



MEETING MINUTES

Planning & Zoning Commission

Thursday, June 11, 2020

CALL TO ORDER

Ms. Call, Chair, called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m. and provided the following opening remarks: "Good evening and welcome to the virtual meeting of the City of Dublin Planning and Zoning Commission. The Ohio Legislature passed several emergency laws to address the pandemic, including the ability for public entities to conduct virtual meetings. We appreciate this ability to maintain our continuity of government and will be holding our meetings online and live-streaming on YouTube until further notice. You can access the live-stream on the City's website. In order to submit any questions or comments during the meeting, please use the form under the streaming video on the City's website. Those questions and comments will be relayed to the Commission by the meeting moderator. We welcome your comments on cases. Please provide a valid name and address when submitting your comments, and please refrain from making any inappropriate comments. We want to accommodate public participation and comments to the greatest extent possible. We appreciate your patience."

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Ms. Call led the Pledge of Allegiance.

ROLL CALL

Commission members present: Mark Supelak, Rebecca Call, Kristina Kennedy, Leo Grimes, Jane Fox, Warren Fishman, Lance Schneier

Staff members present: Jenny Rauch, Claudia Husak, Jesse Shamp, Nichole Martin, Matt Earman, Mike Hendershot, Shawn Krawetzki

ACCEPTANCE OF DOCUMENTS

Mr. Fishman moved, Mr. Grimes seconded to accept the documents into the record and approve the minutes of 5-07-20.

Vote: Ms. Call, yes; Ms. Fox, yes; Mr. Grimes, yes; Mr. Fishman, yes; Mr. Supelak, yes; Mr. Schneier, yes; Ms. Kennedy, yes.

[Motion passed 7-0]

Ms. Call stated the Planning and Zoning Commission is an advisory board to City Council when rezoning and platting of property is under consideration. In such cases, City Council will receive recommendations from the Commission. For other cases, the Commission has the decision-making responsibility, and anyone who intends to address the Commission on any of the administrative cases must be sworn in.

Ms. Call swore in those who intended to address the Commission on this evening's cases.

NEW CASES

- 1. Dublin Community Pool North – Site, 5660 Dublinshire Drive, 19-133AFDP, Amended Final Development Plan**
- 2. Dublin Community Pool North – Building, 5660 Dublinshire Drive, 20-082AFDP, Amended Final Development Plan**

Ms. Call stated that there are two cases on tonight's agenda both involving a City application to make site and building improvements to a public pool facility. Originally, the cases were filed separately, but timing has aligned so that they can be heard together. These applications request review and approval of site improvements for the Dublin Community Pool North to accommodate new pool space and a new pool building, as well as renovations and associated building improvements to three existing mechanical buildings and an addition to the existing parking lot, which requires a text modification. The 28.55-acre site is north of Dublinshire Drive, ±1,500 feet west of the intersection of Earlington Parkway and is zoned Planned Unit Development District.

Staff Presentation

Ms. Martin stated this is a request for review and approval of two Amended Final Development Plans for the renovation of Dublin Community Pool North. This site is located north of Dublinshire Drive, and south of Brand Road. The site is located within an established neighborhood and shares a site with the Wyandot Elementary School and Earlington Park. The site is accessed via Dublinshire Drive, and a shared parking lot is located between the school and the Dublin Community Pool. The proposal before the Commission is the result of many months of public engagement and iterative design. Because the existing pool facility and parking lot have deteriorated over time, demolition and reconstruction is proposed. The existing pool facility, with the exception of the spray park, is proposed to be demolished to accommodate a new facility, which will include a lap pool, a leisure pool, a toddler wading pool, two water slides, a diving platform, and a climbing wall. The three existing mechanical and storage buildings will remain on the site. Both site and building components are provided for review this evening.

