

CITY OF ROCKWALL
205 West Rusk
Rockwall, Texas

APPLICATION FOR ZONING CHANGE

Case No. _____ Filing Fee _____ Date 1-29-90
Applicant RISD- Phone _____
Mailing Address _____

LEGAL DESCRIPTION OF PROPERTY SOUGHT TO BE REZONED: (If additional space is needed for description, the description may be put on a separate sheet and attached hereto.)¹

I hereby request that the above described property be changed from its present zoning which is

MF-15 District Classification to

Commercial District Classification for
for the following reasons: (attach separate sheet if necessary)

For construction of High School and support facilities

There (~~are~~) (are not) deed restrictions pertaining to the intended use of the property.

Status of Applicant:² Owner ☒ Tenant _____

Prospective Purchaser _____

I have attached hereto as Exhibit "A" a plat showing the property which is the subject of this requested zoning change and have read the following concerning the importance of my submitting to the City a sufficient legal description.

Signed _____

Pat Grady - President
RISD

NOTE:

¹The legal description is used to publish notice of the required hearing and in the preparation of the final ordinance granting the zoning change. The description must be sufficient so as to allow a qualified surveyor to take the description and locate and mark off the tract on the ground. Each applicant should protect himself by having a surveyor or his attorney approve his legal description. Failure to do so by the applicant may result in delay in passage of the final ordinance or the ordinance being declared invalid at some later date because of an insufficient legal description.

²If the applicant is someone other than the owner, written acknowledgement by the owner of the zoning request must also be submitted.

SITE PLAN APPLICATIONDate 1-31-91NAME OF PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT Rockwall High SchoolNAME OF PROPERTY OWNER/DEVELOPER Rockwall Independent School DistrictADDRESS 801 E. Washington, Rockwall, Tx. 75087 PHONE 214-771-0605

NAME OF LAND PLANNER/ENGINEER _____

Claycomb Associates, Inc.ADDRESS 12700 Preston Rd. Dallas, Tx. 75230PHONE 214-233-6100TOTAL ACREAGE 35.3421CURRENT ZONING Multi-Family

NUMBER OF LOTS/UNITS _____

SIGNED _____

Following is a checklist of items that may be required as a part of the site plan. In addition, other information may be required if it is necessary for an adequate review of a specific development proposal. All information should be provided on a scaled drawing generally not exceeding 18" x 24".

<u>Provided or Shown</u> <u>On Site Plan</u>	<u>Not</u> <u>Applicable</u>
---	---------------------------------

Yes

1. Total lot or site area - if the site is part of a larger tract include a key map showing entire tract and location of site being planned

Yes

2. Location, dimensions, and size of all existing and planned structures on the subject property and approximate locations of structures on adjoining property within 100 ft.

Yes

3. Location and type of landscaping, lighting, fencing and/or screening of yards and setback areas

Yes

4. Calculation of landscaped area provided

Yes

5. Location and dimensions of ingress and egress

<u>Yes</u>	_____	6. <u>Location</u> , <u>number</u> and <u>dimensions</u> of off-street parking and loading facilities
<u>Yes</u>	_____	7. <u>Height</u> of all structures
<u>Yes</u>	_____	8. <u>Proposed uses</u> of all structures
<u>Yes</u>	_____	9. <u>Location</u> and <u>types</u> of all signs, including lighting and heights
_____	<u>N.A.</u>	10. <u>Elevation</u> <u>drawings</u> citing proposed exterior finish materials and proposed structural materials
<u>Yes</u>	_____	11. <u>Location</u> and <u>screening</u> of trash facilities
Yes	_____	12. <u>Location</u> of nearest fire hydrant within 500 ft.
_____	<u>N.A.</u>	13. Street names on proposed streets
_____	<u>N.A.</u>	14. The following additional information:

If the site plan is required as a preliminary or development plan under a Planned Development Zoning Classification, the attached applicable items specified for preliminary plans or development plans must be included.

Taken by _____

Date 1/31/91

Fee _____

File No. 91-3-SP/FP/Z



CITY OF ROCKWALL

"THE NEW HORIZON"

Rockwall, Texas 75087-3628

(214) 771-1111

Cash Receipt

Name R T S D Date

Mailing Address by Harold C Evans

Job Address R.T.S.D. Permit No.

Check ☐

Cash ☒


Other ☐


DESCRIPTION	Acct. Code	Amount	DESCRIPTION	Acct. Code
Building Permit	01-3601		Water Tap	02-3311
Fence Permit	01-3602		10% Fee	02-3311
Electrical Permit	01-3604		Sewer Tap	02-3314
Plumbing Permit	01-3607		Water Availability	06-3835
Mechanical Permit	01-3610		Sewer Availability	07-3836
Municipal Pool	01-3402		Meter Deposit	02-2201
Zoning, Planning, B.O.A.	01-3411	130.00	Portable Meter Deposit	02-2202
Subdivision Plats	01-3412		Misc. Income	02-3819
Sign Permits	01-3628		NSF Check	02-1128
Health Permits	01-3631		Meter Rent	02-3406
Misc. Permits	01-3625		Penalties	20-3117
Misc. Income	01-3819		Hanger Rent	20-3406
Sale of Supplies	01-3807		Tie Down Fees	20-3407
Marina Lease	08-3810		Land Lease	20-3804
Cemetery Receipts	10-3830		Sale of Supplies	20-3807
PID	13-3828		Airport Cred. Cd.	20-1132
Street	14-3828		Fuel Sales	20-3809
Hotel/Motel Tax	15-3206			
TOTAL OF COLUMN			TOTAL OF COLUMN	

TOTAL DUE

130.00

Received By [Signature]





STATE OF TEXAS
COUNTY OF ROCKWALL

BEING a total of ^{three} ~~five~~ tracts of land situated in the E.P. Gaines Chisum Survey, Abstract No. 64, and the J.D. McFarland Survey, Abstract No. 145, Rockwall County, Texas, and being a part of those certain six tracts of land described in Deed of Trust recorded in Volume 221, Page 954, Deed Records, Rockwall County, Texas; two of said five tracts being part of Goldencrest, an addition to the City of Rockwall, recorded in Slide B, Page 383, Plat Records, Rockwall County, Texas; and three of said five tracts being part of that 57.540 acre tract of land described as Tract 2 in the above mentioned Deed of Trust, and being more particularly described as follows:

TRACT I

All of Lot 1, Block B, of the above mentioned Goldencrest and Containing 319,971 Square Feet or 7.3455 Acres of Land.

TRACT III

BEING a part of the above mentioned 57.540 acre tract, and being more particularly described as follows:

COMMENCING at a point in Yellowjacket Lane, a 90 foot right-of-way at the North corner of said 57.540 acre tract;

THENCE: South $45^{\circ} 35' 54''$ West a distance of 82.08 feet with the Northwest line of said 57.540 acre tract to an iron rod found at its intersection with the Northwest line of Yellowjacket Lane, said iron rod being on a circular curve to the left having a central angle of $15^{\circ} 28' 12''$, a radius of 845.00 feet, and a chord that bears South $19^{\circ} 04' 50''$ West a distance of 227.46 feet;

THENCE: Along said curve and with said Northwest line an arc distance of 228.15 feet to an iron rod found at the point of reverse curvature of a circular curve to the right having a central angle of $34^{\circ} 15' 10''$, a radius of 755.00 feet, and a chord that bears South $28^{\circ} 28' 19''$ West a distance of 444.67 feet;

THENCE: Along said curve and with said Northwest line an arc distance of 451.36 feet to an iron rod found for a corner;

THENCE: South $45^{\circ} 35' 54''$ West a distance of 517.40 feet to an iron rod found at the point of curvature of a circular curve to the right having a central angle of $51^{\circ} 59' 14''$, a radius of 755.00 feet, and a chord that bears South $71^{\circ} 35' 31''$ West a distance of 661.79 feet;

THENCE: Along said curve and with said Northwest line passing at an arc distance of 566.71 feet the point at which Yellowjacket Lane becomes a variable width right-of-way and continuing a total arc distance of 685.05 feet to an iron rod found for a corner;

THENCE: North $82^{\circ} 24' 52''$ West a distance of 97.98 feet continuing with said Northwest line to an iron rod found for a corner on the Southerly Northwest line of said 57.540 acre tract;

THENCE: North $44^{\circ} 35' 08''$ East a distance of 321.65 feet with said Northwest line to a nail found in concrete for a corner at a County Road, said nail bears South $48^{\circ} 14' 45''$ East a distance of 7.26 feet from the West corner of that tract of land described in Volume 52, Page 88, Deed Records, Rockwall County, Texas;

THENCE: South $48^{\circ} 14' 45''$ East a distance of 140.74 feet along the common line of said 57.540 acre tract and said tract recorded in Volume 52, Page 88, with said County Road to an iron rod found for a corner in the center of an old County Road;

THENCE: North $45^{\circ} 35' 54''$ East a distance of 1470.03 feet with the most Northerly Northwest line of said 57.540 acre tract and the center of said old County Road to the Point of Beginning and Containing 335,607 Square Feet or 7.7045 Acres of Land.

