The meeting was called to order by Mr. Krecicki at 7:00 p.m. in the Commission Chambers of the Winter Park City Hall.

Present: Chairman Drew Krecicki, Vice-Chairman Rick Swisher, Michael Dick, Sarah Whiting and Carolyn Cooper. City Attorney Catherine Reischmann was also present. Staff: Planning Director Jeffrey Briggs, Sr. Planner Stacey Scowden, Planning Technician Caleena Shirley, and Recording Secretary Lisa M. Clark.

Public Hearings

Request of the Winter Park YMCA at 1201 N. Lakemont Avenue for Conditional Use Approval and Comprehensive Plan and Zoning Map changes for the following expansions to the existing YMCA:

- Conditional Use request for a 3,115 sq. ft. expansion to the existing building for new locker rooms; and
- Conditional Use request to add an additional zero-depth children’s pool and recreation area on the existing property; and
- Comprehensive Plan and Zoning Map Amendment to change from Single Family (R-1A) to Public Quasi-Public (PQP) and Future Land Use from Single Family Residential to Institutional on the properties located at 1751 and 1761 Palmer Avenue. This change would allow the expansion of the existing YMCA parking lot onto those two properties adding 53 more spaces.

Planning Director Jeffrey Briggs presented the staff report. He reviewed in detail the history of the YMCA expansion, the contents of the original development agreement, the proposal submitted by the Winter Park YMCA which included their proposed site plan, floor plan, perspective architectural elevation drawings, exterior wall plan, landscape plan and traffic study for these expansion requests. He said that in terms of code compliance, the project would meet the setbacks, floor area ratio and other development standards for the PQP zoning (if approved). The existing YMCA is 30,335 square feet in size. The YMCA has 139 parking spaces. With the 3,115 square foot locker room expansion, the total size would be 33,450 square feet. The code requires one parking space for each 250 square feet which equates to 134 spaces.

Mr. Briggs reviewed each of the three separate requests by the YMCA that staff will critique individually:

**Locker Room Expansion:**

Mr. Briggs noted that the locker room expansion was approved in 1996 but not constructed. He said that staff does not believe that locker rooms in and of themselves add to the membership or increase traffic.

The complication concerning the locker room expansion is that the “dirt” area where the locker rooms are to be built has been and is being used as an employee parking lot. Typically there are about 10-12 employee cars in that dirt area. So when the new locker rooms are built, those employee cars will be displaced to the main
paved parking lot thus providing less parking for the membership. The solution is to extend the existing parking lot to the west, replacing the existing storm water retention area by converting that retention area to underground storm water exfiltration. The expansion of the parking lot would add about 14-15 parking spaces bringing the site back to its current parking volume. Staff will propose this as a condition of approval.

Swimming Pool Expansion:

Mr. Briggs stated that new children’s swimming pool was part of the YMCA request in 1996. It was proposed for the area that now holds the child care playground. That component was denied at that time. He said that the YMCA desires to revisit that request but in an alternate location south of the existing swimming pool. They believe that this new zero-depth children’s pool is critical to the mission of the Winter Park YMCA Family Center. He said that staff recognizes the criticism that there are plenty of swim lessons options available now and it is doubtful that any children are currently missing out on swimming lessons due to a lack of swimming pool facilities. He noted that Winter Park has the existing YMCA pool, Cady Way pool, Crosby Center pool and in two years the new zero-depth children’s swimming pool planned for the Winter Park Community Center.

He noted that staff is also aware of the criticism that the children’s swimming pool is all about selling more memberships to families. That may well be true and the swimming pool facilities may add to the membership and use of the YMCA. However, this does not seem to be a reason for denial, as long as there are minimal impacts to the surrounding neighborhood. He detailed staff concerns with the impacts of traffic and noise. Adjacent to the new proposed children’s swimming pool is a vacant single family lot at 1741 Palmer Avenue and that property (as well as maybe 1751/1761 Palmer) is ground zero for the noise impact. Some people may love the sound of children laughing and yelling. But to compound the noise impact, the plans show a ten foot tall water slide proposed right next to the adjacent single family homes. Staff recommended approval of the swimming pool with the elimination of the water slide.

