



CITY OF MARGATE

DEVELOPMENT REVIEW COMMITTEE (DRC) REVIEW #1

September 14, 2021

Meeting Location:

Building Department

901 NW 66th Avenue, Margate, FL, 33063

PROJECT NAME:	Hebrew Academy Expansion		
PROJECT NUMBER:	2021-349		
PROJECT LOCATION:	1500 North State Road 7		
APPLICANT/AGENT:	Matthew H. Scott, Esq. Dunay, Miskel & Backman, LLP Agent for Chabad Hebrew Academy, Inc.		
REVIEW/APPLICATION	Site Plan		
DISCIPLINE	REVIEWER	EMAIL	TELEPHONE
DRC Chairman	Elizabeth Taschereau – Director	etaschereau@margatefl.com	(954) 884-3686
Planning	Andrew Pinney – Senior Planner	apinney@margatefl.com	(954) 884-3684
Planning	Alexia Howald – Associate Planner	ahowald@margatefl.com	(954) 884-3685
Building	Richard Nixon – Building Official	rnixon@margatefl.com	(954) 970-3004
Engineering	Curt Keyser – Director	ckeyser@margatefl.com	(954) 884-3631
Engineering	Randy L. Daniel – Assistant Director	rdaniel@margatefl.com	(954) 884-3633
Fire	David Scholl – Fire Department	dscholl@margatefl.com	(954) 971-7010
Public Works	Mark Collins – Director	mcollins@margatefl.com	(954) 972-8126
Public Works	Gio Batista – Assistant Director	gbatista@margatefl.com	(954) 972-8123
CRA	Cale Curtis – Executive Director	ccurtis@margatefl.com	(954) 935-5300
Police	Cpt. Joseph Galaska – Police Department	jgalaska@margatefl.com	(954) 935-5429

Any questions regarding the DRC comments, please contact the appropriate department.

Applicant is required to address EACH comment and to revise plans accordingly (acknowledgements are not corrections).

DRC comments follow.

NOTE: Please email city staff with names, title and companies from your team that will be in attendance at the DRC meeting and indicate if they will be attending in-person or by zoom.

DEPARTMENTAL COMMENTS

BUILDING

1. There is a current, open violation open for this property. Violation number 01-104702 for an expired permit. The DRC submittals show improvements to the area of the expired permit. No permits exist for the improvements for this area. Permits and plans will be required regardless of DRC approval for this project or not. FBC 105.3.1.4
2. Sheet A-5 shows a column in the middle of an accessible ramp.
3. Show the width of the sidewalks and clear space with doors impeding the walkway. Sheet A-5, also show the clear walkway space near the existing stairs leading to the existing elevator. FAC 403.
4. Accessible paths do not seem to have ramps to the walkways.
5. Sheet SP-2. Parking space lines are to be measured to the center of the lines, not outside edges. FAC 502.1.
6. The Designer of record shall provide an occupant calculation for the entire school (existing and proposed) in accordance with the FBC table 1004.5.
7. The proposed plans show the roof being used as an occupied space. As a note the roof will need to comply with all requirements of the FBC and Accessibility code.
8. An accessible path shall be provided from the pedestrian side walk on 15th street, across the school parking lot to the school.
9. All expired permits and code violations shall be resolved prior to the issuance of a building permit.

FIRE

1. Fire sprinkler system will be required.
2. Fire alarm system will need to be upgraded.

PUBLIC WORKS

1. No comments.

POLICE

1. Pending.

CRA

1. No response.

ENGINEERING

The Director of the Department of Environmental and Engineering Services, or his qualified designee, has conducted a review of the submitted documentation in accordance with Article IV, Chapter 31 of the City of Margate is Code of Ordinances and finds the following:

PREAMBLE

The Department of Environmental and Engineering Services (DEES) is alarmed that both the Master Parking Statement and Traffic Study appear to be prepared and submitted by an individual, Mr. Thomas Hall, who is not a Licensed Professional Engineer in the State of Florida. Although Mr. Hall's traffic study was signed and sealed by Professional Engineer Peter Partington, FL Registration # 45099, the relationship between Mr. Hall and his countersigning Professional Engineer is unclear.

It is unknown whether Engineer Partington collected the engineering data, performed the analysis, and wrote the report himself, or if the work was performed under Engineer Partington's responsible charge as defined in Chapter 61G15 in the Florida Administrative Code, subclause 61G15-18.011.

