



City of Aurora

44 East Downer Place
Aurora, Illinois 60505
www.aurora-il.org

Legistar History Report

File Number: 15-00963

File ID: 15-00963 **Type:** Ordinance **Status:** Agenda Ready

Version: 3 **General Ledger #:** **In Control:** Planning & Development Committee

File Created: 10/23/2015

File Name: SD 129 / Nancy Hill Elementary / Special Use/Final Plan / 724 Pennsylvania **Final Action:**

Title: An Ordinance Granting a Special Use Permit for an Educational Services Use on the Property located at 724 Pennsylvania Avenue

Notes:

Agenda Date: 11/23/2015

Agenda Number:

Sponsors:

Enactment Date:

Attachments: Exhibit "A" Legal Description, Exhibit "B-1" Final Plan - 2015-11-13 - 2015.163.pdf, Exhibit "B-2" Landscape Plan - 2015-11-16 - 2015.163.pdf, Exhibit "B-3" Building & Signage Elevations - 2015-10-22 - 2015.163.pdf, Exhibit "B-4" Fire Plan - 2015-11-13 - 2015.163.pdf, Exhibit "C" Memorandum of Agreement.pdf, Engineering Staff Comments - 2015-11-05 - 2015.163.pdf, Fire Prevention Bureau Staff comments - 2015-11-03.pdf, Property Research Sheet - 2015-07-29 - 2015.163.pdf, Land Use Petition and Supporting Documents - 2015-10-22 - 2015.163.pdf, Plat of Survey - 2015-10-22 - 2015.163.pdf, Legistar History Report - Special Use - 2015-11-12 - 2015.163.pdf

Enactment Number:

Planning Case #: AU16/4-15.163-Rz/Su/Fpn

Hearing Date:

Drafter: tvacek@aurora-il.org

Effective Date:

History of Legislative File

Ver- sion:	Acting Body:	Date:	Action:	Sent To:	Due Date:	Return Date:	Result:
1	City Council	10/27/2015	referred to	DST Staff Council (Planning Council)			
	Action Text: This Petition was referred to to the DST Staff Council (Planning Council)						
1	DST Staff Council (Planning Council)	11/03/2015					
	Notes: <i>Representative Present: Pat Kelsey</i>						
	<i>Mr. Kelsey said Hill School is being replaced. It opened in 1892 and can't efficiently be made ADA</i>						

accessible throughout and there is a significant need for a new school. The final plan shows the final configuration. The trick to this is that the School District has added additional lots to the north, but they need to leave the existing school in place during construction with 2 of the 3 mobile classrooms remaining on site to accommodate the students who attend that school. That school is mostly a school of walkers, so there aren't a ton of buses that come there, but there are some. The site is 3.96 acres. The total lot coverage at final completion will be 55% and we're proposing stormwater detention in the southeast corner where the existing building is today, taking advantage of the additional excavation that will already be done in removing the foundation of the existing school and that underground detention will provide an adequate amount of detention storage for the new facility. The way that that was evaluated was that we calculated the existing runoff and we're not increasing the runoff. The critical duration storm was the 100 year, 2 hour and we are reducing that from 13.1, 13.2 CFS to 9.1. We did not do a downstream offsite storm sewer analysis however. We started to see that comment at West High. If that is something that you are going to want, we should probably chat about that.

Mr. Feltman said I think we're in review right now. I think what we were going to do is try to set up a meeting with you guys and just kind of sit down and go over the stormwater.

Mr. Kelsey said we would appreciate that. As far as the building façade and all that, I really can't speak to it. I'm not sure why the architect isn't here, but they are not. What I can tell you is the southernmost section of the building, which has the little indents on either side, is a 3 story structure. It is a pre-cast building. There is a gymnasium, office space, and then the kindergarten space to the north are all single story facilities. I know we had had some brief discussions at the submittal meeting about hydrant coverage and about where to put the Siamese connection on the building. Those didn't get incorporated by the time we had submitted.

Mr. Feltman said we are going to meet internally to try to figure out what would be the best positioning for the hydrants.

Mr. Kelsey said if you tell us where you want the hydrants, that's probably going to be best for us.

Mr. Feltman said right now the 2 hydrant leads that you are showing are in excess of our standard 150 feet and I think they are too close to the building the way they are located right now.

Mr. Krientz said there are some that are just random locations in the field that are not usable.