The site components include three new pools, a parking lot expansion, stormwater management and landscape modifications. The building components include a new pool building with north and south sections, exterior modifications to the mechanical buildings, and one sign. A parking lot expansion is required with the expansion of the pool facility. The existing parking lot contains 155 parking spaces, which are shared with the adjacent school, because the pool and school have different hours of operation. The total required parking spaces with the expansion of this facility is 200 spaces; a total of 176 parking spaces are proposed. A detailed assessment was conducted, which, based on staffing levels, maximum pool occupancy, and its location within a neighborhood from which many pool users walk and bike, indicated fewer spaces were needed. Landscape modifications, and significant tree and open space preservation west of the facility are included in the proposal. Also proposed are two dry stormwater management basins, which will be planted with hardy, water-loving plants. They will be maintained by the City. The basins are dry for safety reasons, due to their location next to a public pool, park and school.

The proposed pool building will be comprised of two separate buildings joined by a central entrance canopy. The building is typified by a sloped, charcoal color, metal standing-seamed roof. The buildings vary in height from 12 to 15 feet, and the central entry canopy is 17-22 feet in height. This height is less than the maximum permitted height of 35 feet within residential districts. The character of the buildings incorporates natural materials in a current aesthetic, similar to other projects previously approved for other parks and recreational facilities within the City. The primary building material is horizontal cedar siding in a dark gray, accented by a stone veneer in a medium gray. The concession area will be located in the north building. [Images of building elevations and character shown.]

There will be a building-mounted sign. The majority of parks and recreation facilities throughout the City have ground signs. Because this facility is located on a larger site, it was important to identify the building

with a building-mounted sign. The sign will have individually-mounted letters in a metallic finish. Final design details have not been provided.

Staff is recommending approval with a Minor Text Modification to permit 176 parking spaces where 200 are normally required. Also recommended for approval are Amended Final Development Plans for the site with two conditions and for the building with one condition.

Mr. Earman stated that in 2017, the cost of the project was estimated at approximately \$6 million. That estimate was based on the history of the pool usage and the concept itself. The existing structure is an iconic recreational facility in the City that has served thousands of people over the years, and the original concept was for a similar community pool. They considered the possibility of salvaging some of the facilities. The mechanical and storage buildings will be repurposed, as well as the spray park and mechanical room in that area. Before designing the new facility, they looked at comparable projects within the area, including those in Grandview Heights and the City of Athens. There was significant engagement of the community in developing the new facility. A strong swim team presence in the early public meetings influenced the project to include a competition pool – a 50-meter indoor-outdoor facility with retractable roof, which was not included in the original estimate and budget. Later, a strong neighborhood presence at the meetings shifted the design back to more of a community pool than a competitive pool facility. He is pleased that the final concept represents the entire community.

[Mr. Earman paused presentation.]

Ms. Kennedy inquired about the building-mounted sign. What type of sign is located at the South Pool; is it similar to what is proposed?

Ms. Martin responded that most community facilities in Dublin have a Dublin Parks and Recreation style sign, which is a wood sign routed with a green background and white letters. She believes that is the type of sign located at the Dublin Community Pool South. That site is slightly dissimilar, because it is dedicated to the pool facility; whereas, this site is dedicated to multiple users throughout the year.

[Mr. Earman continued presentation.]

Mr. Earman stated that the original cost estimate was \$6 million; however, significant changes were made in the scope. Increases in the pool surface area, building size, deck space, stormwater facilities and an enhanced lap pool access point increased the costs significantly. The estimated cost increase is \$2.5 million. The proposed elements and cost increase were provided to City Council last month, and they were in favor of proceeding with the design as proposed. Upon PZC's approval of the Final Development Plans, a construction contract will be scheduled on the June 22 City Council agenda for review and approval. If approved, construction will commence in early July. That timeframe will permit opening of the new facilities for the 2021 Memorial Day pool opening, absent any weather and construction challenges.

Katie Freeland and Keith Hall, MSA Architects; Tim Schmalenberger, MKSK; and Shawn Krawetzki, City landscape architect manager, are present to answer questions.

Commission Questions

Ms. Kennedy stated that the current parking allows for 155 vehicles. Is that an over-parked or under-parked situation?

Ms. Martin responded that she does not have that information, but a comparison of the current spaces with the proposed need indicates the proposed number of 176 spaces would be adequate.

Ms. Call inquired if there was any documentation regarding the level of utilization of the parking lot last year, when the school was in operation.

Ms. Martin responded, because the peak usage of the school and the pool are at opposite times of the year, the parking lot has functioned quite well. On occasion, there has been a need for some overflow

parking. The anticipation is that the expansion of this parking lot will mitigate that issue for both pool users and special school events.

