary schools.

This excerpt from Table 4 reproduced above notes the date when the amendment is approved to help tracking projects that might be impacted by the date of the revision. Projects where applications are received prior to the effective date of the revision will follow the current rule. The density revision from four to three units per acre is identified for medium density residential, and the threshold for the required use of the Village Mixed Use land use classification is revised. This last revision results from the proposed increase in the minimum project area for village mixed use projects from the current level of 25 acres to the proposed threshold of 100 acres. Under the current rule, projects with 300 units are required to adhere to VMU standards. The revision in the minimum area threshold will also require a policy to direct the process for any village mixed use designated parcels that fall under 100 acres.

While not a current proposed policy revision, note that larger projects of 100 units or more are required to include a public recreation component. Discussion at Town Council meetings and public input have noted a desire to include more recreation opportunities in new developments. The Venesia South and Talichet subdivisions apparently pre-dated this requirement, but all the village mixed use development proposals have included recreation facilities as have the other subdivisions including Whispering Heights and Watermark.

<p>Village Mixed Use (VMU)</p>	<p>Must have a minimum of 25 100 acres for this land use. Maximum of three -4 dwelling units per acre; May be increased to 6 town council may allow up to four dwelling units per acre if the development includes substantial recreation facilities for field sports, court games, and/or indoor recreation facilities. 20% usable public open space (no wetlands).</p> <p>Residential areas shall comprise a minimum of 70% of the Net Land Area and a maximum of 85% of the Net Land Area.</p> <p>Commercial/non-residential areas shall comprise a minimum of 15% of the Net Land Area and a maximum of 30% of the Net Land Area. This includes community facilities and schools.</p> <p>For developments with more than 100 acres, 5% Five percent (5%) of the non-res. land shall be dedicated for public/civic buildings.</p> <p>Commercial/non-residential may be 2 stories with 50% coverage as long as parking and other support facilities (stormwater) are met.</p> <p>Public recreational uses must occupy a minimum of 10% of the useable open space (no wetlands).</p> <p>A minimum of 25% open space is required.</p>	<p>A mix of uses is permitted and required in this category in order to promote sustainable development, including the provisions of reducing the dependability on the automobile, protecting more open land, and providing quality of life by allowing people to live, work, socialize, and recreate in close proximity. Elementary, middle, and high schools are also permitted in this category.</p>
--------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

This excerpt from Table 4 identifies the changes to Village Mixed Use which result from the revised density and revised minimum project size. Note again the change in the minimum project size and the density revision. For VMU projects the proposed amendment allows, but does not require, the Town Council to increase the density of a development from 3 to 4 DU/ac if active recreation using courts or indoor recreation opportunities are included in the project. Currently bonus units may be awarded for additional open space, but the revised proposal is more specific and more directly linked to desired recreation opportunities. The bonus provision also offers the opportunity to reach the current standard density. The other noted change is an editorial revision

since all projects will now be a minimum of 100 acres. The bonus provision is given at the discretion of the Town Council. The public/civic building requirement is retained as currently established.

Notes: Open Space: Open space is figured on the Gross Land Area. Up to ~~50%~~ 25% of the open space requirement may be met with wetlands. Open space may include landscaped buffers and stormwater facilities if they are designed to be a park-like setting with pedestrian amenities and free form ponds. Open space may be passive or active. Open space may include public recreational components of developments. Most of the open space shall be permeable; however, up to 10% may be impervious (plazas, recreational facilities, etc.). Wet ponds are not counted as part of that 10%.

Densities shall be determined by the Net Land Area. The Net Land Area is figured by taking the Gross Land Area (total property less any lakes or water bodies), then subtracting from that any open space requirements, then subtracting from that any remaining unbuildable acreage (remaining wetlands).

The final revision to Table 4 is in the note on open space calculation. The percentage of the open-space requirement that can be met with wetlands is reduced from 50% to 25%. The minimum total open space requirement will be retained at 25% of the gross project area. The full amount of wetland area will be protected, but wetlands will count towards only 25% of the minimum required open space. This revision will result in more upland open space area within individual projects while maintaining current wetland protections.