TRACT IV

BEING a part of the above mentioned 57.540 acre tract and being more particularly described as follows:

COMMENCING at a point in the centerline of Kyle Drive, a 60 foot right-of-way, and at the East corner of said 57.540 acre tract;
THENCE: South $45^{\circ} 20' 55''$ West, passing at 2.00 feet and 0.5 feet Northwest of a chain link fence corner and continuing parallel with said fence a distance of 30.00 feet with the Southeast line of said 57.540 acre tract to an iron rod found at the South corner of Kyle Drive and the Point of Beginning;
THENCE: South $45^{\circ} 20' 55''$ West a distance of 855.66 feet continuing parallel with and 0.5 feet Northwest of said fence to an iron rod found for a corner;
THENCE: South $45^{\circ} 51' 23''$ West a distance of 40.18 feet leaving said chain link fence and along a wire fence to an iron rod found at the East corner of that 10 acre tract described in Volume 229, Page 257, Deed Records, Rockwall County, Texas;
THENCE: North $44^{\circ} 24' 05''$ West a distance of 809.96 feet with the Northeast line of said 10 acre tract to an iron rod found at the North corner of said 10 acre tract and on the Southeast line of Yellowjacket Lane, a 90 foot right-of-way;
THENCE: North $45^{\circ} 35' 54''$ East a distance of 206.98 feet with said Southeast line to an iron rod found at the point of curvature of a circular curve to the left having a central angle of $34^{\circ} 15' 10''$, a radius of 845.00 feet, and a chord that bears North $28^{\circ} 28' 19''$ East a distance of 497.67 feet;
THENCE: Along said curve and with said Southeast line an arc distance of 505.16 feet to an iron rod found at the point of reverse curvature of a circular curve to the right having a central angle of $14^{\circ} 38' 13''$, a radius of 755.00 feet, and a chord that bears North $18^{\circ} 39' 50''$ East a distance of 192.35 feet;
THENCE: Along said curve and with said Southeast line an arc distance of 192.88 feet to an iron rod found at the intersection of said Southeast line with the Southwest line of Kyle Drive, said iron rod being on a circular curve to the right having a central angle of $17^{\circ} 07' 08''$, a radius of 770.00 feet, and a chord that bears South $53^{\circ} 22' 59''$ East a distance of 229.21 feet;
THENCE: Along said curve and with said Southwest line of Kyle Drive an arc distance of 230.06 feet to an iron rod found for a corner;
THENCE: South $44^{\circ} 49' 25''$ East a distance of 813.73 feet with said Southwest line to the Point of Beginning and Containing 783,146 Square Feet or 17.9786 Acres of Land.

TRACT V

BEING a part of the above mentioned 57.540 acre tract and being more particularly described as follows:

COMMENCING at a point in Yellowjacket Lane, a 90 foot right-of-way and at the North corner of said 57.540 acre tract;
THENCE: South $44^{\circ} 49' 25''$ East a distance of 69.17 feet with the Northeast line of said 57.540 acre tract to an iron rod found for a corner on the Southeast line of Yellowjacket Lane and the Point of Beginning;
THENCE: South $44^{\circ} 49' 25''$ East a distance of 24.70 feet with said Northeast line to an iron rod found for a corner on the Northeast line of Kyle Drive, a 60 foot right-of-way, said iron rod being on a circular curve to the left having a central angle of $1^{\circ} 39' 05''$, a radius of 830.00 feet, and a chord that bears North $61^{\circ} 06' 06''$ West a distance of 23.94 feet;
THENCE: Along said curve and with said Northeast line an arc distance of 23.94 feet to an iron rod found at the intersection of said Northeast line with the Southeast line of Yellowjacket Lane, said iron rod being on a circular curve to the right having a central angle of $0^{\circ} 31' 32''$, a radius of 755.00 feet, and a chord that bears North $30^{\circ} 47' 59''$ East a distance of 6.93 feet;
THENCE: Along said curve and with said Southeast line an arc distance of 6.93 feet to the Point of Beginning and Containing 82 Square Feet or 0.0012 Acres of Land.

urvey,
st recorded
dition to
being part
described

ith the
central

the point
ord that

corner

d bears
rthwest
of 22°

und for

e to the
e of 416.23

t line
unty,

outh corner



ne East


rod set

1991-01-29


12:12

PAGE = 04





TBM:
R.R. SPIKE IN 8" OAK @ STA. 22+20 YELLOWJACKET
LANE, 100' LEFT OF C - ELEV. = 521.00



PAVING PLANS						
YELLOWJACKET LANE						
GOLDENCREST						
CITY OF ROCKWALL.....ROCKWALL COUNTY, TEXAS						
HAROLD L. EVANS & CONSULTING ENGINEER						
DESIGN	DRAWN	DATE	SCALE	NOTES	FILE	NO.
DEJ	MLP T.L.D.	MAY, 1985	1" = 40' H. 1" = 5' V.			82114-A

- TOTAL SITE AREA 1,538,718 SF
 - LANDSCAPED AREAS
 - Total landscaped area reqd. (10% of total site) 153,718 sf
 - Landscaped area provided 920,000 sf
 - Natural 210,000sf
 - 10' street buffer 51,000sf
 - Internal Parking 22,000sf
 - Other 607,000sf
 - Trees required total 131 trees required
 - Student parking 530 cars = 27 trees reqd. * 36 provided
 - Faculty parking 180 cars = 9 trees reqd. * 0 provided
 - Street frontage buffer 5100lf = 102 trees reqd. * 50 provided
 - Parking required total 500 cars 760 provided
 - 530 student car spaces provided 252,000sf
 - 180 faculty car spaces provided 57,000sf
 - 16 visitor car spaces provided
 - 34 other car spaces provided
- * See letter requesting variance

All shaded areas are landscaped and irrigated

Rockwall High School
 Rockwall Independent School District
 801 East Washington Street
 Rockwall, TX 75087
 722-3201

Claycomb Associates, Inc. Architects
 12700 Preston, Suite 275
 Dallas, TX 75230
 214-233-6100

site plan


Kyle Drive

Yellowjacket Ln.

Greencrest Blvd.



January 31, 1991
 SCALE: 1"=50'-0"
 0 25 50 100 200



SITE PLAN REVIEW

- ✓ Date Submitted _____
- ✓ Scheduled for P&Z _____
- ✓ Scheduled for Council _____
- ✓ Applicant/Owner RISD
- ✓ Name of Proposed Development High School
- ✓ Location Yellow jacket Legal Description _____
- ✓ Total Acreage _____ No. Lots/Units _____
- ✓ Current Zoning _____
- Special Restrictions _____
- ✓ Surrounding Zoning _____

Planning

- | | <u>Yes</u> | <u>No</u> | <u>N/A</u> |
|--|------------|-----------|------------|
| 1. Is the site zoned properly? <i>portion is M1 -
app made to rezone</i> | _____ | <u>✓</u> | _____ |
| 2. Does the use conform to the Land Use Plan? | <u>✓</u> | _____ | _____ |
| 3. Is this project in compliance with the provisions of a Concept Plan? | <u>✓</u> | _____ | _____ |
| ✓ 4. Is the property platted? | _____ | <u>✓</u> | _____ |
| ✓ 5. Is plat filed of record at Courthouse?
File No. _____ | _____ | <u>✓</u> | _____ |
| ✓ 6. If not, is this site plan serving as a preliminary plat? | <u>✓</u> | _____ | _____ |
| 7. Does the plan conform to the Comprehensive Zoning Ordinance or PD Ordinance on the following: | | | |
| a. Are setbacks correct? | | | |
| front | <u>✓</u> | _____ | _____ |
| side | <u>✓</u> | _____ | _____ |
| rear | <u>✓</u> | _____ | _____ |
| b. Are buildings on same lot adequately separated? | <u>✓</u> | _____ | _____ |

- | | | | | |
|----|--|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| c. | Is the lot the proper size? | ☒ | ☐ | ☐ |
| d. | Does the lot have proper dimensions? | ☒ | ☐ | ☐ |
| e. | Are exterior materials correct? | ☒ | ☐ | ☐ |
| f. | Are structural materials correct? | ☒ | ☐ | ☐ |
| g. | Is coverage correct? | ☒ | ☐ | ☐ |
| h. | Is adequate area in landscaping shown? | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ |
| i. | Is it irrigated? <i>need 15% impervious</i> | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| j. | Is landscaping in parking lot required? | ☒ | ☐ | ☐ |
| k. | Are types of landscaping indicated? | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ |
| l. | Is floor area ratio correct? <i>need a landscaping plan</i> | ☒ | ☐ | ☐ |
| m. | Is building height correct? | ☒ | ☐ | ☐ |
| n. | Are correct number of parking spaces provided? <i>check on no. of students</i> | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| o. | Are driving lanes adequate in width? | ☒ | ☐ | ☐ |
| p. | Are parking spaces dimensioned properly | ☒ | ☐ | ☐ |
| q. | Does the parking lot meet City specifications | ☒ | ☐ | ☐ |
| r. | Is a fire lane provided? <i>it is short on the back side but does allow the</i> | ☒ | ☐ | ☐ |
| s. | Is it adequate in width? <i>300' those 1 ay</i> | ☒ | ☐ | ☐ |
| t. | Are drive entrances properly spaced? | ☒ | ☐ | ☐ |
| u. | Are drive entrances properly dimensioned? | ☒ | ☐ | ☐ |
| |Do drive entrances line up with planned median breaks? <i>being reviewed</i> | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ |
| v. | Is lighting provided and correctly directed? | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| w. | Are sidewalks required? | ☒ | ☐ | ☐ |
| x. | Are sidewalks provided? <i>need to provide</i> | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ |
| y. | Is a screen or buffer required? | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ |
| |Is it sized properly? | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| |Is it designed properly? | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| |Is it of correct materials? | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |

- | | | | |
|--|----------|-------|----------|
| 7. Does the site plan contain all required information from the application checklist? | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| 8. Is there adequate access and circulation? | <u>✓</u> | _____ | _____ |
| 9. Is trash service located and screened? | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| ✓ 10. Are street names acceptable? | _____ | _____ | <u>✓</u> |
| 11. Was the plan reviewed by a consultant?
(If so, attach copy of review.) | <u>✓</u> | _____ | _____ |
| 12. Does the plan conform to the Master Park Plan? | <u>✓</u> | _____ | _____ |
| 13. Are there any existing land features to be maintained?
(ie, topography, trees, ponds, etc.) | _____ | _____ | _____ |