If the first scenario is correct, then Engineer Partington ought to have signed and sealed the document on his letterhead.

If Engineer Partington is in responsible charge of the traffic study, Engineer Partington shall be available to discuss the project and answer questions related to this traffic study, since Engineer Partington is also the Engineer of Record.

DEES requests clarification of the roles played by Mr. Thomas Hall and Engineer Partington in preparing and submitting this Traffic Study. In addition, numerous errors were detected in the report.

Notwithstanding, the following discourse is provided.

A. TRAFFICWAYS

1. In accordance with City Code "School must provide a student drop off area for motorists that is dedicated to student drop off activities and will not interfere with onsite parking or roadways adjacent to the school". Based on observation, this requirement is not met by the existing school as vehicle stacking occurs on NW 15th Street to drop off and pick up students. Amend Traffic Study to illustrate how vehicle stacking will be accommodated within the school compound.
2. In accordance with City Code "The appropriate length and dimensions of the drop off area shall be identified in a traffic study prepared by a licensed engineer in the State of Florida.
3. Provide a detailed analysis to develop a proposed traffic circulation pattern within the school compound and show ingress and egress from the school property; no analysis nor technical discussion was provided in the section entitled "Circulation Analysis" in the traffic study.
4. Provide a detailed analysis to identify the student drop-off and pick-up zones within the school compound and show how these zones function in concert with the circulation patterns developed in item (2).
5. The traffic study incorrectly categorizes NW 15th Street as a collector road; NW 15th Street is a local road. Amend traffic study and clearly identify what project changes will be made to accommodate this amendment. Provide an explanation if no changes are deemed necessary.
6. The study incorrectly states that there are parking lanes on both sides of NW 15th Street. Travel lanes are delineated by white solid lines and the resulting shoulders are provided to allow easy maneuverability of trailer truck traffic. The shoulders behind the white solid lines are NOT for parking and no parking signs are currently posted on NW 15th Street.
7. The traffic study utilizes an incorrect ITE code for Pre K-8, in Table 3. Amend Traffic Study and clearly illustrate the project modifications to accommodate the correct ITE code. Provide an explanation if there are no consequential project modifications.
8. Provide supporting documentation that the software used for the "Turning Movement Count Report" is approved/endorsed by ITE, or other applicable regulatory body.
9. From staff observations, the number of U-turns during AM and PM peak hours far exceeded the U-turn numbers reported in Appendix A – traffic Counts. Redo traffic counts and ensure that the individual performing the traffic counts signs all field collected data.
10. Provide analysis and discussion to illustrate how the AM and PM trip distributions were determined.

11. The traffic study indicates that the applicant had always “intended to have a total of 400 students”. Please provide documented evidence to illustrate that the applicant had approval for a school population of 400 students.
12. The traffic study uses a maximum proposed student population of 450, but the parking statement uses 400 students; clarify which number is correct.
13. Discuss the relevance of the 2019 Historical AADT Report that was sourced from FDOT and attached in Appendix A, and show how this information was used in the analysis.
14. The existing building (31,000 sf) will be increased by 21,000 sf or 67.74%; it stands to reason that notwithstanding (2) and (3), the new school may be able to accommodate 67.74 % more students, or $(0.6774 \times 350 = 237)$ 237 more students.
15. If 206 additional trips would occur from 50 additional students, according to the calculations provided in the traffic study, 237 students would yield $((237/50)$ times 206 trips, which equals to 977 trips.
16. The code requires evaluation of the development based on its maximum impact on the surrounding properties and based on 237 additional students it appears based on the calculations presented, that 977 new trips will be added and therefore the traffic study ought to be redone for a one-mile radius, consistent with Section 31-35 of the Code.
17. Verify the name of the individual and firm who collected the field data for Appendix C – Existing Traffic Conditions Analysis.
18. Provide an analysis of the differences between the Existing Traffic Conditions Analysis (Appendix C) and the Background Traffic Conditions Analysis (Appendix D).
19. Verify the name of the individual and firm who collected the field data for Appendix E– Total Traffic Conditions Analysis.
20. Provide modification factor(s) to take into account the impact of COVID-19, to determine more realistic traffic counts. Provide explanation if this factor is deemed to be unnecessary.
21. Provide data to support the statements that “the HCM analysis software does not model six-lane roadways well”, and “HCM software doesn’t evaluate the queue of vehicles turning right from a freeflow through movement onto a more minor street or driveway.”
22. In lieu of the HCM analysis software that is alleged by the applicant to be deficient, provide an alternative software/literature that models “six-lane roadways well”.
23. The conclusion of the traffic study appears to be baseless and shall be redone based on responses to request for information outlined in items (1) through (19).