7. **2023 Analysis and Reevaluation of Residential Densities and Lot Sizes**

In 2023 the Town Council and the Town’s Planning and Zoning Board analyzed and reevaluated post-2010 residential development in the Town. Residential development under the Village Mixed Use designation resulted after 2010 in substantially increased housing densities and substantially smaller residential lots than were prevalent in the Town’s historical development.

The evaluation and analysis was accompanied by robust public participation. Public sentiment agreed overwhelmingly with Town Council: the increased densities and downsized lots after 2010 were inconsistent with the character, appearance, and ambiance of the Town’s historical neighborhoods. Contrary to FLUE Policy 1.1.2, development in Village Mixed Use had failed to “maintain the unique charm of the Town.”

Consequently, the Town Council determined that amendments to this Future Land Use Element to redirect future residential densities and lot sizes were warranted and desirable.

The preceeding section is added to the analysis portion of the future land use element to provide support for the reduction in overall project density for lands designated medium density and village mixed use. It also provides the basis for actions to establish minimums for at least some of the proposed residential lot sizes. It is essential that goal, objective and policy statements in the comprehensive plan be based on specific data where appropriate and on community values where appropriate. This statement links to a key policy in the future land use element that provides the key values staement in the comprehensive plan. While the goal, objective and policy decisions in the plan are legislative in nature, giving the Town some latitude in their construction, the policies still need to be rooted in sound planning decisions and reflective of stated community values.

OBJECTIVE 1.1: *Identifying Land Use Patterns and Permitted Densities and Intensities.* To identify the appropriate land use patterns, residential densities, and non-residential intensities of land use permitted in Howey-in-the-Hills.

POLICY 1.1.1: *Land Use Designations.* The Town shall establish, adopt and implement density and intensity standards for all future land uses, as applicable, and as indicated on the *Future Land Use Map* and the adopted Town Zoning Map.

Density and intensity standards for land uses in Howey-in-the-Hills are featured below.

Land Use	Maximum Residential Density
Residential:	
Low Density Residential (LDR)	Up to 2.0 dwelling units per acre. Maximum building height is 2-1/2 stories and no higher than 30 feet.
Medium Density Residential (MDR)	Up to 4.0 <u>3.0</u> dwelling units per acre. A 25% minimum open space is required. Developments with 100 units or more shall be required to have a public recreation component. Developments with <u>either</u> more than 300 proposed <u>dwelling</u> units <u>or more than 100 acres</u> must use the Village Mixed Use designation. May include support community facilities and elementary schools. Maximum building height is 2-1/2 stories and no higher than 30 feet.

The goals, objectives and policies comprise the portion of the comprehensive plan that are the action items intended to structure the land development regulations and guide development within the community. In many communities, the formally adopted comprehensive plan elements include only the goal, objective and policy statements and the required maps. These next few amendments take the findings and guidance from Table 4 and formally include the changes in the goal, objective and policy structure of the future land use element. The only change in Policy 1.1.1 in comparison to Table 4 is the elimination of language limiting development to 2 ½ stories. The policy will operate only with the maximum building height which is not revised from the current policy.

<p>Village Mixed Use (VMU)</p>	<p>Minimum of 25 100 acres to apply for this land use. Maximum density of 4 3.0 dwelling units per acre, which may be increased to 6 Town Council may allow an increase up to 4.0 dwelling units per acre if the development includes substantial recreation facilities for field sports, court games, and/or indoor recreation facilities. 20% usable public open space (no wetlands).</p> <p>Residential areas shall comprise a minimum of 70% of the net land area and a maximum of 85% of the net land area.</p> <p>Commercial/non-residential areas shall comprise a minimum of 15% of the net land area and a maximum of 30% of the net land area. This includes community facilities and schools.</p> <p><u>A minimum of fifty percent (50%) of single-family lots must have a minimum lot area of 10,800 square feet.</u></p> <p>For developments with more than 100 acres, <u>Five percent</u> (5%) of the non-residential land shall be dedicated for public/civic buildings.</p> <p>Commercial/non-residential may be 2 stories with 50% coverage as long as parking and other support facilities (stormwater) are met. The maximum building height is 35 feet.</p> <p>Public recreational uses must occupy a minimum of 10% of the useable open space (no wetlands).</p> <p>A minimum of 25% open space is required.</p> <p>The maximum building size is 30,000 sq. ft.; unless a special exception is granted to the developer by the Town Council.</p>
--------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

