

PLAN COMMISSION PC #22-017
Dryden School Building Expansion
772 S Dryden Place
Round 2

34. The petitioner's response to comments 11-13, 16, 17, 19, 20, 22-30, 32 & 33 are acceptable.
35. The petitioner's response to comment no. 14 is noted. The preliminary stormwater management report has been reviewed:
- a) Provide a detailed stormwater report.
 - b) The legacy area is to be reconstructed and does not drain to the proposed Storm Tech system. Although the plan indicates the parking lot detains .24 ac ft, provide additional calculations showing what would be required to meet current Village requirements for Bulletin 75. The difference shall be accounted for in the Storm Tech system.
 - c) Provide a detail showing the restrictor structure.
 - d) Minimum restrictor size for maintenance reasons is 2". Sheet C301 indicates the restrictor is 1.85".
 - e) Clearly show the overflow route for the site.
36. The petitioner's response to comment no. 15 is noted. If additional detention storage is provided, the Village is agreeable to allow the additional storage to be allocated to the School District for any future development on the Dryden School Property.
37. The petitioner's response to comment no. 18 is noted. As the existing building is fully sprinklered, the Village has no further concerns regarding fire access.
38. The petitioner's response to comment no. 21 is noted. Per the Building & Life Safety Department, the following codes shall apply:
- a) International Building Code 2018 Edition.
 - b) International Fire Code 2018 Edition
 - c) 2016 NFPA 13
39. The existing exit is under stop control and detectable warning panels at the crossing. Show the detectable warning panels on the plan.

Public Works:

40. The petitioner's response to comment no. 31 is noted. The Storm Tech Operations and Maintenance schedule shall be provided. This can be addressed at final engineering.

Traffic:

41. Staff has observed queuing issues and congestion on Rockwell Ave with vehicles stacking on both sides of the street. Rockwell is only approximately 27 ft wide east of Dryden and only approximately 24 ft wide west of Dryden. With vehicles stacking on both sides of the street, Rockwell Ave is narrowed to a single lane. If this issue is exacerbated with the proposed full-day kindergarten, SD 25 shall evaluate and address the traffic issues. SD 25 shall accept this understanding.


Michael L. Pagones, P.E. 1/13/23
Village Engineer Date

Planning & Community Development Dept. Review

January 13, 2023



REVIEW ROUND 2

Project: Westgate School Building Expansion
500 S. Dwyer Ave.

Case Number: PC 22-016

34. The responses to the following comments are acceptable: 1-6, 9-11, 13, 14, 18-20, 28-30, and 32.
35. The response to comment #7 is noted. Based on the revised plans and responses to comments, the following approvals are required:
- Special Use Permit to allow a Public Elementary School on the subject property.
 - Variation to Chapter 28, Section 10.4-4, to allow 61 parking stalls where 67 are required.
 - Variation to Chapter 28, Section 5.1-3.6, to allow a building addition at 25.3' in height where building heights are restricted to a maximum height of 25'
 - Variation to Chapter 28, Section 5.1-3.3a, to allow a 22.1' front yard setback for the existing building where a minimum 24.1' setback is required.
 - Variation to Chapter 28, Section 5.1-3.3b, to allow a 10.7' side yard setback (north) for the existing building where a minimum 72.7' setback is required.
 - Variation to Chapter 28, Section 5.1-3.3d, to allow a 29' rear yard setback for the existing and proposed building where a minimum 30' setback is required
 - Variation to Chapter 28, Section 5.1-3.5a, to allow 40.5% building lot coverage where maximum building lot coverage is restricted to 35%.
 - Variation to Chapter 28, Section 6.5-2, to allow a sport court outside of a rear yard and within a side yard.
 - Variation to Chapter 28, Section 6.15-1.2b, to omit the required landscape islands at the southern end of the eastern most parking row within the North lot.
36. The response to comment #8 is noted. As the District has maintained that maximum expected enrollment is 526 students and has not provided a theoretical maximum possible enrollment based on built capacity, a restriction of approval will be recommended that restricts maximum occupancy within the proposed building to 526 students.
37. The response to comment #12 is noted. The response references a new playground structure on the east side of the school and changes to the western playground. Additionally, the revised project narrative does not reference any exterior changes. The text below the staff data table states that staffing will increase by 3, however the table shows staff to increase by 5. Please clarify the exterior changes and confirm the number of new staff.
38. The response to #15 is noted. No measurements have been added to show the perimeter dimensions of the site. Based on the revised plat, please confirm that the following are accurate:
- North: 301.42'
 - South: Approx. 301.41'
 - West: 726.82'
 - East: Approx. 726.82'
39. The response to comment #16 is noted. Based on the revised Plat, the required side yard setback is 72.7' (10 % of lot width). This adjusts the setback variation for the existing building to 10.7' where 72.7' is required, as noted above.