Ms. Call inquired what the utilized capacity was when the pool was in operation.

Mr. Earman stated that, typically, when the pool is in operation, there has been little issue with the parking capacity, so the additional parking spaces should accommodate any overflow issues. Located in the heart of the community, some of the pool users arrive by bicycle. The only times in which there may be a need for more parking spaces is during swim meet season. A number of swim meets occur at this site, which pull people from outside the community. The church parking lot across the street on Dublinshire is used on occasion. However, there is only one major meet per year, so that need is infrequent.

Ms. Fox inquired if there are approximately 50 spaces for bicycles.

Ms. Martin responded that the proposal is for 100 bicycle parking spaces.

Ms. Fox inquired if the site addresses the ability for micro-transit drop-off and ease of connectivity by bikepath or sidewalk. Will children need to bicycle through the vehicle parking lot to access the pool facility?

Ms. Martin responded that they would not. This facility is within Earlington Park, That park has a robust shared-use path system. The immediate and nearby neighborhoods use that pedestrian/bikepath network through the community to the pool facility.

Ms. Call stated that she lives near this park, on the other side of Muirfield Drive, just off Dublinshire. A pedestrian tunnel under Brand Road connects to the pathway system, and there are two paths from the north to the pool and a path up from Indian Run. There are several avenues for connectivity.

Ms. Fox stated that there do not appear to be many shade trees in the parking lot.

Ms. Martin responded that the Landscape Code has a vehicular use area regulation that requires shade trees in the parking lot, based on the square feet area of the parking lot. Additional shade trees are proposed in the large parking lot islands. The trees in the existing parking lot islands will remain, and as the trees in the new parking lot addition grow, they will provide additional shade in the parking lot.

Ms. Fox stated that the City is responsible for maintenance of the dry basins, and there has been some concern about the burden of maintenance of natural plantings for City staff. Will this be a low maintenance area?

Mr. Krawetzki responded that is the intent. There will be grasses, but some flowering plants, as well, which require a higher level of maintenance. The latter will provide a nice aesthetic, but these pockets of plant materials will be placed where they will be easy to maintain.

Ms. Fox stated that is difficult to remove weeds from natural areas, and sometimes those areas become unsightly. She would encourage that this be made a low maintenance area.

Mr. Krawetzki responded that the intent is to utilize a large number of plants, and the sheer volume of plants will minimize weeding issues.

Mr. Supelak inquired what is the amount of increase in total swim area.

Mr. Earman responded that there would be approximately 4,000 square feet of additional surface area, or approximately a 17% increase.

Mr. Supelak stated that for that 17% increase in pool surface, there will be 40% increase in parking spaces. As a frequent pool user, he has never had an issue with parking with the current number of spaces, so the 176 proposed parking spaces should be sufficient. He inquired if the salvaged buildings would be resurfaced.

Ms. Martin responded that is correct. The three small mechanical and storage buildings will be integrated into the character of the campus with new, horizontal cedar siding, a minimal amount of stone veneer and new standing seam metal roofs.

Mr. Supelak inquired about the structure southwest of the site near the lap pool. Is that a canopied structure?

Ms. Martin responded that is correct. The existing site has a number of shade structures within the grassy area; those structures will remain, be repainted and new awnings installed.

Mr. Supelak inquired about the additional, larger structure that appears to be located south of the water slide.

Katie Freeland, Architect, MSA Design, 14 E. Gay Street, Suite 300, Columbus, OH 43215, responded that there will be one larger shade structure that will be located closer to the lap pool.

Ms. Kennedy inquired if consideration has been given to the impact of construction traffic to Wyandot Elementary when school reopens.

Mr. Earman responded that there have been many meetings with school staff about construction plans. The intent is to ensure that construction traffic will have minimal impact on school traffic. Staff will work with the construction company to ensure that their hours of operation will not conflict with peak student drop-off and pick-up times. Construction traffic will be restricted during those hours.

Ms. Call inquired if the parking lot would be utilized for dumpster materials and construction equipment. Due to the school's use of that parking lot, will a portion of the parking lot be designated for construction equipment usage?