Parking Lot Expansion:

Mr. Briggs stated that this is the most difficult part of the YMCA’s application to rationalize given the promises made in 1996, the “Developer’s Agreement” contract that was executed then the subsequent action to ignore the contract and acquire additional property for expansion anyway. The parking lot expansion would add 53 additional parking spaces. It would be screened with the same type of wall and landscaping treatment that successfully screens the existing parking lot. There would be a significant upgrade to the landscaping both in the new parking lot as well as the existing lot. The parking lot expansion is proposed for the convenience of the existing membership but it would also function as a way to increase membership.

The problem for most of the neighbors that are in opposition is the question “When does the expansion of the YMCA ever stop?” In 1996 the City had a promise and a “Developer’s Agreement” contract. Now thirteen years later the City has a request to re-write or throw away the “Developer’s Agreement” contract and no promise that there will be no more future expansions. So the neighbors are justified to ask “How far down Palmer Avenue does the YMCA propose to expand?”

Staff recommendation was as follows: (P&Z needs to have three separate votes)

1. Approval of the Conditional Use request for the Locker Room expansion conditioned upon:
   a. Expansion of the existing parking lot over the existing storm water retention area to compensate for the loss of employee parking, and
   b. Incorporation of the plans submitted such that any change to those plans (including the internal floor plan) would require approval of the City.
2. Approval of the expansion for the new zero depth children’s swimming pool and recreation area excluding the swimming pool slide component.
3. Denial of the Comprehensive Plan future land use map change and the rezoning request to expand the YMCA parking lot onto the properties at 1751/1761 Palmer Avenue.
Bud Oliver, 433 South Lakemont Avenue, introduced the members of the development team. Mr. Oliver gave the Board a general overview of the YMCA’s request.

George Powell, Powell Design Group, used a power point and 3D presentation to provide an in-depth overview of the request. This included proposed landscaping enhancements, the proposal to complete the final build-out of the original conditional use approval from 1996 (the family locker rooms); the zero depth teaching pool; and the request to expand the parking lot. He also reviewed language from the 1997 development agreement.

With regard to the locker room expansion, he noted that this was approved in 1996 as a part of a multi-phase project and that due to funding issues was never completed. He said that this request does not expand the building beyond what was approved in 1996. He stressed that the parking for the 3,000 square foot addition is already in place. With regard to the zero entry swimming pool he noted that this portion of the request was originally approved by the Planning Commission in 1996, but later revoked by the City Commission. He stated that this request is a new request that falls within the boundaries of the property and is independent from the locker room expansion and parking requests, and requested that the Board grant this request. With regard to the parking request, he said that the YMCA reacquired the two residential lots that they previously owned in the 1980s and that they have no interest in purchasing additional properties in the neighborhood. He said that expanding the parking lot will not alter the existing traffic pattern that currently exists around the YMCA and proper lighting and landscaping will be installed. He added that they do not feel that an expansion of the parking lot as an extension of the YMCA. They do not feel that they are in violation of the original developer’s agreement.

Steve Shelling, 2893 Oakcastle, YMCA Board Chair, said that one of the things that the Board hears from members is the need for additional parking.

Mike Sullivan, 1331 Magnolia Bay, Maitland, stated that he also owns a home on Palmer Avenue stated that he is a member of the YMCA and is a Board member of the YMCA Central Florida. He said that he feels that the City should consider a public/private partnership with the YMCA. He said that he does not feel that the improvements that were outlined by Mr. Powell as an encroachment into the residential neighborhood. He requested rebuttal time for the applicant at the end of the public comment section.

The City attorney requested that the Board members disclosed ex-parte communication with the applicant. Mr. Krecicki noted that he is a YMCA member and that he went to one of the community meetings held by the applicant. Mrs. Cooper stated that she holds a family membership and that she has met with Mr. Oliver and others and that she has met with the McIntoshes. Mr. Swisher said that he is not a member, but that he met with Mr. Oliver and representatives and acknowledged the emails that he has received. Mrs. Whiting stated that she is not a member and acknowledged the emails that she has received and that she has met with Mr. Oliver and representatives of the YMCA. Mr. Dick stated that he is not a member and has met with Mr. Oliver and representatives.

The following people addressed the Board in favor of the request: Jim Yarborough, 720 North Phelps, Tiffany Polito, 694 Selkirk Drive, Heidi Farber, Glenridge Way, Lisa Wilcox, 1727 Palmer Avenue, Mary Rumberger, 1234 Palmer Avenue, Lou Nimkoff, 740 Williams Drive, Brad Hester, 1906 Whitehall Drive, and Peter Weldon, 700 Via Lombardy.