The proposed amendments to the Village Mixed Use land use classification again track the specific language introduced in Table 4. The one addition is inclusion of a minimum lot area that is applied to 50% of the proposed single-family lots. The general consensus at the workshop is that minimum lot area rather than a strict minimum lot dimension would be a better approach in getting larger lots. It was recognized that residential subdivision design often results in lots that do not adhere to rigid lot widths. At the Town Council’s workshop on November 1 Mayor MacFarlane said expressly that Town Council would leave it to the Planning Board to recommend a specific minimum lot size in VMU developments. The lot size of 10,800 sq. ft., which is just under one-fourth of an acre, was not voted on by the Council. It is an example given by staff, using lot dimensions of 90’x120’. The Board has the prerogative to recommend a different minimum.

This policy revision comes with a few cautions.

- *The development agreements that form the basis of any village mixed unit development will need to include carefully considered dimensional requirements so that side yard setbacks adequately space units along the street front, that front yard setbacks or at least garage setbacks allow for adequate off-street parking, and that rear setbacks provide adequate area to accommodate accessory structures such as swimming pools.*
- *Development projects may propose deeper and narrower lots in some cases. Thus lots may not have minimum widths of 80, 90 or 100 feet of frontage. For example, a lot depth of 120 feet will yield a lot width of 90 feet at the building line. A lot depth of 150 feet will yield a lot width of 72 feet at the building line. A lot depth of 135 feet will yield a lot width of 80 feet. We can expect developments to consider somewhat narrower and deeper lots to meet the policy criterion because the primary development costs (streets, sidewalks, utilities) are essentially front-foot sensitive. The more lots along a given street, the less the cost generated by each lot.*
- *Again as an example, if the Town wants single-family units spaced at 20 feet between units (ten foot sideyard setbacks) the buildable portion of the lot width on a 72 x 150 lot is 52 feet. This buildable width should be sufficient for a wide range of house designs.*
- *We can expect that the larger developments anticipated by the village mixed use land use will propose the balance of the single family lots at smaller lot sizes that developers consider more in tune with current market demand. Having at least half of the single-family units at larger sizes will allow the applicants and the town to arrange these larger lots on the site to provide maximum compatibility with adjacent development and to visually link newer neighborhoods with older neighborhoods within the town.*
- *This type of consideration is not an issue with standard zoning districts as these districts already have specified lot dimensions and setbacks.*

POLICY 1.1.2: *Land Use Categories.* The land use categories, as depicted on the Town’s 2035 *Future Land Use Map (FLUM)* shall permit the following uses and activities.

Village Mixed Use – Primarily intended to create sustainability and maintain the unique charm of the Town, including the provisions of reducing the dependability dependence on the automobile, protecting more open land, and providing quality of life by allowing people to live, work, socialize, and recreate

in close proximity. Elementary, middle, and high schools are also permitted in this category. Village Mixed Use parcels less than 100 acres shall use a planned unit development format and are not required to meet the non-residential and civic use requirements. The housing standards, public recreation and open space requirements shall still apply.

Policy 1.1.2 describes the categories applied to the future land use map. This excerpt presents the description of the Village Mixed Use category with the proposed amendments. The change in line three is simply an edit. The last two sentences are added to identify how to apply the village mixed use criteria to parcels that are under 100 acres in size. While the undeveloped and non-committed parcels now designated as village mixed use (Mission Rise and J-5 Equities) exceed 100 acres, these parcels could be subdivided and presented in smaller units.

The proposed policy will exempt these tracts from compliance with the non-residential development criteria and the minor criteria for civic land uses while retaining the commitment to public recreation and open space. The planned unit development process will continue as the primary zoning tool. The minimum requirement for at least 50% of the lots to meet or exceed 10,800 square feet also remains a component of the rules applied to these tracts.