Mr. Earman responded that the southernmost row of parking spaces will be cordoned off for construction parking and dumpsters. The remaining area will be used by the school.

Mr. Fishman observed that a significant amount of asphalt is planned. He is concerned about over-parking. He prefers to eliminate asphalt if possible and utilize a parking agreement with the church across the street whereby the parking lot owned by either party could be utilized by the other, if needed.

Ms. Call inquired if a shared parking agreement is in place between the community pool and the school.

Ms. Martin responded that there is not a formal agreement, but there is an understood shared parking agreement between the school and the City for this shared site.

Mr. Fishman responded that due to the changes that can occur with church administrations, formal agreements with churches have been required in other cases. It would be good to consider that in this case, as well.

Mr. Earman responded that staff would look into that possibility.

Mr. Schneier inquired who owns the parking lot – the school system or the City.

Mr. Earman responded that the City of Dublin owns the entire campus property and leases the school site to the school. The City works jointly with the school to resolve any issues that occur.

Ms. Call inquired if the City also maintains the school landscaping.

Mr. Earman stated that the landscape maintenance responsibility is shared, based on the usage. The City is comfortable with the existing arrangement.

Mr. Supelak stated that there is a minor difference in the bike racks in the rendering and the drawings. He suspects the drawings are the most accurate.

Ms. Martin responded affirmatively.

Public Comments

Staff presented the following comments received from the public on this case. Ms. Husak suggested that the City Engineer or Landscape Architect respond to the first inquiry.

Terri Ray, 7694 Glanmore Ct., Dublin, OH 43017:

“What is the code requirement for the retention pond that is identified in the drawings to the north of the pool complex? Is this a new code requirement as there isn't a retention pond for the existing pool? The plans identify the depth of the retention area as 6 feet deep. Is that safe in a park/near an elementary school? Is there an option to have it be less than 6 feet deep?”

Mr. Hendershot, City Engineer, stated that the stormwater design requirements for extended dry detention basins specify the median depth for a dry detention basin shall be between three to six feet, so the six feet is within Code requirements. Staff is working with the applicant to ensure that the side slopes are four-to-one, and in some areas three-to-one. They are attempting to make sure the side slopes are minimized to ensure a safe environment around the pond.

Mr. Krawetzki, City Landscape Architect, stated that the side slopes would not be steep. They will be manageable, with ability to walk in and out of the detention pond space.

Ms. Fox inquired if the pond would contain water.

Mr. Hendershot responded that with a dry detention pond, there is a 48-hour drawdown time requirement. When it rains, the pond will fill because its purpose is to hold and address stormwater quality. Within the course of 48 hours, it would drain empty. In a non-rain condition, no water should remain in the basin.

Ms. Call inquired about the wet pond that exists on the north side of the park that is adjacent to the school.

Mr. Hendershot responded that the design team considered the possibility of utilizing the existing regional retention basin for the stormwater management component of this project. However, that basin was established before water quality requirements were established, and significant modifications would be necessary to bring that pond up to current standards. The design team determined that it would be better to create a new stormwater management facility than attempt to retrofit the existing retention pond to stormwater management standards.

Ms. Call requested that, for the public's benefit, he describe the reason stormwater management is required for a parcel that has an extensive amount of hard, non-permeable surface.

Mr. Hendershot stated that in regard to water quantity, when it rains, stormwater runs off hard surfaces and into the detention pond. Without a stormwater quantity release control, stormwater would run downstream and potentially create a flooding issue. For water quality purposes, rainwater flowing off impervious surfaces contains glutinous debris. The water quality management component separates those glutens before the stormwater is released downstream.

Ms. Fox inquired how the City is approaching rain gardens, such as occurred with the Cardinal Health parking lot. What is the sustainability of rain gardens in conjunction with parking lots?

Mr. Hendershot responded that rain gardens are an approved stormwater facility that could be utilized. The design team has different options they can use for this project. They decided to use the extended dry detention basin. There was a safety concern about proposing an additional retention or wet basin due to the proximity of the school. This project also utilizes underground storage. Other options could be utilized, however, such as permeable pavers or the rain gardens.