B. PARKING

1. The Parking Statement uses a maximum student population of 400; the traffic analysis uses 450 students; clarify which number is correct.
2. A proposed student population of 584 (i.e. 1.6674 times 350 students) will require a minimum of 76 spaces, according to the average rate of 0.13 per student that was presented in the Master Parking Statement.
3. The parking spaces east of property (on the aerial) appear to have been removed on the site plan. If these spaces are disconnected from the main parking lot they may not contribute to the required spaces for the project.

C. POTABLE WATER

Potable water service is available to serve the needs of the proposed addition. The water treatment plant has sufficient available capacity to satisfy the potable water needs of the proposed development, other developments in the service area which are occupied, available for occupancy, for which building permits are in effect, or for which potable water treatment capacity has been reserved.

The determination that potable water service is available shall not be construed as reservation of capacity for the development submitted unless a developer's agreement is executed with the city specifically reserving water capacity.

The size of the water service to the school will be based on the maximum school population; confirm the maximum number of students that can be enrolled in the school.

D. WASTEWATER

Wastewater treatment and disposal service is available to serve the needs of the proposed development. The wastewater treatment plant has sufficient capacity to provide for the wastewater treatment and disposal needs of the proposed development, other developments in the service area which are occupied, available for occupancy, for which building permits are in effect, or for which wastewater treatment and disposal capacity has been reserved.

This determination shall not be construed as a reservation of capacity for the development unless a developer's agreement has been executed with the City specifically reserving wastewater treatment and disposal capacity.

E. DRAINAGE

Submit calculations to illustrate changes in the volume of storm water run-off from the property. Show how stormwater runoff from the site will be managed.

F. SOLID WASTE

The City has hired a private vendor for collecting solid waste. There are four categories for collection of solid waste and the subject project is more closely aligned with the requirements of commercial developments. The developer shall make arrangements with the approved vendor(s) for the waste streams that are associated with their operations.

G. RECREATION

Not Applicable.

DEVELOPMENT SERVICES

After review of the above referenced DRC application, the Development Services Department has provided the following comments and advisory notes. Comments require a written response from the applicant and correction(s) to the application. Advisory notes are for informational purposes only.

Advisory Note 1: This application is for a Site Plan review and is therefore subject to the requirements of Chapter 31 of the Code of the City of Margate.

Sec. 31-35. - Determinations required prior to approval of a development permit.

(1) *Director of development services.* The director of development services determines:

- a. That the proposed development is consistent with the Margate Comprehensive Plan.

- b. That the proposed development is in conformity with the Margate Zoning Code.
- c. In the case of site plans, that the proposed development is in conformity with the provisions of chapter 23 of this Code.

Based on the above Code section, Development Services staff must compare the application to the adequacy determinations described in Section 31-35 of the Code of the City of Margate.

Application documents indicate Applicant is requesting to expand the existing school building at 1500 N State Road 7 to add a 21,009 square foot, 2-story addition along the entire linear building for the use of a private school, as well as provide an active rooftop patio area. The proposed expansion is a special exception use per Section 11.3 of the Margate Zoning Code. Therefore, the petitioner has concurrently submitted a special exception use application and a plat note amendment application in conjunction with the site plan application. Additionally, per Section 31-2, an underground wiring waiver was also submitted with the site plan application.

I. CONFORMITY WITH CODE

Advisory Note 2: The existing principal structure is depicted as 26,280 square feet, comprised on 19,437 (15,274 + 4,163) on the first floor, and 6,843 square feet on the second floor. This application is for a Site Plan proposed to add over 21,009 square feet to a principal structure that is currently 26,280 square feet in area. The size of this addition constitutes redevelopment, per the definition of ‘redevelop,’ provided in Section 2.2 of the Margate Zoning Code. As this project is considered redevelopment, all zoning and code requirements are applicable to the subject property.