POLICY 1.1.4: ***Interpretation of Open Space and Density Designations.*** Open space is figured on the Gross Land Area. Up to ~~50%~~ 25% of the open space requirement may be met with wetlands. Open space may include landscaped buffers and stormwater facilities if they are designed to be a park-like setting with pedestrian amenities and free form ponds. Open space may be passive or active. Open space may include public recreational components of developments. The majority of the open space shall be permeable; however, up to 10% may be impervious (plazas, recreational facilities, etc.). Wet ponds are not counted as part of that 10%.

POLICY 1.2.2: ***Open Space Requirements.*** The Town shall continue to ensure that residential development is consistent with the open space requirements established below:

Open Space: Open space is figured on the Gross Land Area. No greater than ~~50%~~ 25% of the open space requirement may be met with wetlands. Open space may include landscaped buffers and stormwater facilities if they are designed to be a park-like setting with pedestrian amenities and free form ponds. Open space may be passive or active. Open space may include public recreational components of developments. The majority of the open space shall be permeable; however, up to

10% may be impervious (plazas, recreational facilities, etc.).
Wet ponds are not counted as part of that 10%.

The amendments to Policy 1.1.4 and 1.2.2 simply adjust these policies to conform to the lesser wetland contribution to required open space in all projects.

POLICY 1.2.6: *Transition of Residential Densities.* The Town shall continue to orient the transition of residential densities on the *Future Land Use Map* toward higher densities along major transportation corridors and areas adjacent to commercial or other intensive land uses, while lower residential densities shall be directed towards areas **further farther** from the Town center (i.e., the central commercial district) and in areas adjacent to agricultural lands.

The revision to Policy 1.2.6 is an editorial revision.

OBJECTIVE 1.14: *Consistency and Compatibility with the Adopted Comprehensive Plan.* To ensure the Town’s Land Development Regulations, Zoning Districts, and Performance Standards are consistent with and compatible to the adopted *Comprehensive Plan*.

POLICY 1.14.1: *Land Development Regulations Consistency.*

The Land Development Regulations for the Town of Howey-in-the-Hills shall be consistent with, and serve to implement the goals, objectives and policies established within the *adopted Comprehensive Plan*. To implement the goals, objectives and policies of the *adopted Comprehensive Plan*, provisions shall be incorporated into the Land Development Regulations, and shall contain specific and detailed provisions which as a minimum:

- k. Provide that public facilities and services meet or exceed the standards established in the capital improvements element required by **Chaptersection 163.3177 of Florida Statutes, F.S.** and are available when needed for the development, or that development orders and permits are conditioned on the availability of these public facilities and services necessary to serve the proposed development.

The town attorney recommends correction of the state statute identification.

HOWEY-IN-THE HILLS

EVALUATION AND APPRAISAL REPORT

DEMOGRAPHIC ANALYSIS

INTRODUCTION

This report is the first in a series of presentations of community data, trends and issues affecting Howey-in-the-Hills as the town undertakes the periodic review of its comprehensive plan. This report will focus on the town's demographic profile based on data available from the U.S. Census, the American Community Survey, the Bureau of Economic and Business Research (BEBR) at the University of Florida, and the State Office of Economic and Demographic Research. The initial sections will focus on the town's population change over time, specific characteristics of the population that provide a profile of key demographic components, some information on housing, and social characteristics of the population. The report will also provide an estimate of population for the period from 2023 through 2040 using several alternative methods.

The data presented in this report will be one of the key inputs into the review of the various comprehensive plan elements. Future Land Use, Housing and Transportation Elements will particularly rely on this data. The population projections will be compared to the projections developed for the 2017-2018 Evaluation and Appraisal process.

POPULATION CHANGE OVER TIME

U.S. Census data on the population of Howey-in-the-Hills goes back to 1930; the first census when the town was recognized as a municipal entity in the census records. Table 1 provides census counts from 1930 through 2020. The data shows the town has seen spurts of population change rather than a steady progression of growth. Between 1930 and 1950 the town had a declining population, reaching a low point of 188 residents in 1950. The first large growth spurt occurred between 1950 and 1960 which saw the town increase by almost 114 percent. Lesser growth spurts came between 1970 and 1980 (34%), 1990 and 2000 (32%) and 2010 to 2020 (49%).