The following former Mayors also addressed the Board concerning the request. They acknowledged that they were members of the Board when the original request came forward and provided insight as to the discussion that took place at original public hearings:

Terry Hotard, 1461 Palmer Avenue, said that he thinks the Board should look at what is best for the community and that he feels that the needs of the community have changed. He said that he feels that the YMCA has proved to be a good neighbor.
Kip Marchman, 1641 Palm Avenue, explained that at that time there were concerns with the campus expanding into the residential community. He said that it was the Commission’s intent at that time to work diligently to protect the residential property in the City. Further, the YMCA was not forced into the agreement in 1996.

Joe Terranova, 700 Melrose Avenue, agreed with Mr. Marchman and said that he feels that the YMCA should follow the terms of the original agreement.

The following people spoke in opposition to the request: Jean McIntosh, 1756 Pine Avenue, Terry Roen, 1620 Elm Avenue, Rebekka Wilson, 1724 Pine Avenue (submitted a petition with 92 signatures opposed to the request), Julie Swinarski, 1740 Pine Avenue, Margaret Zbor (presented a Power Point presentation on behalf of the neighborhood that detailed neighborhood concerns), Kay Zimmerman, 1040 North Lakemont Avenue, Davon Deboer, 1748 Pine Avenue, Kevin Robillard, 1616 Palmer Avenue, , Byron McIntosh, Mark Enriguez, 1760 Palmer Avenue, Gail Turner, 1040 North Lakemont Avenue, Ann Kubisak, 1040 North Lakemont Avenue, John Kurash, 1050 North Lakemont Avenue, Kathy Kiely, 1800 Oneco Avenue, Mark Salia, 1757 Pine Avenue, Geri Throne, 1771 Chestnut Avenue, Tom Akert, 1570 Place Piccardy.

Mr. Shelling readdressed the Board on behalf of the applicant. He said that development agreements are modified constantly. He said that it is regrettable that there is a perception that they have breached agreement, but that circumstances have changed. He said that their patrons are requesting the changes. Further, the requested parking is to address the peak demand levels and that they do not feel that what they are asking for will increase trips. He said that he feels that will reduce daily trips. He added that they will accept the condition of no slide on the zero depth pool and the condition of parking over the retention area.

Chairman Krecicki recessed the meeting at 9:17 p.m. and reconvened at 9:24 p.m.

Following the recess, Mr. Briggs and Attorney Reischmann had a question and answer session with the Board members. The Board members also posed questions to the YMCA representatives. Following the question and answer session, Chairman Krecicki opened up the item for discussion amongst the board members.

Mr. Krecicki stated he is a YMCA supporter, but that he does not support changing the development agreement at all that it should stay in place as is. He said that he could support granting approval of the conditional use for the locker room expansion with staff recommendations. In addition he encouraged the YMCA to consider remote parking for staff and installing additional bike racks to alleviate the parking situation. He did not support the comp plan amendment. With regard to the pool, he supported the zero depth pool with the exclusion of the slide. In addition, he added that he feels that the hours for the children’s pool hours be more limiting than the adult pool.

Mr. Dick said that he did not have issue with the acquisition of the lots because that could be considered an investment, but once the application was made incorporating those lots, that became a violation of the development agreement. He stated that he could support the conditional use for the locker room expansion. He asked the applicant if the number of lockers would increase or remain the same. The applicant stated that there would be no new lockers and the existing half lockers would be converted into full lockers. He said that he feels that there should be some degree of self-regulation with parking. As for additional parking, he said that he would rather see the parking go within the 35 foot area behind the lots, to accommodate no more than 15 additional parking spaces. He did not support the comp plan amendment, and feels that residential lots should remain residential. With regard to the pool, he did not support it and stated that he feels that there are enough alternatives throughout the city for the pool.

Mrs. Whiting said that she supports the YMCA being in the City. She supported the conditional use request for locker room expansion. She said that she feels that it completes the original expansion plans. In favor of the pool, but how can noise (i.e. buffering, planting, walls, etc.) from the pool be alleviated. She said that she could not support the comp plan amendment.
Mrs. Cooper explained that she is comfortable with granting the additional square footage because it was a part of the original conditional use approval. She did express concern with the impact that she feels the proposed expansion would have on the existing parking situation. She agreed with staff recommendations in this regard. Mrs. Cooper stated that she does not support the pool as presented. She said that it looks like a water park and further that it would be a violation to the peace of the surrounding residential neighborhood. She did not support the comp plan amendment. She said that she is concerned with additional traffic on Lakemont Avenue. She said that she is a proponent of R-1A zoning and feels very strongly that the single-family neighborhood must be protected. Mrs. Cooper also discussed her concerns with how this request ties into the newly adopted comprehensive plan. She also said that she feels that the two existing residences need to be brought up to code and look like a fair representation of the YMCA’s ownership.