Ms. Call inquired if oil water separators are required in permeable basins.

Mr. Hendershot responded that there is a pre-treatment component involved. A medium underneath permeable pavers serves as the water quality feature. For an underground storage system, hydrodynamic separators separate the glutens before the water goes into the system. That is the water quality component of that system.

Mr. Krawetzki stated that the amount of plantings that will be added to this dry basin would assist with uptake of water and nutrients, as well.

Additional Public Comments received:

Michael Berlin, 7708 Heatherwood Lane, Dublin, OH, 43017:

"How could there be 'unknown' site conditions that have to be addressed before demolition/construction has even commenced? Wasn't the City of Dublin involved in the original construction? If bids came in over budget, be honest with the taxpayers/citizens of Dublin. The overall design of the pools and the structures do look good. If the City could find the funds for a bridge that was over budget then the City should be able to fund this pool which will have more impact on residents' lives than any walkway!"

Angela Borromeo, 7757 Fulmar Dr., Dublin, Ohio 43017:

"From my 14 year old swimmer -- Please make room for kids who want to swim. The south pool doesn't have room to swim, only play. Big kids get yelled at when they run out of room to swim. I really liked the North Pool the best because I just want to swim. Antonio Borromeo"

Tracie Bourquin, 5569 Fawnbrook Ln., Dublin, Ohio 43017:

"I urge you to approve building the new North Pool as it was proposed this winter. I understand there have been some unexpected issues, but believe that you should fund the building of the pool as it was proposed. If that means adding additional money to get the same design and features, then I urge you to do this. Many residents are eager to have this pool open next year. In order for this to happen, construction needs to get started as soon as possible. Also, it is a city amenity that many families use. Money spent on it will serve thousands of people over many years. If forced to choose, I think more people would prefer to see money spent on this pool over many other places including the new pedestrian bridge and park. Please fund this project!"

Katy Brown, 6045 Round Tower Lane Dublin, Oh 43017:

"Now more than ever, we need to think about how to safely allow our residents to have access to water in Dublin. I feel you need to strongly consider a 50-meter pool as part of your design. The vast amount of open water will be so important as we move forward here. Dublin folks are desperate for more lap lanes, and this would allow kids and adults alike access to more physical exercise in the pool. You have the opportunity now to create a large swimming space for kids and adults! Please consider adding more water space to your plans. Dublin needs it."

Jennifer Daugherty, 5624 Fawnbrook Ln., Dublin, Oh 43017:

Hello. I am respectfully asking the committee to make necessary changes so that construction can quickly begin to the North Pool. Our large community should not rely on only one public pool, one that less than 5% of residents can walk or bike to. The south pool is in an inconvenient location which most families cannot access except by car. Can the parking lot be trimmed in size at North since so many can walk or bike to it? Please, please begin construction. The community needs an accessible swimming pool. Any changes to landscaping, parking lot or other lower-priority items are encouraged. The longer it stands empty and vacant the less hope the residents have in salvaging 2021 Swim season when it was promised for so long by our leaders. Thank you for your time."

Brian Moran, 7675 Cashel Ct., Dublin, OH 43017:

"As best as I can tell, you are running 6-9 months behind the original proposed schedule you discussed with us. Even allowing for COVID-19 inefficiencies, I am stunned and saddened designs weren't completed last fall, advertised, bid and awarded last winter, and mobilized and field work started by now to take advantage of warm summer weather. At your current pace, you appear to be positioning significant weather-dependent construction activities into next winter season. This puts your schedule and the quality of the finished project at significant risk. (That is, assuming you plan on opening the facility a year from now.) Sadly, the City's ability to manage to a project schedule is nonexistent."

Michelle Worrellia, 6166 Enke Ct., Dublin, OH 43017:

"I hope the pool is handicap accessible with a ramp and lift for all ages and disabilities, also with a zero entry area or a zero entry pool for little kids going up to 3 feet. Although not a fan of diving boards, they are needed for the middle schoolers and up. Also, have a pool for lap swimming and the swim team not connected to the main rec pool for families close by. Also look into new attractions other than slides. There is an attraction that is an obstacle swim course that lowers the objects into the water and is a straight one to two lane pool about 25 yards to 25 meters long - not sure of the name but it has Ninja in it - a city pool in Texas outside Houston has one; check it out."