Comments:

*very fuel site - may want to try to
save fuel for park areas*

Building Codes

- | | | | |
|--|-------|-------|-------|
| 1. Do buildings meet fire codes? | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| 2. Do signs conform to Sign Ordinance? | _____ | _____ | _____ |

Comments:

Engineering

- | | | | |
|--|----------|----------|-------|
| 1. Does plan conform to Thoroughfare Plan? | <u>✓</u> | _____ | _____ |
| 2. Do points of access align with adjacent ROW? | <u>✓</u> | _____ | _____ |
| 3. Are the points of access properly spaced? | <u>✓</u> | _____ | _____ |
| 4. Are street improvements required? | _____ | <u>✓</u> | _____ |
| 5. Will escrowing of funds or construction of substandard roads be required? | _____ | <u>✓</u> | _____ |
| 6. Does plan conform with Flood Plain Regulations? | <u>✓</u> | _____ | _____ |
| 7. Is adequate fire protection present? <i>need to check</i> | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| 8. Are all utilities adequate? | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| 9. Are adequate drainage facilities present? | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| 10. Is there a facilities agreement on this site? | _____ | _____ | _____ |

there should be

11. Are existing roads adequate for additional traffic to be generated? *May need to do a study on yellow jacket* ☒ ☐ ☐
12. Is the site part of a larger tract? Does the plan adversely impact development of remaining land? ☐ ☒ ☐
13. Are access easements necessary? *need to be on plat* ☒ ☐ ☐
14. Are street and drive radii adequate? ☒ ☐ ☐
15. Have all required conditions been met? ☐ ☐ ☐
16. Is there a pro rata agreement on this site? ☐ ☒ ☐
17. Have all charges been paid? ☐ ☐ ☐

Time Spent on Review

<u>Name</u>	<u>Date</u>	<u>Time Spent (hours)</u>
<i>Julie Bork</i>	<i>2/6/91</i>	<i>1 hr.</i>

construction work for which the permit is issued as well as all finish work, painting, roofing, electrical, plumbing, heating, air-conditioning, elevators, fire-extinguishing systems and other permanent equipment.

(c) **Plan Review Fees.** When a plan or other data are required to be submitted by Subsection (b) of Section 302, a plan review fee shall be paid at the time of submitting plans and specifications for review. The plan review fee for buildings or structures shall be 65 percent of the building permit fee as shown in Table No. 3-A.

The plan review fees for electrical, mechanical and plumbing work shall be equal to 25 percent of the total permit fee as set forth in Tables Nos. 3-B, 3-C and 3-D.

The plan review fee for grading work shall be as set forth in Table No. 3-G.

The plan review fees specified in this subsection are separate fees from the permit fees specified in Section 304 (a) and are in addition to the permit fees.

When plans are incomplete or changed so as to require additional plan review, an additional plan review fee shall be charged at the rate shown in Tables Nos. 3-A through 3-G.

(d) **Expiration of Plan Review.** Applications for which no permit is issued within 180 days following the date of application shall expire by limitation, and plans and other data submitted for review may thereafter be returned to the applicant or destroyed by the building official. The building official may extend the time for action by the applicant for a period not exceeding 180 days upon request by the applicant showing that circumstances beyond the control of the applicant have prevented action from being taken. An application shall not be extended more than once. In order to renew action on an application after expiration, the applicant shall resubmit plans and pay a new plan review fee.

(e) **Investigation Fees: Work Without a Permit.** 1. **Investigation.** Whenever work for which a permit is required by this code has been commenced without first obtaining a permit, a special investigation shall be made before a permit may be issued for such work.

2. **Fee.** An investigation fee, in addition to the permit fee, shall be collected whether or not a permit is then or subsequently issued. The investigation fee shall be equal to the amount of the permit fee required by this code. The minimum investigation fee shall be the same as the minimum fee set forth in Tables Nos. 3-A through 3-H. The payment of such investigation fee shall not exempt an applicant from compliance with all other provisions of either this code or the technical codes nor from the penalty prescribed by law.

(f) **Fee Refunds.** The building official may authorize refunding of a fee paid hereunder which was erroneously paid or collected.

The building official may authorize refunding of not more than 80 percent of the permit fee paid when no work has been done under a permit issued in accordance with this code.

The building official may authorize refunding of not more than 80 percent of the plan review fee paid when an application for a permit for which a plan review

fee has been paid is withdrawn or canceled before any examination time has been expended.

The building official shall not authorize the refunding of any fee paid except upon written application filed by the original permittee not later than 180 days after the date of fee payment.

Inspections

Sec. 305. (a) General. Construction or work for which a permit is required shall be subject to inspection by the building official and the construction or work shall remain accessible and exposed for inspection purposes until approved by the building official. In addition, certain types of construction shall have continuous inspection as specified in Section 306.

Approval as a result of an inspection shall not be construed to be an approval of a violation of the provisions of this code or of other ordinances of the jurisdiction. Inspections presuming to give authority to violate or cancel the provisions of this code or of other ordinances of the jurisdiction shall not be valid.

It shall be the duty of the permit applicant to cause the work to remain accessible and exposed for inspection purposes. Neither the building official nor this jurisdiction shall be liable for expense entailed in the removal or replacement of any material required to allow inspection.

A survey of the lot may be required by the building official to verify that the structure is located in accordance with the approved plans.

(b) **Inspection Record Card.** Work requiring a permit shall not be commenced until the permit holder or the agent of the permit holder shall have posted or otherwise made available an inspection record card such as to allow the building official conveniently to make the required entries thereon regarding inspection of the work. This card shall be maintained available by the permit holder until final approval has been granted by the building official.

(c) **Inspection Requests.** It shall be the duty of the person doing the work authorized by a permit to notify the building official that such work is ready for inspection. The building official may require that every request for inspection be filed at least one working day before such inspection is desired. Such request may be in writing or by telephone at the option of the building official.

It shall be the duty of the person requesting any inspections required either by this code or the technical codes to provide access to and means for inspection of the work.

(d) **Approval Required.** Work shall not be done beyond the point indicated in each successive inspection without first obtaining the approval of the building official. The building official, upon notification, shall make the requested inspections and shall either indicate that that portion of the construction is satisfactory as completed or shall notify the permit holder or an agent of the permit holder wherein the same fails to comply with this code. Any portions which do not comply shall be corrected and such portion shall not be covered or concealed until authorized by the building official.

TABLE NO. 3-C—MECHANICAL PERMIT FEES

Permit Issuance	
1. For the issuance of each permit	\$15.00
2. For issuing each supplemental permit	4.50
Unit Fee Schedule	
1. For the installation or relocation of each forced-air or gravity-type furnace or burner, including ducts and vents attached to such appliance, up to and including 100,000 Btu/h	9.00
2. For the installation or relocation of each forced-air or gravity-type furnace or burner, including ducts and vents attached to such appliance over 100,000 Btu/h	11.00
3. For the installation or relocation of each floor furnace, including vent	9.00
4. For the installation or relocation of each suspended heater, recessed wall heater or floor-mounted unit heater	9.00
5. For the installation, relocation or replacement of each appliance vent installed and not included in an appliance permit	4.50
6. For the repair of, alteration of, or addition to each heating appliance, refrigeration unit, cooling unit, absorption unit, or each heating, cooling, absorption, or evaporative cooling system, including installation of controls regulated by this code	9.00
7. For the installation or relocation of each boiler or compressor to and including three horsepower, or each absorption system to and including 100,000 Btu/h	9.00
8. For the installation or relocation of each boiler or compressor over three horsepower to and including 15 horsepower, or each absorption system over 100,000 Btu/h and including 500,000 Btu/h	16.50
9. For the installation or relocation of each boiler or compressor over 15 horsepower to and including 30 horsepower, or each absorption system over 500,000 Btu/h to and including 1,000,000 Btu/h	22.50
10. For the installation or relocation of each boiler or compressor over 30 horsepower to and including 50 horsepower, or for each absorption system over 1,000,000 Btu/h to and including 1,750,000 Btu/h	33.50
11. For the installation or relocation of each boiler or refrigeration compressor over 50 horsepower, or each absorption system over 1,750,000 Btu/h	56.00
12. For each air-handling unit to and including 10,000 cubic feet per minute, including ducts attached thereto Note: This fee shall not apply to an air-handling unit which is a portion of a factory-assembled appliance, cooling unit, evaporative cooler or absorption unit for which a permit is required elsewhere in this code.	6.50
13. For each air-handling unit over 10,000 cfm	11.00
14. For each evaporative cooler other than portable type	6.50
15. For each ventilation fan connected to a single duct	4.50
16. For each ventilation system which is not a portion of any heating or air-conditioning system authorized by a permit	6.50
17. For the installation of each hood which is served by mechanical exhaust, including the ducts for such hood	6.50
18. For the installation or relocation of each domestic-type incinerator	11.00

(continued)

TABLE NO. 3-C—MECHANICAL PERMIT FEES—(Continued)

19. For the installation or relocation of each commercial or industrial-type incinerator	45.00
20. For each appliance or piece of equipment regulated by this code but not classed in other appliance categories, or for which no other fee is listed in this code	6.50
Other Inspections and Fees:	
1. Inspections outside of normal business hours (minimum charge—two hours)	\$30.00 per hour*
2. Reinspection fees assessed under provisions of Section 305 (g)	\$30.00 per hour*
3. Inspections for which no fee is specifically indicated (minimum charge—one-half hour)	\$30.00 per hour*
4. Additional plan review required by changes, additions or revisions to approved plans (minimum charge—one-half hour)	\$30.00 per hour*

*Or the total hourly cost to the jurisdiction, whichever is the greatest. This cost shall include supervision, overhead, equipment, hourly wages and fringe benefits of the employees involved.