Mr. Feltman said so we're going to need to take a good look at the hydrant coverage. The other thing is that the mains in the area are 6 inch and there are 2 distribution mains that are 14 and 12. We're going to try to talk to Water Production to see if it is okay if you guys tap onto that. I think we'd rather you tap onto that than these older 6's. Generally we try to not have taps on our transmission mains, but we'll see. I think you are going to need to tap onto it just to get fire flow for your fire suppression.

Mr. Kelsey said okay. Do you think we'll know that shortly?

Mr. Feltman said yes. We are in review right now. I expect comments maybe by the end of the week or maybe the early part of next week.

Mr. Kelsey said okay. We are in receipt of the city's final plan comments and we've started to address them and we'll have a submittal for the 6th.

Ms. Phifer said and Pat, we had talked about with the West High, as well as this one, that the School District seemed open to following up with the subdivision, a resubdivision. Are you thinking that's going to follow up with this one or is that going to catch up?

Mr. Kelsey said that one will have to catch up with this one. The problem with this one is that plats were done by 3 different surveyors and not all by a single surveyor, so nobody ever wants to touch anybody else's work, so it's going to have to catch up.

Ms. Phifer said okay.

Mr. Sieben said so in summary Planning and Zoning comments have gone out. Engineering comments will be out in the near future.

Mr. Krientz said Fire will be going out as well.

Mr. Sieben said do you have any other comments on the record Gary right now?

Mr. Krientz said yes. There is going to be some aerial apparatus lane issues and some access issues that we will be getting out to you. This building is tall enough we're going to need to have aerial apparatus coverage from one whole side of the building, so we are going to have to figure that out with you. The fire access lanes, the ones on the plan, are listed as 12 feet and they need to be 26 feet. We'll have to address some of those issues with you too. The Fire Department connection is going to be the Penn Avenue side.

Mr. Kelsey said yes. What we talked about was putting it actually on the end of the 3 story addition so that it would face Penn, but it would be also visible from Illinois so it would be...

Mr. Sieben said at the southeast corner of the building.

Mr. Kelsey said yes, in the southeast corner of the building.

Mr. Sieben said so it would suffice for the Penn address, but still kind of have dual...

Mr. Kelsey said we are trying to keep the Penn address if at all possible. That changes a great deal of things in the education world.

Mr. Feltman said I sat down with the City Traffic Engineer yesterday and we've got some concerns about drop-off and pickup. We'll probably be making a few suggestions. We haven't formalized it yet, but it will be part of our review.

Mr. Kelsey said okay, that's fine. We've been waiting for those.

Mr. Sieben said I think we did discuss them a little bit at the DST meeting.

Mr. Kelsey said we did, and again, there aren't a tremendous number of good options because of just the way the neighborhood lays out with Penn and Iowa not having a cut through street in that part of the neighborhood.

Ms. Phifer said so we are running into the end of the year with regard to scheduling, so we were hoping to actually get this to the second Planning Commission meeting in November, so if you guys can get your comments out that would be greatly appreciated so we can try to get everything addressed in time for that meeting.

1	DST Staff Council (Planning Council)	11/10/2015	Forwarded	Planning Commission	12/02/2015	Pass
---	---	------------	-----------	------------------------	------------	------

Action Text: A motion was made by Mrs. Vacek, seconded by Mr. Beneke, that this agenda item be Forwarded to the Planning Commission, on the agenda for 12/2/2015. The motion carried by voice vote.

Notes: Mrs. Vacek said I make a motion to move this out of Planning Council. This is going to next Wednesday's Planning Commission. We did meet with the School District this morning and we did talk a little bit about traffic and traffic patterns and stacking and stuff of that nature, so they will be making some revisions to that. I'm assuming that there might be some Engineering conditions placed on this.

Mr. Feltman said well they are going to try to work on more car stacking for pickup and drop-off. I think it was a pretty productive meeting. It seemed like they were receptive to the change. It is still going to impact the roadways, but it is going to be far better than it is today.

Mr. Beneke said Fire also has comments on this. I believe they've sent their notes out and they talked with Dan. We talked last week about some of the comments we have. Fire will be working with them to resolve any of their issues.

Mr. Feltman said this drop-off/pickup had to be resolved first, but we are aware that there are fire access lanes that need to be maintained.

Mr. Sieben said do I have a second? Obviously, there may be conditions eventually.

Mr. Feltman said are you going to make a condition about the reconfiguration?

Ms. Phifer said I think that the traffic congestion and the pickup/drop-off concerns need to be addressed and all the fire comments need to be addressed. Those are the 2 conditions.