Robin Campbell, 5565 Brand Rd, Dublin, OH 43017:

"I am watching the live feed on tonight's PZC meeting on the Dublin Community Pool North, and I do not see any forum for submitting questions. We live on the north side of Earlington Park. Can you please tell us about the lighting situation on the expanded parking lot? Currently, the parking lot is lit up like Meijer, and I am confident that it is not the desire of the neighborhood to expand the light condition. How may I get answers to my questions?"

Ms. Call requested that Ms. Martin respond to the lighting concern.

Ms. Martin responded that as part of this application, a photometric plan is required. Photometrics look at the lighting level proposed to be dissipated from various features. This site does include site and building lighting. Both are intended to have the minimum light level necessary to ensure the site is safe at night. The Parks and Recreation Department recognizes the site's location within a neighborhood; therefore, it has not proposed any lighting on the west side of the structure, which would be adjacent to the single-family residences. There would be only the required parking lot lighting. The Code requires that light levels be zero (0) at ten feet past the property line; this application meets that requirement. They anticipate the light fixtures to have shields.

Ms. Fox inquired if the new light level will be similar to the existing light level.

Ms. Martin responded that it would be consistent with the existing level.

Ms. Fox stated that the complaint is that the existing light level is too bright, and the current parking area will be expanded. Typically, lighting is bright over a parking lot. Could a timer be utilized to dim these lights after a certain hour? What are the options for addressing Ms. Campbell's complaint?

Ms. Martin responded that there is an option to turn off 50% of the light fixtures at a certain time. Auto-oriented businesses in Dublin have been required to do so. Staff could investigate the potential solutions and determine which would be best for this site.

Ms. Call inquired the Commission's thoughts on dimming the lights after a certain time.

Mr. Fishman stated that pools typically have a nuisance problem after hours, such as kids breaking into the pool. It is important to ensure the lighting is sufficient to deflect that type of problem. Perhaps some landscaping could be used to mitigate the lighting. His only concern is the safety issue.

Mr. Schneier inquired what the pool hours are. How long are the lights typically left on? During pool season, do they remain on 24/7?

Mr. Earman responded that the lights come on earlier in the early and late months of the year, versus the middle of the year. There is the other component of school activities that extend into the evening hours. School activities determine the need for lighting in that parking lot, as well. The technologies of lighting have significantly improved over the last few years. When the new lighting is added, they will be looking at the actual photometric balance. Adjustments can be made by either adding new lighting improvements throughout or making adjustments to what is on site.

Keith Hall, Principal, MSA Design, 14 E. Gay Street, Suite 300, Columbus, OH 43215, stated that the average light level across the lot is three foot candles or less. That is not a significant level of light. They are using cut-off fixtures, which hold the light inbound onto the parking lot itself. There is no light spillage to the surrounding properties. The lights will have photocells, and will come on when the outdoor light level triggers it. Timers or other devices can be added to shut them down, as the group has suggested. The lighting can be controlled.

Ms. Kennedy stated that the pool closes at 8:00 p.m. in the summer. The sun is still up at that time. Ms. Call stated that this is an elementary school, so there will not be evening football games or similar activities after hours. She believes the resident's request is a reasonable expectation that the lighting be reduced at the time adults retire for the night. Of course, simultaneously, safety on the site must not be compromised.

Mr. Schneier stated that he is concerned about the Commission inserting itself into an area that has many implications. We want to be sensitive to the residents, but remain aware of safety and school function needs. Without conferring with others who would have an interest in this issue, he is not comfortable with giving any direction to reduce the lighting. He would prefer to defer to the experts.

Mr. Supelak stated that the photometrics component is included in the set of drawings, as well as attention to the many codes involved. He has full confidence that the new lights will be fully compliant and sensible. The issue is the current lights. Perhaps they could be augmented to address the concern.

Commission Discussion

Mr. Fishman stated that he is confident the experts will address the lighting issue. He was concerned about parking, but if the City has a joint agreement with the church across the street, that should address any additional needs.

Ms. Call stated that Code requires 200 parking spaces with the pool addition. Staff is recommending 176, which is a decrease of 24 spaces. She understood his concern to be over-parking.