Comment 1: On Sheet SP-1, the existing site plan indicates the existing ground floor area of the building is 19,437 square feet (15,274 sq. ft. plus 4,163 sq. ft.), which matches the Site Data Chart on SP-2, for “BUILDING FOOTPRINT” under the “EXISTING” column; however, the same chart also indicates the total “BUILDING AREAS” for the first floor under the “EXISTING” as 23,296 square feet. The “AGGREGATE BLDG. COVERAGE” is somehow the lowest figure of all at 5,165 square feet. Please clarify the discrepancies between the existing “BUILDING FOOTPRINT” and the existing “BUILDING AREAS” of the first floor and where the difference of 3,859 square footage comes from.

Comment 2: Sheet SP-2, the proposed master site plan indicates the existing 2-story is 6,843 square feet in area however, the chart for “BUILDING AREA” for the second floor under “EXISTING” indicates the total area at 6,837. Please clarify the discrepancies.

Comment 3: Sheet SP-2, the entire chart has many discrepancies. Please make a clear distinction between existing building area for the first floor and second floor and the proposed building area for the first floor and second floor and then provide the total square footage for each floor.

Comment 4: Clearly show the existing versus the proposed square footage to be consistent within each plan sheet.

Comment 5: Clearly show setbacks from each building, to nearest property line(s). The term “building” is defined in Section 2.2 of the Margate Zoning Code.

Comment 6: Include a pdf version of the property survey with each submittal.

Comment 7: Show the square footage between the different uses of religious/house of worship uses and school uses on the chart and plan sheets.

Comment 8: The chart indicates the number of stories incorrectly. The existing west wing is not a 2-story.

Comment 9: The chart indicates the existing heights incorrectly. The existing height is shown at 40 feet and 9 inches on the architectural elevations and the chart at 41 feet. The proposed height on the chart indicates 35 feet however, on the proposed architectural elevations, the proposed height is 39 feet and 5 inches (not measured at ground floor). Therefore, the chart continues to have discrepancies. Revise chart correctly.

Comment 10: The Site Data chart on sheet SP-3 indicates a total of 450 students however, the parking study and traffic study calculated at a maximum student population of 400. The traffic study stated that “The Academy has always intended to have a maximum enrollment of 400 students, but, as of this date, has **not** reached that number of enrollees.” However, the plat note amendment provided concurrently with this site plan application stated “Petitioner **currently** has an enrollment of approximately 400 students and does not intend to expand the enrollment with the new addition.” Address and correct all discrepancies and inconsistencies.

Comment 11: The application did not include any sign information, as required by Section 31-54(b)(1) of the Code of the City of Margate.

Comment 12: The structure with blue covering shown in Figure 1., requires a permit from the Building Department. If removed, indicate on the demo plan and submit a demo permit. If to remain, all structures must meet the required setbacks within the CF-1 zoning district. Depict the structure on the existing site plan with setbacks from the property line to the structure.



Figure 1. Undocumented Structure with Blue Covering

Comment 13: Include demolition sheet with plan set.

Comment 14: The proposed roof plan indicates a proposed roof top patio. Please clarify and explain the intended use of the rooftop patio.

Comment 15: Provide detail of proposed canopies by the playground. Show proposed canopy on the site plan and show setbacks from property line to the outer edge of the structure.

Comment 16: The CF-1 Zoning District limits lot coverage to a maximum of 30% (2-story) of the total lot. Section 2.2 of the Margate Zoning Code provides a definition of "coverage." Clearly account for all square footage of coverage as defined in Section 2.2 (MZC) and calculate total lot coverage.

Advisory 3: A separate paint permit required is required prior to issuance of certificate of occupancy. The gymnasium is also required to be part of the new paint permit.

Advisory 4: A separate tree removal permit from the Department of Environmental and Engineering Services is required.

Comment 17: The subject property is located on State Road 7 which is classified as an arterial roadway per the Broward County MPO Highway Functional Classification Map. The location of the subject property does not comply with Section 11.3(B)(1)(a), criterion #1 of the Margate Zoning Code. Applicant has not addressed this criterion.

Comment 18: The existing building is a freestanding single use building. According to Broward County Public Schools criteria, "A middle school site should be at least twenty (20) acres in size. The recommended site is rectangular in shape with 1200 feet of frontage and 730 feet of depth." Applicant has not addressed this criterion.