TABLE NO. 3-D—PLUMBING PERMIT FEES

Permit Issuance	
1. For the issuance of each permit	\$15.00
2. For issuing each supplemental permit	4.50
Unit Fee Schedule (in addition to 1 or 2 above)	
1. For each plumbing fixture or trap or set of fixtures on one trap (including water, drainage piping, and backflow protection therefor)	6.00
2. For each building sewer and each trailer park sewer	15.00
3. Rainwater systems—per drain (inside building)	6.00
4. For each cesspool (where permitted)	22.50
5. For each private sewage disposal system	45.00
6. For each water heater and/or vent	7.50
7. For each industrial waste pretreatment interceptor including its trap and vent, excepting kitchen-type grease interceptors functioning as fixture traps	12.00
8. For installation, alteration, or repair of water piping and/or water-treating equipment, each	3.00
9. For repair or alteration of drainage or vent piping, each fixture	3.00
10. For each lawn sprinkler system on any one meter, including backflow protection devices therefor	9.00
11. For atmospheric-type vacuum breakers not included in Item 1:	
1 to 5	7.50
over 5, each	1.50

(continued)

TABLE NO. 3-D—PLUMBING PERMIT FEES—(Continued)

12. For each backflow protective device other than atmospheric-type vacuum breakers:	
2 inches and smaller	7.50
over 2 inches	15.00
13. For each gas piping system of one to four outlets	3.00
14. For each gas piping system of five or more outlets, per outlet	0.75

Other Inspections and Fees:

1. Inspections outside of normal business hours	\$30.00 per hour*
(minimum charge—two hours)	
2. Reinspection fees assessed under provisions of Section 305 (g)	\$30.00 per hour*
3. Inspections for which no fee is specifically indicated	\$30.00 per hour*
(minimum charge—one-half hour)	
4. Additional plan review required by changes, additions or revisions to approved plans	\$30.00 per hour*
(minimum charge—one-half hour)	

*Or the total hourly cost to the jurisdiction, whichever is the greatest. This cost shall include supervision, overhead, equipment, hourly wages and fringe benefits of the employees involved.

TABLE NO. 3-E—ELEVATOR PERMIT FEES

New Installations:

Passenger or freight elevator, escalator, moving walk:

Up to and including \$40,000.00 of valuation—\$55.00

Over \$40,000.00 of valuation—\$55.00 plus \$1.00 for each \$1,000.00 or fraction thereof over \$40,000.00

Dumbwaiter or private residence elevator:

Up to and including \$10,000 of valuation—\$15.00

Over \$10,000.00 of valuation—\$15.00 plus \$1.00 for each \$1,000.00 or fraction thereof over \$10,000.00

Major Alterations:

Fees for major alterations shall be as set forth in Table No. 3-A.

Installation fees include charges for the first year's annual inspection fee and charges for electrical equipment on the conveyance side of the disconnect switch.

TABLE NO. 3-F—ELEVATOR ANNUAL CERTIFICATES OF INSPECTION FEES

For each elevator	\$25.00
For each escalator or moving walk	15.00
For each commercial dumbwaiter	10.00
(Each escalator or moving walk unit powered by one motor shall be considered as a separate escalator or moving walk.)	

TABLE NO. 3-G—GRADING PLAN REVIEW FEES

50 cubic yards or less	No fee
51 to 100 cubic yards	\$15.00
101 to 1,000 cubic yards	22.50
1,001 to 10,000 cubic yards	30.00
10,001 to 100,000 cubic yards—\$30.00 for the first 10,000 cubic yards, plus \$15.00 for each additional 10,000 cubic yards or fraction thereof.	
100,001 to 200,000 cubic yards—\$165.00 for the first 100,000 cubic yards, plus \$9.00 for each additional 10,000 cubic yards or fraction thereof.	
200,001 cubic yards or more—\$255.00 for the first 200,000 cubic yards, plus \$4.50 for each additional 10,000 cubic yards or fraction thereof.	

Other Fees:

Additional plan review required by changes, additions or revisions to approved plans	\$30.00 per hour*
(minimum charge—one-half hour)	

*Or the total hourly cost to the jurisdiction, whichever is the greatest. This cost shall include supervision, overhead, equipment, hourly wages and fringe benefits of the employees involved.

TABLE NO. 3-H—GRADING PERMIT FEES¹

50 cubic yards or less	\$15.00
51 to 100 cubic yards	22.50
101 to 1,000 cubic yards—\$22.50 for the first 100 cubic yards plus \$10.50 for each additional 100 cubic yards or fraction thereof.	
1001 to 10,000 cubic yards—\$117.00 for the first 1,000 cubic yards, plus \$9.00 for each additional 1,000 cubic yards or fraction thereof.	
10,001 to 100,000 cubic yards—\$198.00 for the first 10,000 cubic yards, plus \$40.50 for each additional 10,000 cubic yards or fraction thereof.	
100,001 cubic yards or more—\$562.50 for the first 100,000 cubic yards, plus \$22.50 for each additional 10,000 cubic yards or fraction thereof.	

Other Inspections and Fees:

1. Inspections outside of normal business hours	\$30.00 per hour ²
(minimum charge—two hours)	
2. Reinspections fees assessed under provisions of Section 305 (g)	\$30.00 per hour ²
3. Inspections for which no fee is specifically indicated	\$30.00 per hour ²
(minimum charge—one-half hour)	

¹The fee for a grading permit authorizing additional work to that under a valid permit shall be the difference between the fee paid for the original permit and the fee shown for the entire project.

²Or the total hourly cost to the jurisdiction, whichever is the greatest. This cost shall include supervision, overhead, equipment, hourly wages and fringe benefits of the employees involved.

HANDICAPPED ACCESSIBILITY STATEMENT OF INTENT

EAB PROJECT # _____

New Rockwall High School

NAME OF BUILDING OR FACILITY

Yellow Jacket Lane

LOCATION (ADDRESS) OF BUILDING OR FACILITY

Rockwall

CITY

75087

ZIP CODE

Rockwall

COUNTY

Rockwall Independent School District

BUILDING OWNER

(214) 722-3201

TELEPHONE NUMBER

801 E. Washington

MAILING ADDRESS

Rockwall

CITY

Texas

STATE

75087

ZIP CODE

Bill Howlett, Asst. Supt.

OWNER CONTACT PERSON

(214) 722-3201

TELEPHONE NUMBER

Claycomb Associates, Inc.

ARCHITECT

(214) 233-6100

TELEPHONE NUMBER

12700 Preston Rd, Suite 275

MAILING ADDRESS

Dallas

CITY

Texas

STATE

75230

ZIP CODE

Larry Claycomb

ARCHITECT CONTACT PERSON

(214) 233-6100

TELEPHONE NUMBER

August, 1993

EST. DATE OF PROJECT COMPLETION

New Senior High School

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Having examined Article 7, Article 601b, Texas Revised Civil Statutes, and being familiar with the provisions thereof, I do hereby notify the State Purchasing and General Services Commission of the above described project and certify that I will perform, or cause to be performed, all services necessary to complete said project so that it will comply with the provisions of the statute.

Larry Claycomb
SIGNATURE OF OWNER OR AUTHORIZED AGENT

President
TITLE

Claycomb Associates, Inc.
COMPANY OR FIRM

August 23, 1991
DATE

IF FINAL CERTIFICATION OF THE BUILDING OR FACILITY IS DESIRED, THE OWNER OR AN AUTHORIZED AGENT SHOULD CONTACT THE COMMISSION IMMEDIATELY UPON COMPLETION OF THE PROJECT. ACCESSIBILITY CERTIFICATIONS WILL BE ISSUED BY THE COMMISSION ONLY UPON A FINDING OF COMPLIANCE PURSUANT TO THE VERIFICATION PROCESSES AUTHORIZED AND DESCRIBED IN RULE 115.57 AND RULE 115.58.

STATE PURCHASING AND GENERAL SERVICES COMMISSION

RECEIVED BY _____

DATE _____



International Conference of Building Officials

REGIONAL OFFICE: 9300 JOLLYVILLE ROAD • AUSTIN, TEXAS 78759-7455 • (512) 794-8700

BOARD OF DIRECTORS

CHAIRMAN

EUGENE J. ZELLER, P.E., C.B.O.
SUPERINTENDENT OF BUILDING
AND SAFETY
LONG BEACH, CALIFORNIA

FIRST VICE-CHAIRMAN

JAMES L. MANSON, C.B.O.
DIRECTOR, DEPARTMENT OF
BUILDING AND SAFETY
COUNTY OF SPOKANE
SPOKANE, WASHINGTON

SECOND VICE-CHAIRMAN

PHIL M. HERRINGTON, C.B.O.
DIRECTOR, DEPARTMENT OF
BUILDING AND SAFETY
RENO, NEVADA

IMMEDIATE PAST CHAIRMAN

WILLIAM E. SCHLECHT, C.B.O.
MANAGER, BUILDING AND
DEVELOPMENT SERVICES
PASADENA, CALIFORNIA

RON BULLOCK
CHIEF BUILDING OFFICIAL
SANDY, UTAH

ROBERT J. EPPSTEIN, C.B.O.
DIRECTOR, BUILDING AND SAFETY
FREMONT, CALIFORNIA

BOB FOWLER, P.E., AIA, C.B.O.
DIRECTOR OF BUILDING INSPECTION
ABILENE, TEXAS

JAN P. GASTERLAND, C.B.O.
BUILDING CODE OFFICER
ST. PAUL, MINNESOTA

DOUGLAS E. HOOD, C.B.O.
BUILDING OFFICIAL
COLORADO RIVER INDIAN TRIBES
PARKER, ARIZONA

GORDON W. MURDOCH, P.E.
BUILDING OFFICIAL
DANA POINT, CALIFORNIA

MICHAEL J. NOLTE, C.B.O.
BUILDING OFFICIAL
CRESWELL, OREGON

ALAN P. OLSON
ASSISTANT DEVELOPMENT
SERVICES DIRECTOR
PHOENIX, ARIZONA

RON PERKEREWICZ, C.B.O.
DIRECTOR OF COMMUNITY
DEVELOPMENT
COUNTY OF KITSAP
PORT ORCHARD, WASHINGTON

THOMAS R. THOMPSON, C.B.O.
BUILDING OFFICIAL
BROOMFIELD, COLORADO

ROBERT D. WEBER, P.E., C.B.O.
DIRECTOR, DEPARTMENT OF BUILDING
COUNTY OF CLARK
LAS VEGAS, NEVADA

ALLEN O. ZEPPE, C.B.O.
BUILDING OFFICIAL
STILLWATER, MINNESOTA

PRESIDENT

JAMES E. BIHR, P.E.