Mr. Beneke seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

2	Planning Commission	11/18/2015	Forwarded	Planning & Development Committee	11/23/2015	Pass
---	---------------------	------------	-----------	--	------------	------

Action Text: A motion was made by Mrs. Anderson, seconded by Mr. Bergeron, that this agenda item be Forwarded to the Planning & Development Committee, on the agenda for 11/23/2015. The motion carried.

Notes: See attachment for Items 15-00962 and 15-00963.

Aye: 8 At Large Bergeron, At Large Cameron, At Large Cole, Aurora Twnshp Representative Reynolds, At Large Anderson, At Large Divine, At Large Engen and SD 131 Representative Garcia

3	Planning & Development Committee	11/23/2015				
---	-------------------------------------	------------	--	--	--	--

Attachment for Items 15-00962 and 15-00963

15-00962 An Ordinance Amending Ordinance Number 3100, being the Aurora Zoning Ordinance and the Zoning Map attached thereto, by rezoning property located at 724 Pennsylvania Avenue from R-1 and R-3 One Family Dwelling to P – Park and Recreation District (Whitt Law LLC – L115-00962 / AU16/4-15.163-Rz/Su/Fpn – TV – Ward 6 (PUBLIC HEARING)

15-00963 An Ordinance granting a Special Use Permit for an Educational Services Use on the property located at 724 Pennsylvania Avenue (Whitt Law LLC – L15-00963 / AU16/4-15.163-Rz/Su/Fpn – TV – Ward 6) (PUBLIC HEARING)

Vice Chairman Truax said our first item of business is an Ordinance amending Ordinance Number 3100, being the Aurora Zoning Ordinance and the zoning map attached thereto, by rezoning property located at 724 Pennsylvania Avenue from R-1 and R-3 One Family Dwelling District to P Park and Recreation District. It is in Ward 6 and this is a public hearing.

Mrs. Vacek said can we also take the next one at the same time?

Vice Chairman Truax said indeed we can and that's an Ordinance granting a Special Use Permit for an Educational Services Use on the property located at 724 Pennsylvania Avenue in Ward 6, also a Public Hearing.

Mrs. Vacek said the subject property is being rezoned from R-1 and R-3 One Family Dwelling District to P Park and Recreational District. This zoning is consistent with the other school sites in the City of Aurora.

The Special Use and the Final Plan proposal consists of requesting approval of a Special Use for the educational services and then the Final Plan that I just put up on the screen for you includes the construction of a new building on the west side of the site and the demolition of the existing building after completion. The new school building will be approximately 72,330 square feet and will have the capacity of 750 students. Along with the new building, an 80 space parking lot is being proposed at the southeast portion of the property where the existing school currently is located. Access into the site is from Pennsylvania Avenue with a drive around the parking lot to provide stacking for drop-off and departure. I will turn it over to the School District, unless you have any questions for me.

The Petitioners were sworn in.

Good evening again. My name is Stuart Whitt. My address is 70 S. Constitution Drive, Aurora, 60506. I'm an attorney for the Board of Education of West Aurora School District #129 and I'm the Petitioner in this matter, which involves the rezoning of property at 724 Pennsylvania Avenue in Aurora from R-1 and R-3 One Family Dwelling to P Park and Recreation District, which is Item 15-00962, as well as the granting of a Special Use Permit for an Educational Services Use of that property, which is agenda item 15-00963. That would allow for the construction of a new Nancy Hill Elementary School to replace the existing building that was first constructed in 1888. A lot of Aurorans went to it, including my wife. With me this evening is Dr. Jeff Craig, the School District Superintendent. Dr. Craig will make a brief statement this evening. He will be followed by Mr. Pat Callahan, a principal at the architectural firm of Studio GC and lead architect for this project. He will discuss both the final plan as well as the architectural plans for this project. Pat Kelsey of Wills Burke Kelsey is not available this evening, but we

do have present Mr. Justin Benham, the Design Engineer, and he'll be able to answer any questions you may have with regard to the final plan. Dr. Craig.

Thank you. Good evening tonight. I want to just tell that you that we are here tonight as Petitioners to present the proposed rebuilding of Nancy Hill Elementary. Last spring our community spoke definitively with a positive referendum vote. Because these are tax dollars, we are committed to responding to the needs of our community, and the students and staff of Nancy Hill Elementary. The proposed new school will replace the existing building, which is now 128 years old, built just 23 short years after the Civil War. The new facility will provide adequate instructional and play space for grades Pre-K through 5. The City of Aurora, the surrounding neighbors and the School District share a mutual desire to eliminate the mobile classrooms, provide appropriate parking, sufficient queuing space and reduce traffic on adjacent streets. These projects attend to all those identified needs. Thank you for your consideration tonight.