Mr. Fishman responded that he concurs with staff on the reduction in parking spaces. However, it was indicated that, occasionally, a special meet or event could increase the parking need. In those situations, a formal parking agreement with the church would prevent the need for vehicles to park within the neighborhood. Typically, verbal agreements prove to be insufficient a few years in the future.

Ms. Kennedy stated that the Commission was asked to provide feedback on the sign. She believes the building-mounted sign is appropriate for the facility. The traditional City Parks and Recreation sign does not seem to be the right fit for this facility. She also is supportive of the proposed reduction in parking spaces to 176 spaces. As a frequent pool user, she has never had an issue parking there.

Mr. Grimes stated that this an incredible project. He is impressed with the level of cooperation and communication on the development of this plan. This will be a great use and realignment of that site in the center of that community. This is a great plan!

Mr. Supelak stated that staff's due diligence involving the public has been impressive. This facility is very important to many people. It is a nice project. He has no concerns.

Mr. Schneier stated that he had some concerns about the parking, but defers to the experts on that. He shares the other sentiments expressed – this is a great exhibition of community involvement. He is supportive.

Ms. Fox congratulated Planning, Parks and Recreation staffs and the design team. This was an impressive community engagement effort. While the process involved many turns, the result was a better project. This facility will bring joy to the community for years to come. She agrees that the sign is attractive and

contemporary. She would appreciate any attention that can be given to the neighbors' concerns about the lighting, but she is confident the experts can address that. She is supportive of the project, even with the \$2.5 million cost increase for the extras. This will be a great community asset.

Ms. Call stated that the previous pool was in operation and well utilized for 33 years; that is remarkable! She appreciates that the primary focus was not looking at this with the goal of staying within the \$6 million budget, which may have resulted in a pool with a 20-year usable lifespan. She believes staff has functioned as good stewards of the residents' tax dollars, but also focused on safety, connectivity, and amenities that would well serve the present community and future generations.

Mr. Grimes moved, Mr. Fishman seconded approval of a Minor Text Modification for the Dublin Community Pool North – Site, Case 19-133AFDP, to permit 176 parking spaces where 200 parking spaces are required.

Vote: Ms. Fox, yes; Mr. Grimes, yes; Ms. Call, yes; Mr. Fishman, yes; Mr. Supelak, yes; Mr. Schneier, yes; Ms. Kennedy, yes.

[Motion passed 7-0.]

Mr. Supelak moved, Mr. Grimes seconded approval of an Amended Final Development Plan for the Dublin Community Pool North – Site, Case 19-133AFDP, with the following two conditions:

- 1) That the applicant continue to work with the Engineering Division to demonstrate stormwater management compliance in accordance with Chapter 53 of the Dublin Code.
- 2) That the applicant incorporate flowering plants to encourage more pollinators and aesthetics to this area of the park, subject to staff approval.

Vote: Mr. Supelak, yes; Mr. Fishman, yes; Ms. Fox, yes; Mr. Grimes, yes; Ms. Call, yes; Ms. Kennedy, yes; Mr. Schneier, yes.

[Motion passed 7-0.]

Mr. Supelak moved, Mr. Grimes seconded approval of an Amended Final Development Plan for the Dublin Community Pool North – Building, Case 20-082AFDP, with the following condition:

- 1) That the applicant provide final sign details for the building mounted sign, subject to staff approval.

Vote: Ms. Kennedy, yes; Mr. Schneier, yes; Mr. Fishman, yes; Ms. Fox, yes; Ms. Call, yes; Mr. Grimes, yes; Mr. Supelak, yes.

[Motion passed 7-0.]

COMMUNICATIONS

- A follow-up from the June 4, 2020 Special Joint PZC/ARB meeting will be provided to the Commission at their next meeting with the anticipation that proposed Code revisions will be ready for Commission consideration in August.
- The next regularly scheduled PZC meeting is scheduled for Thursday, July 9, at 6:30 p.m.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 8:10 p.m.

Rebecca Call [Approved 7-09-2020]

Chair, Planning and Zoning Commission

Judith K. Beal

Deputy Clerk of Council