FAX NUMBERS

Order Department	(213) 692-3853
Plan Review	(213) 692-3425
ICBO ES	(213) 695-4694
Administration	(213) 699-8031
Indiana	(317) 879-0966
Missouri	(816) 741-9475
Texas	(512) 343-9116
Washington	(206) 637-8939

August 23, 1991

Mr. David Smith
Building Official
CITY OF ROCKWALL
205 W. Rusk
Rockwall, Texas 75087

Dear Mr. Smith:


Thank you for your recent inquiry regarding plan review services available from the International Conference of Building Officials. We have enclosed information explaining the service and setting forth plan review fees and an application blank.

Please refer to the attached brochure for instructions and submittal requirements. Our turn-around time for a plan review is from one to six weeks, depending upon the complexity and completeness of submitted data.

If a complete plan review for conformance to the *Uniform Building Code* or a structural-only review is desired, in addition to a set of plans, we require specifications, complete structural calculations, and a soil investigation report. If only a non-structural review is desired, then a set of plans and specifications is sufficient. If plumbing, mechanical/ and/or electrical reviews are desired, there reviews are performed through our headquarters office in Whittier, California, and an additional set of plans and specifications would expedite these reviews.

We appreciate your interest in our plan review service and look forward to being of assistance. If you have a question, please don't hesitate to contact us at (800) 252-3602.

Very truly yours,


Carroll Lee Pruitt, AIA
Regional Manager

CLP:sf
Enclosure
c:\wp51\pruitt\corr\dsmith1.91

OFFICES OF

CARROLL L. PRUITT, AIA
REGIONAL MANAGER

JAMES W. SHEFFIELD, P.E.
REGIONAL ENGINEER

Main Office: 5360 South Workman Mill Road • Whittier, California 90601 • (213) 699-0541

PLAN REVIEW APPLICATION

TO: International Conference of Building Officials
9300 Jollyville Road, Suite 101
Austin, Texas 78759-7455
Attention: Plan Review Services

Date: _____

FROM: _____

Please provide plan review services for the following project:

1. Name of Jurisdiction: _____
2. Name of Project: _____
3. Address of Job: _____
4. Valuation: _____
5. Seismic Zone: _____
6. Basic Wind Speed: _____
7. Frost Line: _____
8. Soil Bearing Data: _____
9. Project Contact Person and Address (Optional): _____
10. Please circle: Perform a Complete, (Nonstructural, Structural) plan check.
11. Please circle: One, (Two, Three) set(s) of plans and one set each of calculations, soils report and specifications are enclosed.

Please Check:
☐ Enclosed
☐ Under Separate Cover
12. Please check plans under the following edition of the Uniform Building Code:
☐ 1988 Edition
☐ 1991 Edition
☐ Other: (please specify) _____
13. Please check plans for compliance with the additional following codes:
☐ State of Texas Handicapped Requirements
☐ Other: (please specify) _____
14. Copy comments to contact person (circle one): yes no

Signed: _____ Title _____ Telephone: _____

**INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE OF BUILDING OFFICIALS
PLAN REVIEW SERVICES**

All active Class A members of the Conference are welcome to take advantage of our plan review services. These services may include a review for compliance with the nonstructural and structural provisions of the Uniform Building Code and/or compliance with other construction codes such as the Uniform Mechanical Code, Uniform Plumbing Code and the National Electrical Code. Simply submit a complete set of plans with design calculations, specifications, foundation investigation report and a letter of authorization including such pertinent information as code edition in effect, estimated valuation, wind zone, seismic zone or other special features. When it is desired to have plans reviewed for compliance with both the Uniform Building Code and other construction codes, the plan review process can be expedited if two sets of plans and related information are provided.

Upon completion of the plan review, Conference headquarters will invoice your jurisdiction based on fees as follows:

Uniform Building Code Review:

The plan review fees are based on Section 304 (c) and the fee schedule set forth in Table No. 3-A of the 1988 Uniform Building Code with a reduction from 65 percent to 50 percent of the permit fee as illustrated in the following table:

<u>VALUATIONS</u>	<u>PLAN CHECK FEE COLLECTED BY JURISDICTION</u>	<u>ICBO PLAN CHECK FEE</u>	<u>AMOUNT RETAINED BY JURISDICTION</u>
\$ 200,000.00	\$ 643.20	\$ 494.75	\$ 148.45
500,000.00	1,325.70	1,019.75	305.95
1,000,000.00	2,300.70	1,769.75	530.95
5,000,000.00	7,500.70	5,769.75	1,730.95
10,000,000.00	14,000.70	10,769.75	3,230.95
15,000,000.00	20,500.70	15,769.75	4,730.95
25,000,000.00	33,500.70	25,769.75	7,730.95
50,000,000.00	66,000.70	50,769.75	15,230.95

If only a structural review is desired, the fee is 85 percent of the complete review; a nonstructural only review is 75 percent of the complete review.

Electrical, Plumbing and Mechanical Code Reviews:

Fees for the National Electrical Code, Uniform Plumbing Code and Uniform Mechanical Code review services are based on those set forth in Section 304 (c) and Tables No.'s 3-B, 3-C and 3-D of the 1988 Uniform Administrative Code with a reduction from 25 percent to 20 percent of the permit fee.

State of Texas Handicapped Requirements:

There are no fees assessed for this review when it is requested with a complete Uniform Building Code review; otherwise, the service will be provided at an hourly rate of \$50.00.

Recheck services are offered at no additional charge. Other code consulting services are offered at an hourly rate of \$50.00.

TABLE
3C



CITY OF ROCKWALL
DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNITY SERVICES
BUILDING INSPECTION
APPLICATION

SUBMIT IN DUPLICATE

PLUMBING PERMIT

APPLICANT TO COMPLETE
ALL PERTINENT ITEMS
WITHIN HEAVY LINES.
PLEASE PRINT OR TYPE.

Date _____ Use of Property _____ Address of Proposed Work Include Suite # If Applicable _____

Description of Proposed Work _____

Owner or Tenant _____ Address _____ Total Value of Work _____

Contractor _____ Business Address _____ License Number _____

I HAVE CAREFULLY READ THE COMPLETED APPLICATION AND KNOW THE SAME IS TRUE AND CORRECT AND HEREBY AGREE THAT IF A PERMIT IS ISSUED ALL PROVISIONS OF THE CITY ORDINANCES AND STATE LAWS WILL BE COMPLIED WITH. WHETHER HEREIN SPECIFIED OR NOT I AGREE TO COMPLY WITH ALL PROPERTY RESTRICTIONS. I AM THE OWNER OF THE ABOVE PROPERTY OR HIS DULY AUTHORIZED AGENT. PERMISSION IS HEREBY GRANTED TO ENTER PREMISES AND MAKE ALL INSPECTIONS.

APPLICANT'S NAME (PLEASE PRINT) _____ SOC. SEC. NO. _____

APPLICANT'S SIGNATURE _____ PHONE _____

Call 771-7700 for Rough and Final Inspections

1CBO

	NO.	EACH	AMOUNT
Issuing Permits	_____	\$5.00	15.00
Traps For Each Fixture	_____	\$2.00	6.00
Sewer Connection	_____	\$6.00	15.00
Water Heater (each)	_____	\$2.00	6.00
Gas Piping (1-5 outlets)	_____	\$2.00	7.50
Gas Piping (5 or more outlets each)	_____	\$.50	3.00
Waste Interceptor (grease or sand)	_____	\$2.00	2.25
Septic System	_____	\$5.00	12.00
Lawn Sprinkler	_____	\$6.00	45.00
Other	_____	\$ 9	9.00
_____	_____	\$	_____
_____	_____	\$	_____
TOTAL			_____

EACH



High School

call Wayne Res

Wayne - the discussion on
Kyle Drive

15% = 230,807 \$ Chao ? 51,000 - 10' Buffer

need 10' buffer on west
side of yellow plot

22,000 - parking

40,430 - A

37,340 - B

10,500 C

161,270

8,624 D

169,894

is the other going to be irrigated - what is

check

~~where is the trash service area~~

is dumpster screened w/ door

do we need another fire hydrant at rear -
get Ed to review.

is landscaped area curved

trees in buffer

do need to grass in Row + design roads to keep water

what is area of student parking lot

plants and Faculty parking lot? for screening?

School Site Issues

Facilities agreement issues -

1. Provision of sidewalks - when & when
2. Completion of Kyle Drive
3. Waiver of parking lot landscaping and screening
4. Future landscaping plan
5. Issue of trees to be provided
6. Construction of farm homes & integration of
medians? mainly just taps for irrigation

Utilities -

1. Storm drainage?

Fees -


1. Availability fees $\begin{array}{r} \$27,677 \\ - \$15,390 \\ \hline \end{array}$ - est.

Student
parking lot

$$\begin{array}{r} 205,830 \\ + 20,000 \text{ estimated add} \\ \hline 225,830 \\ 11,291 \quad 5\% \quad \text{OK} \end{array}$$

is it face brick on all sides. except for
front.