Good evening. Pat Callahan, 223 W. Jackson, Chicago, Illinois 60606. I'll start by discussing the final plan. As was previously mentioned by staff, the existing lot is about 3.96 acres. Total lot coverage for buildings, walks and pavement is about 2.47 acres with a lot coverage percentage of 62%. Open space is 1.49 acres with an open space coverage of 38%. We are requesting a rear yard setback variance of zero on the west. The proposed plan has a drop-off loop in addition to 80 total parking spaces, which includes 4 handicap spaces. Stormwater detention and stormwater management on site is going to be handled with on-site detention to take off the peak demand using an underground vault located in that square box right in the middle of the parking lot. A storm trap is what it is commonly referred to. Then the remaining 1.24 acres will be requested to be cash in lieu of. So a total compensatory storage of 1.99 acre feet is required for this parcel. If you don't have any questions on the final plan, I'll move to the elevations. The classroom portion of the building, which is located on the corner of Iowa and Illinois, is the multi-story structure which will house grades 1-5. The one story portion of the building, looking at the top elevation on the far right hand side, which is the one story, is where the Pre-K and Kindergarten will be. That is the closest to the neighbors. The objective was to scale the building down as we got further into the neighborhood. One item of note, the existing Hill building is actually a 3 story building. It has essentially an English basement. The maximum height to the parapet is 39 feet. We are proposing a variance in height in this location and our building is being proposed at 44½ feet, I believe, if memory serves me correctly. Let me verify my dimension. Yes, that's correct. Essentially the structure will match in close vertical height to the existing structure, the existing Hill building. The east elevation of the structure facing Pennsylvania will maintain the same address as the current structure. It has a Pennsylvania address now. We need to maintain that for public records of students. The exterior façade is masonry cladding around the perimeter with a combination of punched openings, window openings, and Kalwall, which is a translucent panel around the perimeter of the gymnasium. This is the proposed landscape plan. Again, our objective on this property is to try to maintain as much green space as possible, but using it as active green space. Many of the perimeter parkway trees will remain. We are trying to maintain the existing mature trees at the northeast corner of the property at Pennsylvania and Illinois, which are on the front of the existing building with the placement of our parking lot and through the demolition of the existing structure. The play areas will be on the north side of the property closest, where the green space exists between Iowa and Pennsylvania. The remaining landscaping is per ordinance. With that, I would entertain any questions or comments you have.

Mr. Garcia said regarding the exterior of the wall, I've seen some of the new structures where there is some reason after it is already built you see a white powdery substance. I'm hoping that Nancy Hill is not going have that.

Mr. Callahan said right. The white powdery substance is called efflorescence. Mortar has lime in it and lime when mixed with moisture emits a white substance. Portions of the building, the 3 story classroom structure, as well as gymnasium, will actually be thin brick precast, so the actual exterior skin of the building will be face brick with a precast panel behind it. So that portion of the building will have no cavity, no ability for moisture to get in. The 1 story portion of the building will be a cavity wall and with proper detailing and proper construction we can minimize the amount of efflorescence that occurs. Typically efflorescence occurs within 12 months of the final structure being constructed and as long as it is cleaned properly within the right timeframe that can be eliminated permanently. That is our plan. Thank you for bringing it up.

Mr. Garcia said does the District have a plan to maintain this here? Typically once it is constructed there is no maintenance component, so who is going to maintain it? If properly done, you said it would go away or not be there, correct?

Mr. Callahan said right. Our design of the wall will make it maintenance-free. It will require tuckpointing for the 1 story portions in 25 to 30 years and with the proper cavity sequencing as well as the actual threshold for the base flashing and the jamb flashings and seal flashings we should not have an efflorescence on this structure.

Mr. Engen said I have a question Pat. I don't know how you would do this, but is anything going to be incorporated from the old school to be used with the new building? How do you take some old bricks from 1888 and salvage that?