Mr. Swisher said that he agrees with the previous comments. He discussed his recollection of the previous public hearing with regard to landscape buffering. He stated that he supports the conditional use for locker room expansion. He added that he would all for the zero depth pool if it were in a different location. He said that he cannot support the comprehensive plan amendment changing R-1A lots for use as a parking lot.

Locker Room Expansion

Motion made by Mr. Krecicki, seconded by Mrs. Whiting to approve the conditional use request for a 3,115 sq. ft. expansion to the existing building for new locker rooms with the following conditions:

1. Expansion of the existing parking lot over the existing storm water retention area with no more than up to 15 spaces.
2. Any changes to the approved plans, including internal floor plans, will require approval from the City.
3. The YMCA is to research areas of remote parking for employees and more adding more bike racks to promote more bike ridership with their members.

Mr. Dick requested to amend the motion to add that final landscape plans and updated lighting plan come back to the Board for final approval. Mr. Krecicki and Mrs. Whiting accepted the amendment. Motion carried with a 5-0 vote.

Swimming Pool Expansion

Motion made by Mrs. Cooper, seconded by Mr. Dick to deny the request for the swimming pool.

The Board entered into a discussion with regard to whether it would be appropriate in another location. Mr. Krecicki requested to amend the motion giving the applicant the option to return to the Board with revised plans for a smaller pool or to relocate the pool to another location on the property. Mrs. Cooper and Mr. Dick accepted the amendment. Motion carried with a 4-1 vote. Mrs. Whiting voted against the motion.

Comprehensive Plan Amendment

Motion made by Mr. Krecicki, seconded by Mrs. Cooper to deny the request for a Comprehensive Plan and Zoning Map Amendment to change from Single Family (R-1A) to Public Quasi-Public (PQP) and Future Land Use from Single Family Residential to Institutional on the properties located at 1751 and 1761 Palmer Avenue. Motion carried unanimously with a 5-0 vote.

Site Plan Reviews

SPR 3:09  M/M Zwirn request lakefront site plan approval for a new single-family residence at 600 Via Lugano on Lake Maitland
Assistant Planner Stacey Scowden presented the staff report. She reviewed the issues of floor area ratio, impervious coverage, views of the neighbors and the lake, storm water retention and tree preservation. Staff recommended approval of the three (3) -foot variance for only the office portion of the home on the east side in order to reduce the cumulative impact on the 2.5’ and 3’ cypress on the east side of the home. Staff believes that this design will not only help reduce the impact of the cypress trees but removes home and patio from the 50’ setback area of the lakeside. She responded to Board member questions and concerns.

The applicants were present to address concerns of the Board. No one wished to speak in favor of or in opposition to the request. Public hearing closed.

Motion made by Mrs. Whiting, seconded by Mr. Krecicki to approve the request with staff conditions. Motion carried unanimously with a 5-0 vote.

SPR 4:09 Ms. France requests lakefront site plan approval for a pool and decking at 1511 Via Tuscany on Lake Maitland.

Assistant Planner Stacey Scowden presented the staff report. She reviewed the issues of floor area ratio, impervious coverage, views of the neighbors and the lake, storm water retention and tree preservation. Staff recommended approval with the following conditions:
1.) Bring the lakeside elevations in compliance with the three foot code rule.
2.) Remove the spire from the cabana roof.
3.) Match the cabana roof slope to the home roof slope of 4:12.

She responded to Board member questions and concerns.

The applicant was present and responded to Board member questions and concerns. No one else wished to speak concerning this issue. Public Hearing closed.

Motion made by Mrs. Cooper, seconded by Mr. Krecicki to approve the request subject to the conditions recommended by staff in addition to the following:
1. Bring the lakeside elevation into compliance with the three-foot code rule.
2. The applicant is to remove the spire from the cabana roof.
3. Limit the at the height point of the cabana roof to 18 feet above pool level.
4. Match the cabana roof slope t the roof of the home.
5. The steps and no other structure are to intrude into the 50 foot setback area of the lake.

There was no further business. Meeting adjourned at 11:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Lisa M. Clark,
Recording Secretary