\$ 1.00 Tuesday.
630-5626
Tom Bloodgood



ROCKWALL

INDEPENDENT SCHOOL DISTRICT

801 EAST WASHINGTON • ROCKWALL, TEXAS 75087 • (214) 722-3201

Wayne Bingham,
Superintendent

January 31, 1990

Mr. Bill Eisien
City of Rockwall
205 West Rusk
Rockwall, Texas 75087

Dear Bill:

The Rockwall Independent School District hereby authorizes Larry Claycomb, school architect, to represent the school by applying for a zone change at the site for the new high school.

Your cooperation is greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,

Wayne Bingham
Superintendent of Schools



CLAYCOMB
ASSOCIATES, ARCHITECTS

January 31, 1991

**Ms. Julie Couch
Asst. City Manager
City of Rockwall
205 W. Rusk
Rockwall, Tx. 75087**

Re: New Rockwall High School

Dear Julie:


As part of the site plan application for the new Rockwall High School, we request that the detailed landscaping plan be waived until a later date.

We propose this date be determined after the site grading is completed and after the building is under construction, and of course prior to its completion. Due to the size and complexity of this project, details around the building may continue to be developed until issuance of the plans to the bidders.

We request that the parking lot landscaping requirement be waived in the case of the faculty parking area as this is also serving as the foul weather band marching practice area. Due to the natural terrain on the site an alternate location for these band students to march is not feasible. In the submittal drawings we have totaled the two large parking areas landscaping requirements and have exceeded these total requirements with the landscaped areas and trees in the student parking area alone.

It is our intent to leave a large area of the site around the tennis courts in the southwest corner of the site in its natural state. There are to numerous trees of varying sizes and types located in this heavily wooded area to count and/or specifically locate. We request that these trees count toward 50% of the 102 trees required in the landscaped buffer adjacent to the streets surrounding the site. It is our hope that other native trees on the site may be able to be saved as the grading develops. but that is next to impossible to determine at this point.

**Very truly yours,
Claycomb Associates, Inc.**


Larry Claycomb, AIA

MASTERPLAN

Mrs. Julie Couch
City of Rockwall
205 W. Rusk
Rockwall, Texas 75087

February 11, 1991

Dear Mrs. Couch:

YELLOWJACKET LANE MEDIAN OPENINGS - GREENCREST TO KYLE

Pursuant to our conversation, I have reviewed the median opening and access plan proposed for the new High School campus located along the south side of Yellowjacket between Greencrest and Kyle Drive. The following information is deemed pertinent.


1. The Rockwall City Council approved a specific median opening plan for this section of Yellowjacket on April 6, 1987. The proposed plan does not completely agree with that plan.
2. The proposed plan would establish a median opening approximately 330 FT east of Greencrest Drive. This distance, although less than the approved plan showing an opening at approximately 480 FT, could be accepted from an engineering perspective.
3. The proposed plan would establish a second median opening only 265 FT east of the first proposed opening. This distance is insufficient to permit the future construction of an eastbound left turn approach to the second median opening, and would, therefore, be unacceptable from an engineering perspective. The minimum median length which can be recommended between driveways is 300 FT.
4. It appears that the proposed median openings may require the relocation of existing illumination poles which are in the median along this section of the street.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Approve the proposed location of the median opening which is approximately 330 FT from Greencrest.

2. Require the median east of this first opening to be at least 300 FT in length.
3. Require the RISD to pay for any relocation of illumination poles along the median.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in dark ink, appearing to read "John F. Reglin". The signature is fluid and cursive, with a large loop at the end.

John F. Reglin, P.E.
Vice President



February 13, 1991

**Ms. Julie Couch
Asst. City Manager
City of Rockwall
205 W. Rusk
Rockwall, TX 75087**

RE: New Rockwall High School


Dear Ms. Couch:

As part of the site plan application for the New Rockwall High School, the Rockwall I.S.D. respectfully requests the following site plan requirements be waived or modified:

- A. We request the developers impact fee be waived for this site.**
- B. We request the building construction permit fee be waived for this project.**
- C. We request the requirement of a sidewalk along all of the district owned Greencrest Drive frontage be waived.**
- D. We request the requirement of interior parking lot landscaping at the faculty parking/band marching area be waived.**
- E. We request the requirement for oak trees to be planted for each 50 feet of street frontage be reduced by 50%.**
- F. We request the requirement for the submittal of detailed landscaping plans be postponed until after the building is under construction.**

We appreciate your assistance and cooperation with this project.

Very truly yours,


**Larry Claycomb, AIA
CLAYCOMB ASSOCIATES, INC.**

**LC/lr
c.c.: Supt. Wayne Bingham**



February 18, 1991

**Ms. Julie Couch
Asst. City Manager
City of Rockwall
205 W. Rusk
Rockwall, TX 75087**

RE: New Rockwall High School


Dear Ms. Couch:

As part of the site plan application for the New Rockwall High School, the Rockwall I.S.D. respectfully requests the following site plan requirements be waived or modified:

- A. We request the developers impact fee be waived for this site.**
- B. We request the building construction permit fee be waived for this project.**
- C. We request the requirement of a sidewalk along all of the district owned Greencrest Drive frontage be waived.**
- D. We request the requirement of interior parking lot landscaping at the faculty parking/band marching area be waived.**
- E. We request the requirement for oak trees to be planted for each 50 feet of street frontage be reduced by 50%.**
- F. We request the requirement for the submittal of detailed landscaping plans be postponed until after the building is under construction.**

We appreciate your assistance and cooperation with this project.

Very truly yours,


**Larry Claycomb, AIA
CLAYCOMB ASSOCIATES, INC.**

**LC/r
c.c.: Supt. Wayne Bingham**

MEMORANDUM

July 24, 1991

TO: Bill Eisen, City Manager

FROM: Julie Couch, Assistant City Manager
Dub Douphrate, City Engineer

RE: Status of Development of New High School Site

There are several areas of concern regarding the status of development of the high school site that we believe need to be addressed. The site plan and preliminary plat were approved by the City Council in February of this year. Since that time grading work has begun on the site without a number of additional approvals from the City. A chronology of the events to date is as follows:

- A. January through February the site plan and preliminary plat were processed for approval. The architect and engineer indicated that they would like to be able to begin grading prior to the approval of the final plat. Staff indicated to them that grading could begin but that all engineering needed to be approved prior to the start of grading to ensure that the drainage would meet the standards established in the City's construction specifications, as is done with all development within the City.
- B. The first set of engineering drawings were submitted on May 17, 1991. These plans were reviewed and returned to the project engineer for corrections on May 23, 1991.
- C. The second week of June staff learned that the grading had begun even though the engineering had not been approved. A letter was sent to the project engineer with a copy to Wayne Bingham, the School Superintendent, indicating that this work was occurring without final approval of the engineering and that changes in the grading might be necessary as a result of the plan approval.
- D. Staff received a portion of the corrected drawings back from the project engineer on July 12, 1991. A number of corrections were not completed which delays any approval of the engineering. The engineer was told which information had still not been provided on July 19, 1991. The project engineer requested approval to proceed with the installation of a portion of the proposed storm sewer system on July 19, 1991. He was told by staff that no portion of the utility system could be installed until the plans had been fully submitted and approved and a preconstruction conference held, which is consistent with City policies.
- E. Staff became aware that trenching for the storm sewer line was apparently being done on Tuesday, July 23. This raised some concerns that portions of the storm sewer system,

which will be a public line dedicated to and maintained by the City, may be installed which may not meet City construction standards.

In addition to these items the school has not yet filed their final plat for approval by the City. The soonest that the plat could now be approved under our normal meeting schedule is September 16, assuming that the plat is filed by August 26 and assuming that all engineering is approved by that date. The project engineer has indicated that the architect is planning to request a building permit for the school by the middle of September. Not only does the final plat need to be approved along with a facilities agreement, as specified in the preliminary plat approval, but the building plans will need to be reviewed in depth by the Inspection department prior to issuance of the permit. Because of the complexity and size of the building the plan review could take up to three weeks to complete depending upon building activity.

To summarize, staff concerns are 1) that final grading is being completed prior to City approval of the grading and drainage plan, which may result in changes being necessary to work that has already been done, 2) that installation of at least portions of the drainage system may be constructed prior to approval of engineering plans which, again, may result in changes being necessary to work that is already done, and 3) that the school will be in a position to request a building permit before approval of the final plat or before the building plans have been thoroughly reviewed.

We understand that the school district has a time table that they are attempting to follow in order to complete the school in a timely manner and we would like to work with the District to ensure that they are not delayed in starting the building construction. However, in order for them to meet their timetable, coordination with the City will be necessary.



August 13, 1991

**Ms. Julie Couch, Asst. City Manager
City of Rockwall
205 W. Rusk
Rockwall, Texas 75087**

Re: Rockwall High School

Dear Julie:

Thank you and your associates for allowing me to give you an overview of the New High School. Your comments and suggestions were appreciated.


Julie, our bid date on this high school is September 24, 1991. If all goes as planned, the General Contractor should be chosen by October 1 and should begin construction by October 10, 1991.

We will be issuing the last addenda to all bidders on September 18, 1991. This addenda will be answering questions and clarifying items on the plans. If at all possible, we would appreciate it if we could review with you and/or your staff any code questions they may have prior to the September 18th date in order that we could include any of their requested changes in that last addenda.

Attached for your review are some "cut sheets" on the pre-manufactured Security House we propose to install near the Greencrest student and service drive entry.