Mr. Callahan said the bricks are the hardest thing to reuse because they are embedded in the wall and it is difficult to clear the mortar off to reuse it. Portions of the exterior, the cornerstone, some of the entablatures that have the original Nancy Hill engravings in them have been discussed for salvage and reuse. They may not go back into the structure. They may be a pediment or a monument, if you will, on site somewhere. There are several internal reliefs that were done during the WPA era that are going to be salvaged. We have not quite determined where they may go inside the existing building so thought has been given to try to maintain some of the history of that structure prior to the demolition and do some salvage, but we have no definitive plans at this point for exactly where that will be located.

Mrs. Cole said I have a question and a comment I'll do first. I'm very happy to see the rain gardens incorporated into the parking lot in the revised plans. It is very, very good. My second question is when you demolish the old school are you going to recycle what you demolish? That's not going to just go to a landfill I hope.

Mr. Callahan said that is correct. Oftentimes now demolition contractors actually will be a competitive edge. It costs us a little more to recycle, but actually there is a savings in dump fees because the EPA in Illinois has changed how much they charge and what type of landfill certain objects can go to and so many of the contractors now will do the recycling. They don't do it on-site, but they will recycle it off-site in lieu of dumping it in the landfill.

Mrs. Cole said and that is something that West Side is going to use?

Mr. Callahan said I believe we can incorporate some of that into the specifications, yes.

Mrs. Cole said I have one more question. You have 4 bike racks mentioned in your plans and hopefully with over 600 students, one would need more than 4 bike racks, but I guess you know your student population.

Mr. Callahan said we provided what is required per the ordinance. We're in discussions right now with the administration at the building to determine what the right threshold will be based on the neighborhood and how many students actually take their bikes to school. One of the concerns we obviously have is by encouraging that in that location, there is a lot of traffic on Pennsylvania, a lot of traffic on Iowa, and our concern is safety. That's the primary concern for the School District. We want to make sure we have it available, but there has to be a balance between student safety and riding your bike to school.

The public input portion of the public hearing was opened. No witnesses came forward. The public input portion of the public hearing was closed.

Vice Chairman Truax said do we have a recommendation from staff?

Mrs. Vacek said I do want to just bring up a couple of things. Alderman Saville, who is the Alderman of this Ward, did express some concerns to me earlier today. I actually met with him yesterday and then he e-mailed me, so I did want to just go kind of through those real quickly. His one concern was that there was only one access off Penn Avenue, or into the site off of Penn Avenue and then his other concern was stacking. He did talk to the Traffic Engineer today. They did have a conversation. The School District, as well as staff, including the Traffic Engineer did meet on Monday to explore the best options that we have with this site and we felt that this was the best option that you are seeing on there, but I did want to express his concerns tonight. With that, I will give you the recommendation for the Zoning and then I will go into the recommendation for the Special Use after you vote on the zoning. Staff would recommend approval of the Ordinance amending Ordinance No. 3100 being the Aurora Zoning Ordinance and the zoning map attached thereto by rezoning the property located at 724 Pennsylvania Avenue from R-1 and R-3 One Family Dwelling District to P Park and Recreational District.

MOTION OF APPROVAL WAS MADE BY: Mrs. Cole

MOTION SECONDED BY: Mr. Cameron

AYES: Mrs. Anderson, Mr. Bergeron, Mr. Cameron, Mrs. Cole, Mr. Divine, Mr. Garcia, Mr. Reynolds

NAYS: None

PASS: Mr. Engen

Mrs. Vacek said this will next be heard at the Planning and Development Committee meeting on Monday, November 23, 2015, at 4:00 p.m. in the 5th floor conference room of this building.

FINDINGS OF FACT

1. Is the proposal in accordance with all applicable official physical development policies and other related official plans and policies of the City of Aurora?

Mrs. Cole said it is and they are listed in the staff report.

2. Does the proposal represent the logical establishment and/or consistent extension of the requested classification in consideration of the existing land uses, existing zoning classifications, and essential character of the general area of the property in question?

Mr. Cameron said this site has been used as a school since 1892, so it is a continuation of the same use. It just has increased capacity over the existing school that is not able to be made in conformance with the ADA rules.

3. Is the proposal consistent with a desirable trend of development in the general area of the property in question, occurring since the property in question was placed in its present zoning classification (desirability being defined as the trend's consistency with other applicable official physical development policies and other related official plans and policies of the City of Aurora)?

Mrs. Cole said this site has been a school for over 100 years and hopefully will continue to be for another 100 years.

4. Will the proposal permit uses which are more suitable than those uses permitted under the existing zoning classification?

Vice Chairman Truax said I believe educational properties in the community are being zoned with the park zoning rather than the residential zoning, so it comes into conformance with that.