Comment 19: Sheet A-8 does not show doors on half of the rooms depicted in the first floor plan – phase II.

Parking

Comment 20: The following deficiencies were found in the Master Parking Plan (MPP):

- a) MPP did not clearly demonstrate drop-off and pick-up operations.
- b) MPP did not identify minimum required queuing distances needed to avoid overflow onto adjacent streets.
- c) MPP sketch must be prepared by a professional engineer, licensed in the state of Florida. MPP must include an accurate delineation of required features described in Section 33.2(F) of the Margate Zoning Code.
- d) MPP sketch lining is indecipherable due to overlapping lining and text. Lining seems to arbitrarily appear greyed vs bolded throughout.
- e) MPP fails to account for the parking requirements of the daycare/pre-school use of the subject property.

- f) The on-site observation of student drop-off revealed parents parking in the adjoining retail parking lot to the south and walking across 15th Street. Provide a shared parking agreement. Provide a pedestrian access plan for safe pedestrian access circulation within the Master Parking Plan and Site Plan.
- g) MPP sketch depicts parking spaces delineated as 8 feet wide x 18 feet deep. The minimum dimensions for off-street parking are 9 feet wide x 18 feet deep, per Section 33.2 of the Margate Zoning Code.
- h) MPP fails to provide land use description(s) of the ITE use code(s) utilized and any other related land use codes, all available independent variables for a given use(s), and a rationale explaining why a given independent variable was chosen over others.
- i) MPP statement indicates that 81 parking spaces are available, however, the MPP sketch depicts 79 parking spaces.
- j) MPP statement did not provide an analysis for how the proposed MPP will not create a parking problem due to customers or employees using on-street parking in the neighborhood, and that traffic problems in the neighborhood will not be materially increased. Include analysis of parking demand including employees. Clarify whether there will be afterschool or any other ancillary/extracurricular programs/assemblies. Include parking analysis for those activities.

Comment 21: When designing the student pick-up/drop-off area, the vehicle queuing area should conform to the design criteria of vehicle reservoir areas, as described in Section 33.11 of the Margate Zoning Code. The purpose of these areas is to ensure that the vehicles using the facility do not interfere with the flow of vehicular and pedestrian traffic within public rights-of-way, nor interfere with parking circulation or loading within the facility. Each reservoir area shall be a minimum of ten (10) feet wide by twenty (20) feet long and each reservoir area shall not block parking stalls, parking aisles, driveways or pedestrian ways.

Comment 22: The handicap signs shall comply Section 33.10 of the Margate Zoning Code. Ensure that the displayed fine amount is depicted in 2" tall series. Please revise handicap detail accordingly.

Comment 23: Provide the total drive way width for each.

Comment 24: The site plan shows and counts 3 parking spaces at the east end of the property. The proposed dumpster enclosure and related gates and bollards appear to interfere with vehicle maneuvering in and out of the northernmost parking space.

Lighting:

Comment 25: Confirm the hours of operation for both the school use and house of worship use, and all ancillary activities/uses.

Comment 26: The pdf of the plans did not include a photometric plan in accordance to Section 33.2(E) of the Margate Zoning Code.

Comment 27: The photometric plan does not meet the minimum requirements of Section 33.2(E) of the Margate Zoning Code. The photometric plan shall clearly and accurately designate the required parking spaces, lighting, access aisles, driveways, adjacent utility poles that provide light to the subject property, and trees (existing and proposed). Such facilities shall be arranged for the convenient access and safety of

pedestrians and vehicles. Photometric plans shall delineate footcandle measurements in a grid pattern using ten-foot squares throughout the vehicular use area and measured at grade.

Comment 28: The photometric plan does not provide the adjacent utility poles that provide light to the subject property as required per Section 33.2(E)(8). Some proposed trees are located within 10 feet from the light poles. The proposed trees shall be a minimum of ten feet from the edge of the tree canopy to the location the light poles per Section 33.2(E)(7).

Comment 29: The proposed wall pack light fixtures do not provide the height location as required per Section 33.2(E)(5) of the Margate Zoning Code.

Comment 30: All exterior parking lot fixtures must be fully shielded to prevent nuisance lighting per Section 33.2(F)(4) of the Margate Zoning Code. Provide a manufacturer's cut sheet of the proposed light fixture on the plans.