Again, thank you for your assistance.

Very truly yours,

A large, stylized handwritten signature in black ink, which appears to read 'Larry Claycomb'.

**Larry Claycomb, AIA
CLAYCOMB ASSOCIATES, INC.**



August 23, 1991

**George W. Ferrie, Architectural Assistant
Elimination of Mechanical Barriers
State Purchasing and General Services Commission
1711 San Jacinto, P.O. Box 13047 Capitol Station
Austin, Texas 78711-3047
(512) 463-3222**

Re: Rockwall High School

Dear Sir:

As per our phone conversation today, the plans for the new Rockwall High School have been sent to your office on August 20, 1991. I am forwarding the Handicapped Accessibility Statement of Intent to verify that all your requirements will be met before the owner occupies this project.

I understand, with your backlog of projects, the review of this high school will not be completed prior to its bidding. Therefor, any changes required by your office will be done by the general contractor during construction using change orders and drawings for verification.

The signed Letter of Intent to Comply is all your office requires at this time and building permits are not contingent upon your approval.

Yours very truly,

**Kevin Smith, AIA
CLAYCOMB ASSOCIATES, INC.**

**cc: David Smith
Building Inspector, City of Rockwall**

KS/tl

CITY OF ROCKWALL
Planning and Zoning Agenda

Agenda Date: February 14, 1990

Agenda No: III. A.

Agenda Item: P&Z 91-3-Z/SP/PP - Hold Public Hearing and Consider Recommending Approval of a Request from the RISD for a Change in Zoning from "MF-15", Multifamily, to "C", Commercial, and Approval of a Site Plan and Preliminary Plat on a Tract of Land Located on Yellowjacket Lane East of FM-740

Item Generated By: Applicant, RISD

Action Needed: Hold public hearing and take any necessary action.

Background Information:

The RISD has submitted the necessary applications to begin development of the new high school site on Yellowjacket Lane. The site contains approximately 35 acres and is located along Yellowjacket Lane between FM-740 and SH-205. A discussion of the issues is as follows:

Zoning

A portion of the site is zoned MF-15 and the remainder is zoned Commercial. The school would need to rezone the MF portion or request a CUP for an institutional use in a MF district. Because the surrounding property is already Commercial they have requested rezoning. This is in conformance with our land use plan. We would recommend approval of the rezoning.

Preliminary Plat

A portion of the property acquired by the school is already platted as a part of the Goldencrest Addition. The school will replat those portions in conjunction with the platting of the remaining property. The site is served with water and sewer, but there will be additional utility extensions needed to serve the site. The school is preparing a drainage plan for our review in conjunction with the final plat. No additional ROW is needed on site, however, a discussion of access is addressed below.

The school is platting additional land over and above what was originally platted as Goldencrest. The total area owned by the school is approximately 52 acres. That portion that has not been platted is subject to impact fees. This area is approximately 17.98 acres, which will generate an impact fee of \$27,677. The school is planning to request a waiver to this requirement.

SEE ATTACHED NOTES

Attachments:

1. Site plan
2. Grading and utility plan
- 3.

Agenda Item: RISD High School

Item No: III. A.

**CITY OF ROCKWALL
City Council Agenda**

Agenda Date: February 18, ~~1990~~ 1991 **Agenda No:** VI. B.

Agenda Item: P&Z 91-3-Z/SP/PP - Hold Public Hearing and Consider Approval of an Ordinance Requested by the RISD for a Change in Zoning from "MF-15", Multifamily, to "C", Commercial, and Approval of a Site Plan and Preliminary Plat for the Proposed High School on a Tract of Land Located on Yellowjacket Lane East of FM-740

Item Generated By: Applicant, RISD

Action Needed: Hold public hearing and take any necessary action.

Background Information:

The Commission has reviewed this case and the following is a discussion of their recommendation:

Zoning

The Commission unanimously recommended approval of the change in zoning from MF-15 to Commercial.

Preliminary Plat

The Commission recommended, although not unanimously, to approve the preliminary plat and to waive the impact fees associated with the development of the school. The waiver would only apply to the RISD. If they were to sell the property prior to development the fees would be applicable.

SEE ATTACHED NOTES

Attachments:

Agenda Item: RISD High School Site Plan **Item No:** VI. B.

Site Plan

The Commission recommended approval of the site plan with the following conditions:

- Landscaping - A requirement that a detailed landscaping plan be submitted for Commission approval prior to the completion of the high school. Such plan will address the number of street trees to be provided.
- Approval of the requested waiver to the parking lot landscaping in the faculty parking lot.
- Turn Lanes - As mentioned in the previous notes, there was some concern regarding the proximity of the two median breaks between the parent drop off area and the student access on Yellowjacket which, as we understand it, be used normally as an exit only. Mr. Reglin's concern was with the proposed turn lane into the student access. The median, as proposed, is too short to accommodate the turn lane into this area and provide a future turn lane into the property to the north. Another concern was that if the access is only to be used as an exit except for special after school events that might be a large traffic generator, the presence of the turn lane will not normally serve traffic and its presence will be confusing to the traveling public.
- It is recommended by the Commission that the median break be retained but that the turn lane be deleted. This would allow exiting traffic from the parking lot to go either left or right, but would not allow for normal left turns into the property. If the school needed to use the access as an entrance for a special event they could, in coordination with the City and on a temporary basis, sign it and utilize school security to direct traffic into the lot. If the event is large enough to need two entrances the school would most probably be utilizing security officers in any case.
- The Commission also recommends that prior to final plat the left turn lane from Yellowjacket onto Greencrest be studied to determine if the length of the turn lane needs to be increased. With all student traffic entering the school off of Greencrest, the existing turn lane may not be adequate.
- Access - The Commission has recommended that Kyle Drive either be widened down to the second bus drive for two way traffic or extended to the service road for one way service prior to the issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy for the school. They also stipulated that a status report on the expansion of the road be submitted to the Commission by August of 1991.
- Fire Protection - That an additional fire hydrant be installed along the faculty drive toward the south of the building. There was considerable discussion regarding whether or not to require the fire lane at the rear of the building to tie into the faculty drive. It was pointed out to the Commission that the location of the fire hydrants provided fire protection that met City requirements.
- CUP - That a CUP be applied for if the material used in the front of the building does not meet masonry standards.
- Facilities - That a facilities agreement be entered into with the school at the time of final plat outlining all of the approved conditions.
- Sidewalks - The School requested that sidewalks not be required along the Greencrest frontage. The Commission discussed this issue at length and ultimately did not recommend a waiver to the sidewalk requirements. They also recommended that a sidewalk be provided along the north side of the main drive into the student parking area to Greencrest.

The site plan was unanimously approved. A draft copy of the minutes is attached for your review.

CITY OF ROCKWALL
City Council Agenda

Agenda Date: February 18, ~~1999~~ 1991

Agenda No: VI. C.

Agenda Item: P&Z 91-3-Z/SP/PP - Hold Public Hearing and Consider Approval of an Ordinance Requested by the RISD for a Change in Zoning from "MF-15", Multifamily, to "C", Commercial, and Approval of a Site Plan and Preliminary Plat for the Proposed High School on a Tract of Land Located on Yellowjacket Lane East of FM-740

Item Generated By: Applicant, RISD

Action Needed: Hold public hearing and take any necessary action.

Background Information:

The RISD has submitted the necessary applications to begin development of the new high school site on Yellowjacket Lane. The site contains approximately 35 acres and is located along Yellowjacket Lane between FM-740 and SH-205. A discussion of the issues is as follows:

Zoning

A portion of the site is zoned MF-15 and the remainder is zoned Commercial. The school would need to rezone the MF portion or request a CUP for an institutional use in a MF district. Because the surrounding property is already Commercial they have requested rezoning. This is in conformance with our land use plan. We would recommend approval of the rezoning.

Preliminary Plat

A portion of the property acquired by the school is already platted as a part of the Goldencrest Addition. The school will replat those portions in conjunction with the platting of the remaining property. The site is served with water and sewer, but there will be additional utility extensions needed to serve the site. The school is preparing a drainage plan for our review in conjunction with the final plat. No additional ROW is needed on site, however, a discussion of access is addressed below.

The school is platting additional land over and above what was originally platted as Goldencrest. The total area owned by the school is approximately 52 acres. That portion that has not been platted is subject to impact fees. This area is approximately 17.98 acres, which will generate an impact fee of \$27,677. The school is requesting a waiver to this requirement.

SEE ATTACHED NOTES

Attachments:

1. Site plan
2. Grading and utility plan

Agenda Item: RISD High School Site Plan

Item No: VI. C.

MINUTES OF THE ROCKWALL CITY COUNCIL
February 18, 1991

CALL TO ORDER

5

Mayor Frank Miller called the meeting to order with the following Councilmembers present: Nell Welborn, Alma Williams, Norm Seligman, David Elkins, and Pat Luby. Gary Martin was absent. Seligman led the invocation and the pledge of allegiance.

10 **PRESENTATION BY FRIENDS OF THE LIBRARY**

Claudette Hatfield presented the Mayor a with plaque on behalf of the Friends of the Library in appreciation to the City of Rockwall for participation and support of the new Rockwall County Library.