5. Will the proposal maintain a compatible relationship with traffic pattern and traffic volume of adjacent streets and not have an adverse effect upon traffic or pedestrian movement and safety in the general area of the property in question?

Mr. Engen said I'll answer that if I'm allowed to. We probably won't see much of a difference in the pattern. There are certain times in the morning for about 10 to 15 minutes where there is a high volume of traffic and also in the afternoon there is a high volume of traffic, but after that it does clear out. We are not going to see a big difference in the traffic pattern. We have plenty of crossing guards that work the streets there of getting the kids across the street safely.

6. Will the proposal allow for the provision of adequate public services and facilities to the property in question and have no adverse effect upon existing public services and facilities?

Vice Chairman Truax said I believe they are already in place.

Mrs. Vacek said staff would recommend conditional approval of the Ordinance granting a Special Use Permit for an Educational Service Use on the property located at 724 Pennsylvania Avenue with the following conditions:

1. That the Plat of Subdivision be submitted and approved within 180 days of the approval of the Special Use. Right now there are multiple lots on this property, so we would like to have a Plat of Subdivision to create 1 lot for the entire property, so that's the condition for that.

2. That the documents be reviewed to incorporate the Engineering staff comments from the memo dated November 5, 2015 prior to building permit issuance, and shall be contingent upon Final Engineering approval.
3. That the documents be revised to incorporate the Fire Prevention Bureau staff comments from the memo dated November 3, 2015 prior to building permit issuance, and shall be contingent upon Fire Access Plan approval. These 2 conditions, I don't know if you noticed, but you did get revised plans today, those 2 conditions were based on those comments, so they will be reviewing them and if there is anything else that they need, they will be working with the School District as we go through the process to finish those comments up.

MOTION OF APPROVAL WAS MADE BY: Mrs. Anderson

MOTION SECONDED BY: Mr. Bergeron

AYES: Mrs. Anderson, Mr. Bergeron, Mr. Cameron, Mrs. Cole, Mr. Divine, Mr. Garcia, Mr. Reynolds

NAYS: None

PASS: Mr. Engen

FINDINGS OF FACT

1. Will the establishment of the proposed Special Use be unreasonably detrimental to or endanger the public health, safety, morals, comfort or general welfare?

Mrs. Cole said the Special Use is exactly the same use that has been in existence for over 100 years and there really should be no effect on public health, safety, morals, comfort or general welfare.

Vice Chairman Truax said at least no negative effect.

2. Will the establishment of the proposed Special Use be injurious to the use and enjoyment of other property in the immediate vicinity for the purposes already permitted?

Vice Chairman Truax said I believe most of the property in the immediate vicinity is already built up and has a lot of homes that have been there for many years as well.

3. Will the establishment of the proposed Special Use substantially diminish/impair property values within the neighborhood?

Mr. Reynolds said the subject property will not diminish or impair property values. If anything, it should improve property values over time.

4. Will the establishment of the proposed Special Use impede the normal and orderly development and improvement of surrounding properties for uses permitted by their respective zoning districts?

Mrs. Cole said it should not impede any normal or orderly development or redevelopment. Actually this area is pretty much fully developed. If anything, it might encourage property owners in the area to update their property.

5. Are adequate utilities, access roads, drainage and other necessary facilities provided or shown as being proposed on the site plan for the proposed Special Use?

Mr. Cameron said they are already in place.

6. What effect will the proposed Special Use have on traffic or general area? Has ingress and egress been designed to minimize congestion in the public streets? (For automobile intensive uses (including but not limited to gas stations, car washes, and drive through facilities): if there is a concentration of similar uses within 1000 feet of said subject property, there should be consideration as to the negative impact on the traffic patterns and congestion in the area.)

Mr. Engen said we should not see a change in the traffic pattern there. As I mentioned earlier, there are 2 times during the day where we see an increase in the morning when school starts and then in the afternoon when students are being dismissed. This is a home school and the majority of the kids are all walkers in that area. When colder weather does come along, we do see an increase in automobile traffic, but for the most part it will be normal traffic of what we have seen for the past 120 some years.

7. Does the proposed Special Use conform in all other respects to the applicable regulations of the zoning district in which it is located, except as such regulations are modified pursuant to the Plan Commission recommendations?

Mr. Engen said this Special Use does conform to all its applicable regulations.

Mrs. Vacek said this will next be heard at the Planning and Development Committee meeting on Monday, November 23, 2015, at 4:00 p.m. in the 5th floor conference room of this building.