COYOTE VALLEY SPECIFIC PLAN

PRINCIPLES ♦ STRATEGIES ♦ FILTERS

SCHOOL PLANNING GOALS AND STRATEGIES

GOAL #1 – First Class Schools to Enhance Coyote Valley Community

GOAL #2 – Efficient Use of Land to Optimize Project Feasibility

- Fixed Assumptions
  1. Students per Classroom
  2. Square Footage per Student
  3. Playfield/Hardcourt Area per Student
- Flexible Assumptions
  1. Students per School
  2. Single-Level vs. Multi-Level Schools
  3. Joint Use of Playfields/Hardcourts
  4. Rooftop Hardcourt Areas
  5. Structured, Reduced, or Shared Parking

COYOTE VALLEY SPECIFIC PLAN

PRINCIPLES ♦ STRATEGIES ♦ FILTERS

SCHOOL PLANNING STRATEGIES

		Typical	Efficient
▪ Students per School – (Number of Schools)	Elem	600 (8)	800 (6)
	Mid	800 (3)	1,200 (2)
	High	1,500 (2)	3,000 (1)
▪ Building Stories --	Elem	1	2 or 3
	Mid	1	2 or 3
	High	1	3
▪ Joint Use Fields --		None	up to 80%
▪ Rooftop Hardcourts (Elem Only) --		None	up to 40%
▪ Structured Parking --		None	up to 100%
▪ Reduced or Shared Parking --		None	up to 100%

COYOTE VALLEY SPECIFIC PLAN

PRINCIPLES ♦ STRATEGIES ♦ FILTERS

STUDENTS PER SCHOOL

		Smaller	Larger
Assumptions – (Students and Schools)	Elem	600 (8)	800 (6)
	Mid	800 (3)	1,200 (2)
	High	1,500 (2)	3,000 (1)

Larger Schools Results –

Land Consumption -- save 20 acres (10%)

Construction Costs -- lower due to economies of scale

Operations and Maintenance -- lower due to economies of scale

Phasing -- more difficult, due to larger increments of development

COYOTE VALLEY SPECIFIC PLAN

PRINCIPLES ♦ STRATEGIES ♦ FILTERS

BUILDING STORIES

Examples – Galarza Elementary and Horace Mann Elementary, San Jose

COYOTE VALLEY SPECIFIC PLAN

PRINCIPLES ♦ STRATEGIES ♦ FILTERS

BUILDING STORIES

		Single Story	Multi-Story
Assumptions –	Elem	1	2
	Mid	1	3
	High	1	3

Multi-Story Strategy Results –

Land Consumption -- save 11 acres (5%)

Construction Costs – comparable to Single Story

Operations and Maintenance – higher due to elevators

Phasing – comparable to Single Story

Other -- primary grades (K-2 or K-3) must be on ground floor

COYOTE VALLEY SPECIFIC PLAN

PRINCIPLES ♦ STRATEGIES ♦ FILTERS

JOINT USE FIELDS

Examples – Natomas USD,
Sacramento

COYOTE VALLEY SPECIFIC PLAN

PRINCIPLES ♦ STRATEGIES ♦ FILTERS

JOINT USE FIELDS

		Stand Alone	Share with Parks
Assumptions –	Elem	None	80%
	Mid	None	80%
	High	None	80%

Shared Strategy Results –

Land Consumption -- save 80 acres (40%)

Construction Costs – possibly lower if shared with City Parks

Operations and Maintenance – possibly lower if shared with City Parks

Phasing – departmental coordination required may cause delays

Other -- City Parks may maintain at higher standards than Schools

ROOFTOP HARDCOURTS

Example – Horace Mann Elementary, San Jose

COYOTE VALLEY SPECIFIC PLAN

PRINCIPLES ♦ STRATEGIES ♦ FILTERS

ROOFTOP HARDCOURTS

		Surface	Rooftop
Assumptions –	Elem	None	40%
	Mid	None	None
	High	None	None

Rooftop Strategy Results –

Land Consumption -- save 3 acres (1.5%)

Construction Costs – higher for re-inforced/waterproof roof

Operations and Maintenance – higher than ground level courts

Phasing – comparable to Surface

Other -- primary grades can't use rooftops, must be on ground floor

COYOTE VALLEY SPECIFIC PLAN

PRINCIPLES ♦ STRATEGIES ♦ FILTERS

STRUCTURED PARKING

Example – Polytechnic High School, Long Beach, CA

COYOTE VALLEY SPECIFIC PLAN

PRINCIPLES ♦ STRATEGIES ♦ FILTERS

STRUCTURED PARKING

		Surface	Structured
Assumptions –	Elem	None	100%
	Mid	None	100%
	High	None	100%

Structured Strategy Results –

Land Consumption -- save 15 acres (7.5%)

Construction Costs – higher than Surface parking

Operations and Maintenance – higher than Surface parking

Phasing – comparable to Surface

COYOTE VALLEY SPECIFIC PLAN

PRINCIPLES ♦ STRATEGIES ♦ FILTERS

SHARED OR REDUCED PARKING

		Standard	Shared/Reduced
Assumptions –	Elem	None	50%
	Mid	None	50%
	High	None	50%

Shared/Reduced Strategy Results –

Land Consumption -- save 11 acres (5%)

Construction Costs – lower than Standard

Operations and Maintenance – lower than Standard

Phasing – may need transit/ped/bike routes in place before reduction

Other – potential conflicts with certain uses at peak hours

SCHOOL PLANNING OPTIONS SUMMARY

Efficient School Designs can Reduce Land Consumption by 40 - 50%

Ranking of Methods to reduce land consumption:

1. Joint Use Fields (80 acres)
2. Larger Schools (20 acres)
3. Structured Parking (15 acres)
4. Building Stories (11 acres)
5. Shared/Reduced Parking (11 acres)
6. Rooftop Playgrounds (3 acres)