Given the small base of population, these periodic growth spurts are not unexpected as even a modest sized residential project can have a larger effect on the numbers. For example, the 2010 to 2020 growth was likely driven in large part by the completion of the

Venezia South subdivision and some infill development primarily along South Florida Avenue. Earlier growth spurts can be tied to residential development in the Mission Inn complex.

**TABLE 1
TOWN-OF-HOWEY-IN-THE-HILLS
U.S. CENSUS POPULATION COUNTS 1930 - 2020**

YEAR	POPULATION	CHANGE	PERCENT CHANGE
2020	1,643	545	49.6
2010	1,098	142	14.9
2000	956	232	32.0
1990	724	98	15.7
1980	626	160	34.3
1970	466	64	15.9
1960	402	214	113.8
1950	188	-15	-7.4
1940	203	-135	-39.9
1930	338	NA	NA

The town’s official population for 2023 as set by BEBR and published by the State Office of Economic and Demographic Research is 1,790 or an increase of 147 over the 2020 census count. Most of this population increase is driven by development in the Talichet Phase 1 project. The Talichet Phase 2 homes are just now coming online and will be reflected in the 2024 population counts. Remember that the official state counts are done as of April 1st of each calendar year and are largely driven by electric meter statistics. New residents moving into homes in town after the end of March will not be counted until next year.

CHARACTERISTICS OF THE POPULATION

The following information provides a snapshot description of the current population with regard to several descriptive statistics. This data comes from the American Community Survey and is based on survey data that has an accuracy range of 90% probability. As such the totals in some cases may not align completely with the census data or the estimates of population provided by BEBR. Nevertheless, the data can be useful in giving a reasonably accurate picture of the town residents. The tables provide some information on social characteristics and economic characteristics.

TABLE 2 TOWN OF HOWEY-IN-THE-HILLS POPULATION BY RACE		
RACE	TOTAL	PERCENT
White	1321	80.4
Black	100	6.1
Asian	16	1.0
Other	62	3.8
More Than One	144	8.8
Total	1643	100.0

Data based on 2021 ACS

TABLE 3 TOWN OF HOWEY-IN-THE-HILLS SCHOOL ENROLLMENT		
GRADE	TOTAL	PERCENT
Pre-School	20	6.0
Kindergarten	16	4.8
Elementary	113	33.7
High School	127	37.9
College	59	17.6
Total	335	100.0

Data based on 2021 ACS

TABLE 4 TOWN OF HOWEY-IN-THE-HILLS HOUSEHOLD INCOME			
INCOME RANGE	HOUSEHOLDS	TOWN PERCENT	FLORIDA PERCENT
<10,000	35	4.5	5.9
10,000 - 14,999	8	1.0	3.9
15,000 - 24,999	58	7.4	8.6
25,000 - 34,999	53	6.8	9.3
35,000 - 49,999	101	12.9	13.0
50,000 - 74,999	147	18.7	18.2
75,000 - 99,999	114	14.5	12.8
100,000 - 149,999`	120	15.3	14.7
150,000 - 199,999	93	11.8	6.3
200,000 +	56	7.1	7.3

Data based on 2021 ACS

TABLE 5 TOWN OF HOWEY-IN-THE-HILLS AGE PROFILE	
AGE RANGE	PERCENT
< 5	3.8
5 - 9	5.1
10 - 14	4.0
15 - 19	5.2
20 - 24	3.8
25 - 34	10.1
35 - 44	9.6
45 - 54	17.2
55 - 59	5.8
60 - 64	9.9
65 - 74	13.2
75 - 84	9.1
85 +	3.2

Data based on 2021 ACS

The statistics profile a community that has relatively few minorities, has a school age population of about 17.5 % from pre-school through high school, and has a retirement age population of just over 25%. Household incomes tend to run above the averages for Florida as a whole. The median household income is reported as \$73,813 and the mean household income is reported as \$93,332. These figures exceed the state median of \$61,777 and state mean income of \$88,267.

