

1. Overall

- a. Need to see overlay of site plan – before and after. Helpful for reference.
 - i. Athletic field. Where did 110'x85' come from?
- b. Floor plans.
 - i. It would be beneficial to see detailed floor plans of proposed to see why you need so much new area. Applicant is asking for +35 students, which is about 2-3 classrooms, but then wants +20,500sf. 3 classrooms would be about 900sf each, so +2,700sf. How is rest of area utilized? Numbers are not adding up, especially considering the fact there is no proposed floor plan.
 1. SK suspects you have more area requested than needed and would be highly beneficial to wrap the Gym space into the overall footprint of the Kilmer building.
 2. Are you attempting to get a regular sized gym such as that of Louise Archer? They use a combo of gym/classroom/stage area adjacent o it for events. The more detailed information the better.
 - a. Using area calcs from Louise Archer's recent renovation/expansion I rana rough calc for total areas. I came up 7000sf short of your requested area. This is close to the requested area of the new gym building. By removing some duplicate areas (storage and mechanical) I might be right at the requested area for Kilmer.
 - ii. On the phasing plan the more SWM issues and buffers that can be installed early in the project (Phase 1) the better. If memory serves, I think that was one of the complaints is that the major SWM structure was slated for a late phase of construction and thus never built. This would go a long way to appeasing neighbor's concerns.
- c. Having a standalone gym building doesn't make a lot of sense to me.
 - i. You are encroaching into the backyards of your neighbors with a large two-story building.
 - ii. The gym building is taking over valuable outdoor space/parking area from the site.
 - iii. Access to the gym in inclement weather is a problem without an overhead porch/structure.
 - iv. SK highly suggests omitting this building and wrapping the gym into the footprint of the renovated Kilmer building.
 - v. Removal will also allow more opportunities to add buffer zones around that portion of the site.
- d. Long term strategic planning. (New comment)
 - i. As noted by Mr. Miller last night there are several requests over the years as technologies and student populations fluctuate. What assurances are there this will be the last request on the CUP revisions?
 - ii. What is the schools long-terms vision? How is this CUP request addressing their long-term needs and goals?

- e. Student population.
 - i. You offer a range of classes from Pre-K, K and up to 8th grade. While this mix may vary year over year you have records of the numbers per grade or mix of grades. That would be helpful to know.
 - 1. For example, if 40% of your school population is focused on Pre-K and K that is much different than one full classroom of each grade level. Those kids likely come and go at different drop-off and pick-up times. So you have less of an impact in the first drop-off time slot and last pick-up slot.
- 2. Traffic flow.
 - a. Walk us through the daily drop-off and pick-up routines.
 - b. How many kids arrive by car? By bus? Walk/bike?
 - i. SK observed the morning drop-off from Nutley 2/28. I did NOT witness any back-up onto Nutley. I did notice a slight back-up from Madison traffic northbound Nutley.
 - 1. From what I saw over ½ hour of drop-off I didn't witness 190 cars dropping kids off. So you either have a significant carpool program or a major younger student population that is not being dropped off from Nutley.
 - ii. I did not witness the Windover cycle, which I would like to see.
 - c. Number of kids in each grade level? How many are in K or Pre-K? Is this a different drop-off routine?
 - i. How does parking work currently? Who gets to park where? Vs proposed.
 - ii. What is number of spaces currently on site? How many proposed? How does that correlate with the adjusted CUP request?
- 3. You have a current CUP and a history of CUPs for the site.
 - a. History of CUPs for this site?
 - b. What aspects of that CUP were built and what were not built? Why / Why not?
 - c. What has changed to trigger a need for a revised CUP?
 - d. With the underground gym why was that asked for initially? Why is that not offered now?
 - e. Neighbors have had a number of complaints raised over the last two years, maybe more. How is applicant addressing them/rectifying them?
- 4. Are they responsive to the neighborhood;
 - a. Are you showing proper buffers to the surrounding neighbors? Screening? Landscape? Fencing? Sound barriers (fence mounted)?
 - i. Having a 10' buffer along the revised drive lane seems a bit weak.
 - ii. Showing a variety of landscape buffers around the edge – why?
 - 1. Why not use the same or similar thick landscape buffer zone as shown at stepped property line elsewhere, along the northern end of the site?
 - iii. Consider noise barrier walls/fencing along high activity playground zones bordering adjacent residential properties.

- b. How close are you building to the neighbor properties? Where is it closer to them than currently used? I'm concerned about the Gym building in particular.
 - c. Where are the activity zones on site – existing vs proposed? Do they adversely impact the neighbors? It looks like these are intended for different grade levels, correct? Seeing these in relation of expected student population levels would be helpful.
 - d. Are we screening the parking lot from the street? Landscape buffers? How are we addressing the Windover Ave. More the better. VPC on Maple added a serpentine wall which helps screen the parking lot. GH could consider similar such barriers.
 - e. Any existing storm water management issues on site or adjacent to the site?
 - i. How are they intending to correct such deficiencies?
 - ii. Is GH open to correcting nearby/adjacent flood-prone low yards? I think some yards immediately next to the GH site flood on occasion. Some neighbors may be open to allowing onsite drainage easements if needed. Might be a good overall solution if GH is open to the idea.
5. Current school functions.
- a. Says there is an existing gym. Where is it? Size? Vs proposed?
 - b. Existing cafeteria? Size? Vs proposed?
6. ROW
- a. Are they subject to new ROW dedications? No sidewalks, curb/gutter on Lewis Street. There are exg large trees along the roadway. Farther down the did the c/g and sidewalks.
 - i. We may want to look at them in combination with adjacent Windover Hts historic district roadway improvements, although they are NOT within the historic district. How do we dovetail them in, if at all? Staff seems to think they are stand alone, which may be the case.
7. Overall concerns for Steve Kenney
- a. Gym building. Seems unwarranted if you can fit the same function without the footprint of the renovated school.
 - b. Buffer zones along the perimeter should be robust and adjust by zone. Those nearest a heavy impact playground area should include noise barriers and heavy vegetation, where as those at parking lots and/or greenspace should just be primarily trees and bushes.
 - c. Justify the need for such a huge increase in building area. Adding +35 students and associated staff does not match +20,500sf. Something is very off on the math, even when considering libraries, cafeterias and even a gym.
 - d. Traffic flow for pick-up and drop-off. Justify this is being managed.
 - e. Address the complaints on CUP violations to date and moving forward. How will the applicant be a good neighbor.
 - f. If intent is the rent out the gym (hopefully within the footprint of the renovation) who will parking be managed? Not enough parking for events on site.