15

CONSENT AGENDA

A. the Minutes of February 4, 1991

20

B. Ordinance No. 91-9 on second reading granting a request from Michael James for a change in zoning from "LI" Light Industrial to "PD" Planned Development or "HWY C" Highway Commercial on a tract of land located on the south service road of I-30 west of FM-549

25

AN ORDINANCE OF THE CITY OF ROCKWALL, TEXAS, AMENDING THE COMPREHENSIVE ZONING ORDINANCE OF THE CITY OF ROCKWALL AS HERETOFORE AMENDED SO AS TO GRANT A ZONING CHANGE ON A TRACT OF LAND MORE FULLY DESCRIBED HEREIN; ORDERING A CHANGE IN THE USE OF SAID PROPERTY FROM "LI" LIGHT INDUSTRIAL TO "PD-34" PLANNED DEVELOPMENT NUMBER 34; PROVIDING SPECIAL CONDITIONS; PROVIDING FOR A PENALTY OF FINE NOT TO EXCEED THE SUM OF TWO THOUSAND DOLLARS (\$2,000) FOR EACH OFFENSE; PROVIDING FOR A SEVERABILITY CLAUSE; PROVIDING FOR A REPEALER CLAUSE; AND PROVIDING FOR AN EFFECTIVE DATE.

30

C. Resolution No. 91-4 ordering the 1991 Municipal Officers Election

35

D. Ordinance No. 91-10 on second reading establishing the position of Fire Marshall

AN ORDINANCE OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF ROCKWALL, TEXAS, DELETING CHAPTER 10, ARTICLE 11, FIRE MARSHAL, SECTIONS 10-16 THROUGH 10-32, IN THEIR ENTIRETY BY PROVIDING FOR NEW SECTIONS 10-16 THROUGH 10-17; PROVIDING A PENALTY OF FINE NOT TO EXCEED THE SUM OF (\$2,000.00) AND THAT A SEPARATE OFFENSE SHALL BE DEEMED COMMITTED FOR EACH DAY THE VIOLATION OCCURS; PROVIDING A SEVERABILITY CLAUSE; PROVIDING FOR AN EFFECTIVE DATE

40

E. Resolution No. 91-5 naming April as "Prevent-a-Litter" month

45

Assistant City Manager Julie Couch read the ordinance captions. Welborn made a motion to approve the Consent Agenda. Williams seconded the motion. The motion was voted on and passed unanimously.

50 **APPOINTMENT WITH ROCKWALL HISTORICAL FOUNDATION AND APPROVAL
OF A CONTRACT EXTENSION**

55 Marilyn Miller explained that the Historical Foundation was requesting the contract be renewed for \$2000 for the making of minor repairs and painting of the museum building. Seligman made a motion to approve the contract extension. Luby seconded the motion. The motion was voted on and passed unanimously.

PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION CHAIRMAN'S REPORT

60 Chairman of the Planning and Zoning Commission explained the Commission's recommendation on the three public hearing items on the agenda.

65 **P&Z 91-3-Z/SP/PP PUBLIC HEARING AND ORDINANCE AUTHORIZING CHANGE
IN ZONING FROM "MF-15" MULTI-FAMILY TO "C" COMMERCIAL, SITE PLAN
AND PRELIMINARY PLAT FOR HIGH SCHOOL**

70 Larry Claycomb, architect for the Rockwall I.S.D. presented the application and discussed the proposed materials, the lighting, and the areas to be landscaped. As there was no one else wishing to address this issue, the public hearing was closed. Welborn made a motion to approve the ordinance authorizing the change in zoning. Luby seconded the motion. Couch read the ordinance caption. The motion was voted on and passed unanimously.

75 AN ORDINANCE OF THE CITY OF ROCKWALL, TEXAS, AMENDING THE COMPREHENSIVE ZONING ORDINANCE OF THE CITY OF ROCKWALL AS HERETOFORE AMENDED SO AS TO GRANT A ZONING CHANGE ON A TRACT OF LAND MORE FULLY DESCRIBED HEREIN; ORDERING A CHANGE IN THE USE OF SAID PROPERTY FROM "MF-15" MULTI-FAMILY TO "C" COMMERCIAL; PROVIDING FOR A PENALTY OF FINE NOT TO EXCEED THE SUM OF TWO THOUSAND DOLLARS (\$2,000) FOR EACH OFFENSE; PROVIDING FOR A SEVERABILITY CLAUSE; PROVIDING FOR A REPEALER CLAUSE; AND PROVIDING FOR AN EFFECTIVE DATE.

80 Miller confirmed with staff that the preliminary plat request included a request for a waiver of the \$27,677 in applicable impact fees. Seligman confirmed that the City would pay the fees if the waiver was granted. Welborn noted that the school district included 15,358 accounts (or taxpayers) which included the 6966 City accounts (or taxpayers). Miller agreed that the impact fees should be spread over a larger tax base. Welborn made a motion to approve the preliminary plat and deny the waiver request of impact fees. Elkins seconded the motion. The motion was voted on and passed unanimously.

90 Seligman made a motion to approve the site plan with the conditions recommended by the Planning and Zoning Commission. Luby seconded the motion. The conditions were recommended as follows:

- 1) a detailed landscaping plan be submitted for approval prior to the completion of the high school
- 2) recommending a waiver to the landscaping requirement in the faculty parking lot

- 95 3) eliminating the left turn lane on Yellowjacket into the student parking lot, and reviewing turn lane length into Greencrest prior to final plat approval
- 100 4) that Kyle Drive either be extended to tie into I-30 and become one way or be widened to the second bus drive (third entrance) for two way traffic prior to issuance of the certificate of occupancy and that a plan for the improvement of Kyle be submitted to the Planning and Zoning Commission by August 1991
- 105 5) that an additional fire hydrant be installed along the faculty drive toward the south of the building
- 110 6) that the dumpster be screened
- 115 7) that the R.I.S.D. make a CUP application if the building materials do not meet masonry standards
- 8) that a facilities agreement be entered into with the school district at the time of the final plat outlining all of the approved conditions
- 9) that sidewalk requirements not be waived
- 10) that a sidewalk be added along on the north side of the drive between the student parking lot and Greencrest

120 Council discussed the sidewalk provisions, the widening of Kyle Drive and the requirement that the CUP for building materials be applied for and approved. The motion was voted on and passed unanimously.

125 **P&Z 91-1-CUP/SP/FP PUBLIC HEARING AND ORDINANCE AUTHORIZING CUP FOR BUILDING NOT MEETING MASONRY REQUIREMENTS, SITE PLAN AND FINAL PLAT FOR RACETRAC STATION LOCATED ON SH-205 NORTH OF I-30**

130 Mayor Miller opened the public hearing. Don Gosset, surveyor representing the applicant, was present to answer questions of Council regarding the plat. Welborn made a motion to approve the ordinance authorizing a CUP for split faced block material on the building. Williams seconded the motion. Couch read the ordinance caption. The motion was voted on and passed unanimously.

135 AN ORDINANCE OF THE CITY OF ROCKWALL, TEXAS, AMENDING THE COMPREHENSIVE ZONING ORDINANCE OF THE CITY OF ROCKWALL AS HERETOFORE AMENDED SO AS TO GRANT A CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT FOR A STRUCTURE WITH LESS THAN 90 PERCENT EXTERIOR MASONRY FACADE ON THE PROPERTY DESCRIBED HEREIN; PROVIDING FOR A PENALTY OF FINE NOT TO EXCEED THE SUM OF TWO THOUSAND DOLLARS (\$2,000.00) FOR EACH OFFENSE; PROVIDING FOR A SEVERABILITY CLAUSE; PROVIDING FOR A REPEALER CLAUSE; PROVIDING FOR AN EFFECTIVE DATE.

140 Seligman made a motion to approve the final plat subject to conditions recommended by the Planning and Zoning Commission: requiring a 24 foot access easement on south side and a 10 foot utility easement on the frontage. Welborn seconded the motion. The motion was voted on

Notes on RISD High School Cont'd.

Site Plan

The site plan details the proposed layout for the school. The site plan is generally in conformance with the City's requirements. Our comments are as follows:

Landscaping - the plan provides the required percentage of irrigated landscaping. They have not completed a detailed landscaping plan at this point. They propose to complete a plan for submission to the Commission and Council at a later date. The School is asking for a waiver to the parking lot landscaping in the faculty parking lot. The school will use this parking area for marching band practice as well as parking and internal landscaping will interfere with this type of use. They have exceeded the required landscaping in the student parking area and they propose to screen the faculty parking lot with shrubs. The school is also proposing to use some of the existing trees around the tennis courts for their street tree requirement. This is an issue we would need to review when they do submit the detailed landscaping plan.

Site Access - the site plan provides for access into the student parking lot from Yellowjacket and from Greencrest. There is also access off of Yellowjacket proposed for the parent drop off area in front of the building. Both of these points of access propose to utilize a median break. John Reglin has reviewed the proposed median breaks and indicated some concern about the lack of separation between the parent drop off drive and the student parking lot drive on Yellowjacket. The Commission will review this issue Thursday night.

The access into the faculty parking lot is off of Kyle Drive, which is currently only half of a street. Both the school and the City recognize the need to widen and /or extend Kyle along the school's property line. The school is also interested in extending Kyle all the way to the service road to improve circulation around the site. We would recommend that a condition be placed on the site plan that Kyle be expanded prior to completion of the school.

Sidewalks - the City's subdivision regulations require that sidewalks be provided on all streets on the City's thoroughfare plan. All of the streets in this development are on the thoroughfare plan and would require sidewalks unless otherwise approved. The school is requesting a waiver to the sidewalk requirements for their frontage along Greencrest. They do have frontage on both sides of Greencrest.

Fire Access - the site plan does not provide for a fire lane all around the building. The architect proposes to place one fire hydrant at the rear of the library area. Because they do not wish to extend the fire lane around the music room to tie into the rear drive we would recommend that an additional fire hydrant be placed off of the faculty driveway for a second means of accessing a fire hydrant.

Building - The school is planning to use a metal material in the front of the building that may not meet our masonry requirements without a CUP. The school is aware that if the material does not meet standards that an application will have to be made for a CUP.

The Planning and Zoning Commission will be considering this item at their meeting on Thursday night. We will forward their recommendation to you on Friday.