Data on employment shows that about 60% of the residents are employed with the other 40% not currently in the workforce. Unemployment was low with only 2.1% of the persons in the labor force being reported as unemployed.

HOUSING CHARACTERISTICS

Information was gathered on selected housing characteristics to add to the community profile and to assess housing needs based on several traditional categories. The census reported on 855 total housing units of which 785 units were occupied and 70 units were identified as unoccupied. The percentage of units unoccupied was 8.2% versus a statewide average of 16.5%. Unoccupied units are often vacant units for sale and seasonally occupied units. These reported percentages suggest the town has fewer seasonal residents than the state as a whole.

Housing statistics also confirm the town has relatively few units that are not single-family detached homes. The data shows 736 detached single-family units, 29 attached single-family units, five units in two-family dwellings and 85 units in buildings with three or four units. Again, the timing of this data precedes the completion of Talichet Phases 1 and 2 and the addition of the townhouse units in Venezia South. The following summaries provide some additional information. Table 6 shows a community that is dominated by owner occupied units with very few units lacking in some facilities or exhibiting overcrowding conditions.

TABLE 6 TOWN OF HOWEY-IN-THE-HILLS SELECTED HOUSING STATISTICS		
Occupied Units	785	
Owner Occupied	666	84.8%
Renter Occupied	119	15.2%
Facilities		
Lacking Plumbing	2	
Lacking Kitchen	2	
Occupants per Room		
1.00 or Less	733	98.3
1.01 - 1.50	10	1.3
1.51 of More	2	0.4

Data based on 2021 ACS.

The next set of tables provides information on the value of owner-occupied units in comparison with state statistics, gross rent, and gross rent as a percentage of income. As the data indicates, Howey-in-the-Hills has generally higher housing values than the state averages while rents tend to be a little lower. However, like most communities the percentage of renters paying more than 30% of their income for housing is an issue of affordability with 62% of renters exceeding the 30% level. The thirty percent mark is typically identified as the standard maximum for affordable housing expenditures. The median rent is reported as \$1,347 monthly.

TABLE 7			
TOWN OF HOWEY-IN-THE-HILLS			
VALUE OF OWNER-OCCUPIED UNITS			
VALUE RANGE	UNITS	TOWN PERCENT	FLORIDA PERCENT
< 50,000	5	0.8	6.1
50,000 - 99,999	21	3.2	8.0
100,000 - 149,999	68	10.2	9.5
150,000 - 199,999	90	13.5	13.5
200,000 - 299,999	239	35.9	25.2
300,000 - 499,999	153	23.0	24.7
500,000 - 999,999	90	13.5	10.0
1,000,000 +	0	0.0	2.9
		100.0	100.0

TABLE 8			
TOWN OF HOWEY-IN-THE-HILLS			
GROSS RENT			
VALUE RANGE	UNITS	TOWN PERCENT	FLORIDA PERCENT
< 500	0	0.0	4.5
500 - 999	25	21.0	21.4
1,000 - 1,499	51	42.9	38.5
1,500 - 1,999	25	21.0	22.8
2,000 - 2,499	18	15.1	8.0
2,500 - 2,999	0	0.0	2.6
3,000 +	0	0.0	2.2
		100.0	100.0

TABLE 9			
TOWN OF HOWEY-IN-THE-HILLS			
GROSS RENT AS A PERCENT OF INCOME			
VALUE RANGE	UNITS	TOWN PERCENT	FLORIDA PERCENT
< 15	9	7.6	8.7
15 - 19.9	10	8.4	10.6
20 - 24.9	10	8.4	12.2
25 - 29.9	16	13.4	11.6
30 - 34.9	14	11.8	9.6
35 +	60	50.4	47.2
		100.0	100.0

POPULATION PROJECTIONS

Population projections are an essential requirement of the planning process, but projections for small units of government or small areas are notoriously difficult to accurately generate. Relatively small actions can have an outsized impact on projections when the initial population base is small. In the 2017 EAR update the 2020 population was projected to be 1,520 and the 2025 population was projected as 1,652. These projections were a little low as the census counted 1,643 in 2020 and BEBR estimated the 2023 population at 1,790. The residential housing market after 2017 was more robust than anticipated and the accelerated building program that saw the completion of Venezia South single-family neighborhood and the rapid build-out of Talichet Phases 1 and 2 accelerated the population growth ahead of estimates.