Landscape

Comment 31: Dumpsters must be located in enclosures with landscape buffer, per Section 23-9 of the Code of the City of Margate. Hedge material does not extend across rear of proposed enclosure.

Comment 32: Tree staking specification shows 12ga. Galv. Wire. This material is prohibited by Section 23-5(B) of the Code of the City of Margate.

Comment 33: Where mulch is applied in landscape areas, it shall be laid so that it is a minimum of three (3) inches thick. Trees in sodded areas shall be mulched under the drip line, except that no mulch shall be laid within six (6) inches of any tree trunk.

Comment 34: The landscape plan indicates the existing air conditioning units will be relocated. Where will the units be relocated? Per Section 23-9(B) of the Code of the City of Margate, all mechanical, utility, or any other equipment installed outside and on the ground shall be screened from all public rights-of-way by a hedge maintained to a height not less than six (6) inches above the height of the installed equipment. The screening hedge shall be planted within ten (10) feet of the equipment that it was planted to screen. The hedge shall not be required if the equipment is screened by a building or other permanent structure.

Comment 35: Landscape plan shows slick trunk Sabal Palm trees being installed in areas that are currently paved with asphalt. Please clarify scope of improvements to the site.

Comment 36: Landscape plan shows Simpson Stopper trees spaced 18 feet on center along NW 15th Street, within the right-of-way area lying between the public sidewalk and property line. Trees planted within the R-O-W require a permit from the Department of Environmental and Engineering Services, per Section 23-10 of the Code of the City of Margate. These trees are noted to satisfy requirements of Section 23-6 of the Code of the City of Margate, however, this section requires the landscape buffer to be a minimum of 10 feet wide, located wholly on private property. The subject property does not provide a landscape buffer compliant with this section.

Comment 37: Landscape plan shows Simpson Stopper trees spaced 18 feet on center along NW 15th Street, within the right-of-way area lying between the public sidewalk and property line. Section 23-6(B)(1) requires a 10-foot wide landscape buffer to be located entirely on private property, along property lines adjacent to a

public right-of-way. Update the landscape data chart how you meet section 23-6 of the Margate Zoning Code.

Comment 38: Landscape plan shows 4 Sabal Palms along the eastern perimeter line and 3 Areca Palms at the north perimeter line which are not considered shade trees as defined in section 23-2 of the Code of the City of Margate. Section 23-7(A) of the Code of the City of Margate requires a landscape strip no less than 5 feet in width along parcel lines on both sides of the properties to result in a 10-foot wide landscape buffer. Within the landscape strip each property shall plant one shade tree along the property line every 75 lineal feet. The remaining area of the perimeter landscape strip shall be planted with small ornamental trees, shrubs, ground covers, and turf. Not more than thirty (30) per cent of the perimeter landscape strip may be sodded with turf. Update the landscape data chart how you meet section 23-7 of the Code of the City of Margate.

Comment 39: Section 23-8 of the Code of the City of Margate requires a minimum of 20 square feet per parking space. The proposed master site plan depicts 79 parking spaces, which requires a minimum of 1,580 square feet of interior landscaping area. This section also requires a minimum of (1) shade tree and 5 shrubs per two hundred (200) square feet of interior landscape, and limits sod coverage to a maximum of 30%. Sheet LP-1 accounts for 72 parking spaces, and incorrectly applies the landscaping requirement. The chart indicates that 4 Simpson Stoppers and 1 existing Black Olive are provided to satisfy the requirement. Not only is this an insufficient amount of tree material, the material does not appear within the vehicular use area, as required by Code. Further, TS-1 identifies all existing trees, and the only Black Olive trees to remain are #'s 12, 13, 14, and 15, located in the SR7 ROW and along the north property line, nowhere near the vehicular use area.

II. CONSISTENCY WITH COMPREHENSIVE PLAN

ADVISORY NOTE 5: The subject property has a land use designation of Activity Center. Policy 1.1.2 of Element I, Future Land Use of the Margate Comprehensive Plan describes permitted uses within each land use category, and community facilities such as the subject property are permitted within the Activity Center.

COMMENT 40: The school is located on the northeast corner of State Road 7 and Northwest 15th Street. Policy 5.3.1 of Element I, Future Land Use of the Margate Comprehensive Plan guides schools to be located away from major traffic corridors and mass transit routes. The current use of the school is not consistent with this policy.