40. The response to comment #17 is noted. Based on the response, the need for the dumpster enclosure fence height variation has been eliminated.
41. The response to comment #21 is noted. However, full depth removal of the asphalt parking lot triggers the requirement for the replacement to conform to current code requirements relative to landscaping. Accordingly, the following variation is required:
- Variation to Chapter 28, Section 6.15-1.2b, to omit the required landscape island (including a shade tree) at the ends of certain rows of parking. Specifically, 1) the south side of the eastern most two parking stalls within the North lot, and 2) the west side of the northern most parking row within the North lot). Staff is supportive of the first variation but is not supportive of the second variation and is recommending installation of the code required landscape island and shade tree.
42. The response to comment #22 is noted. Please refer to comment #36.
43. The response to comment #23 is noted. Should the agreement with the church expire, additional drop-off/pick-up loading areas and/or parking shall be required, or changes to address parking issues with drop-off/pick-up must be implemented at the discretion of the Village.
44. The response to comment #24 is noted. Wheel stops should be added to the two eastern most parking stalls within the North lot.
45. The response to comment #25 is noted. Based on the dimensions added to the revised plans, the drive aisle width in the South lot complies with Code and no variation is required.
46. The response to comment #26 is noted. If the significant issues with parking or drop-off/pick-up are created as a result of the increased school capacity, which shall be at the discretion of the Village, then SD25 shall be required to work with the Village to address any such issues, which could involve additional staff actively monitoring drop-off/pick-up operations, changes to drop-off/pick-up procedures, additional outreach to families to inform/encourage compliance with procedures, and any other means deemed appropriate by the Village as necessary to address drop-off/pick-up issues.
47. The response to comment #27 is noted. However, during Village observations of the pick-up queuing at Dryden School, cars were stopping/standing at the Dryden/Rockwell intersection to await entry into the queue, which extended to the Dryden/Rockwell intersection. Please see #46 above.
48. The response to comment #31 is noted, however, no details were provided on the length or terms of the parking agreement with the Southminster Church. Please provide details.
49. The response to comment #33 is noted, however, the plans do not indicate the number of bike parking spaces provided within the racks. Please confirm.
50. As the curbs within the South lot are being altered, the School District may wish to consider revising the three ADA parking stalls in the South lot to where two stalls share accessible striping and altering the accessible path to lead to the west directly across the loading lane. This would allow one additional parking stall within the South lot.

Prepared by: 

Dryden School Building Expansion
722 S. Dryden Place
PC #22-017
January 12, 2023

Landscape Issues

- 1) The ends of all parking rows and every 20 parking spaces shall include a landscape island equal in area to one parking space. In addition, the island must include a 4" caliper shade tree (Chapter 28, section 6.16-1.2b). The islands/trees are absent for both parking areas located in the northwest and southeast corner.

Please either comply with Code or seek a variance for the island and shade trees that are absent for the parking area in the southeast corner. In addition, a variance is required for the islands absent in the northwest corner where it is required at the ends of each parking row.

- 2) Per Chapter 28, Section 6.15 a three foot high screen is required between the public right of way and the parking area. For the parking area in the southeast corner, please indicate on the plan that the existing three foot high screen will remain.

This has been addressed and there are no additional comments.

- 3) Provide six foot high landscaping or a fence that provides year round opacity along the north property line in order to screen the parking lot located in the northwest corner. Per Chapter 28, Section 6.15-2 all paved parking areas shall be effectively screened from a residential district.

The existing screen along the north property line adjacent to the parking area is nonconforming. If and when the screen deteriorates it will need to be replaced with code compliant six foot high screen.