With the build-out of Talichet anticipated in early 2024 there may be a lull in residential construction in the town as there is not a ready supply of lots for development. The Hillside Groves Phase 1 is moving through final development approvals, but once approved the construction of roads and other infrastructure is likely to take most of a year to bring new residential lots online. This is assuming the development moves quickly to construction once approvals are obtained. The other pending projects including Watermark, Lake Hills and Whispering Heights are being delayed in part by the lack of sewage treatment availability.

The Office of Economic and Demographic Research has done some analysis of trends affecting population growth in Florida. They note that by 2025-2026 all population growth in Florida will be from net migration. Deaths will outnumber births leaving population growth to be determined by the excess of in-migrants over those departing the state. This condition leaves the state particularly vulnerable to events elsewhere in the country. Weak housing markets in the Northeast or Midwest could limit the ability of residents in these areas to sell their homes and move to Florida.

The agency also projects that retirees will be a key driving force generating new residents. The median age range for Lake County is already high falling between 45.6 and 52.6 years. As noted above, the retiree age population in Howey is already 25% and most of the new developments being proposed are targeting the retiree market. The agency also projected that people over 60 will constitute 53% of the population growth between 2010 and 2030. We are just over halfway through this period and the statistics are supporting the projection.

One method of projecting population growth is to assume Howey-in-the-Hills will maintain a constant share of the Lake County population over the planning period. Table 10 provides a comparison of the Lake County population projections with a constant share projection for Howey.

TABLE 10 TOWN OF HOWEY-IN-THE-HILLS TOWN POPULATION AS A PERCENT OF LAKE COUNTY			
YEAR	LAKE COUNTY POPULATION	HOWEY POPULATION	PERCENT
2020	383,956	1,643	0.43
2025	432,345	1,859	0.43
2030	474,963	2,042	0.43
2035	509,812	2,192	0.43
2040	538,082	2,314	0.43

Lake County projections from BEBR

Another option is to assume an absorption rate for new units that have been approved for development and then convert the units to population based on the average household size of 2.39 persons. The Talichet developments are the most recent examples of new developments. Based on the project total of 114 units which have largely been constructed in the three-year period between 2021 and 2023, the absorption rate has averaged about 38 units per year. Allowing for some infill development in other areas of the town, an absorption rate of 40 to 45 units annually seems reasonable. One expects that this absorption rate may be on the low side as outside of Talichet there have been very few lots available for development. If one of the other approved projects had been available for construction, there may have been sufficient market to support added residential development. Table 11 provides a summary of population growth based on the absorption rate assumptions.

TABLE 11 TOWN OF HOWEY-IN-THE-HILLS TOWN POPULATION BASED ON ABSORPTION RATES			
YEAR	PROJECTED UNITS	NEW POPULATION	TOTAL POPULATION
2020			1,643
2023			1,790
2025	80	191	1,981
2030	200	478	2,459
2035	225	538	2,997
2040	225	538	3,535

TMH Consulting Projections

Table 11 assumes an absorption rate of 40 units per year through 2030 and 45 units per year through 2040. New population is generated based on 2.39 people per unit. When compared with Table 10, the population projection is larger than is generated by a constant share approach. Under the Table 11 assumptions, Howey-in-the-Hills will be 6.6% of total county population by 2040.

From 2023 through 2040 the town's population would grow by 97%. Comparing this growth rate to the historical growth rate for the ten years leading up to 2023 which was 64%, the absorption rate calculation seems to be reasonable. For the 10-year historical period, the only larger scale projects were Venezia South and Talichet. Going forward there are four approved projects totaling almost 1,900 dwelling units. The population projection assumes that only about 40% of these units will be developed over the planning period. As a best projection, Table 11 results are recommended as the population projections for use in the current update.