

## Zoning Commission

### 1 Comprehensive Land Use Update Meeting

October 9, 2018

2  
3  
4  
5 Roll: Mark Duell, Christine Trebellas, Todd Dove, Katie Stenman, Dennis McNulty, Adam Pychewicz

6  
7 Township Officials Present: Michael McCarthy Township Counsel  
8 Michele Boni Planning and Zoning Director

9  
10 Ms. Boni: I also invited Ms. Olin; she was unable to attend. We have a BZA member, Ms. Victoria  
11 Jordan, as well as Trustee Ryan Rivers present.

12  
13 Mr. Duell: We are back to the Comprehensive Plan. The last time we discussed a number of changes and  
14 in looking thru them, it seems we've caught most everything brought up and discussed. I think Mr.  
15 McCarthy may have a list.

16  
17 Mr. McCarthy: I made as listing of the points raised by the Zoning Commission at the last meeting, and I  
18 think a lot of them are just things you have to decide; I don't know that they're all going to be points. On  
19 Page 66, Strategy Z-4.4, it reads "review existing standards in all the zoning districts and amend". If  
20 there was a period after districts, I think that was more in keeping with your thinking.

21  
22 Mr. Duell: Yes; strike "and amend". Nothing is going to prevent us from doing that but you don't want  
23 to....

24  
25 Ms. Trebellas: Just put a period after districts and call it a day.

26  
27 Mr. McCarthy: Buffers, natural resources under NR in the back on Page 9, Strategy NR-1.7 and it starts  
28 out "set buffers around waterways" and I thought you did not want that as an obligation.

29  
30 Ms. Trebellas: I thought we were changing most of these to consider.

31  
32 Mr. McCarthy: In my part they were; there were a couple where it bled thru.

33  
34 Ms. Boni: There used to be 3 goals and I just combined all of it into 1 goal as I thought it could all fall  
35 into the same.

36  
37 Ms. Trebellas: I would like to replace it with consider since you know I like to have buffers around  
38 waterways but I agree it shouldn't be a strict requirement.

39  
40 Mr. McCarthy: Page 99, 5.4 says "the site north of existing Wal-Mart may be appropriate", I think you  
41 were still thinking there should be commercial in the frontage.

42  
43 Mr. Dove: I think it's appropriate.

44  
45 Ms. Trebellas: I have no problem with it because we talked about having part of it commercial and part  
46 of it multi-residential since it's maybe.....

47  
48 Mr. McCarthy: Maybe you can deal with since it doesn't say its entirety but maybe.

49  
50 Mr. Duell: I'm still uncomfortable talking about multi-family there although I'm not going to hold up the  
51 process for it.

## Zoning Commission

52 Ms. Trebellas: I understand commercial would be nicer but...  
53  
54 Mr. Dove: If it comes with multi-family, we can argue it then.  
55  
56 Ms. Trebellas: But the fact that there already is multi-family not that far from it on the other side of The  
57 Chiller...  
58  
59 Mr. Duell: That's just it, there's already multi-family not far from it, so it's alright.  
60  
61 Ms. Boni: We can include "while maintaining commercial in the front" or something.  
62  
63 Mr. McCarthy: Yes, just add "with commercial to the front".  
64  
65 Ms. Boni: Does that make the Board a little more comfortable with that statement?  
66  
67 Mr. Dove: It doesn't matter.  
68  
69 Ms. Trebellas: I'm fine with it. I can't imagine anyone would put multi-family backing up on 23.  
70  
71 Ms. Boni: You could.  
72  
73 Ms. Trebellas: You could but I wouldn't advise it.  
74  
75 Mr. Duell: We've seen some multi-family requests in some areas where you wouldn't have thought  
76 there'd be.  
77  
78 Mr. McCarthy: Page 55, you can read it, if it doesn't cause you any issue, we'll move on.  
79  
80 Ms. Boni: "Revisit the Zoning Code to allow for more flexible commercial business standards such as  
81 mixed use or a preferred architectural style."  
82  
83 Ms. Trebellas: That's a report on what happened at the public meeting, not something we're supposed to  
84 do.  
85  
86 Mr. McCarthy: I was torn on that.  
87  
88 Mr. Duell: I agree; that looks like feedback from the public meeting, just a recording of what they said.  
89  
90 Ms. Trebellas: Whether it's accurate or not it's....  
91  
92 Mr. Dove: Public input.  
93  
94 Mr. McCarthy: Sub-area 14, 14-5 on Page 108, the last sentence.  
95  
96 Ms. Boni: This is from the 2010 plan, so I can just....  
97  
98 Mr. McCarthy: "This mixed use district has decorative street lighting.....", just get rid of....  
99  
100 Ms. Boni: Get rid of the sentence or just change the words?  
101  
102 Mr. McCarthy: Just "had: to the word "has" or "contains".

## Zoning Commission

- 103 Mr. McCarthy: Sub-area 8, Section 8-5 requested that there be a recommended residential type and  
104 density back when we did the original stipulations and I did not see that. 8-7...  
105
- 106 Ms. Boni: It says “Condominiums or empty nester or exclusive elderly housing setting maximum density  
107 may fill in some small pockets that are too small for single family.  
108
- 109 Mr. McCarthy: You have housing type but not recommended density, so that’s for you guys to work out.  
110
- 111 Mr. Dove: I don’t think we said it here.  
112
- 113 Mr. McCarthy: In some other sub-areas, usually it’s like 1 per acre, 2 with sewer, something like that.  
114
- 115 Ms. Trebellas: The ones we’ve said before were usually the standard single family density with or  
116 without sewer.  
117
- 118 Mr. McCarthy: Yes, I’m just saying the original stipulations that were sent out had that.  
119
- 120 Mr. Duell: This would be the point where do you want to maintain the 2 or do you want to consider,  
121 given that we’ve had a lot of requests for density higher than 2 but less than the multi-family of 4.  
122
- 123 Mr. Dove: I want to maintain the 2 and let them come in and ask for more. If we go to 3, they’re going  
124 to come in and ask for more.  
125
- 126 Ms. Trebellas: Not only that but throughout the whole process we had an issue with what do they mean  
127 by empty nester housing and how to include the elderly; that’s like a moving target.  
128
- 129 Mr. Duell: You just say condominiums, so that’s one way to define it. And then you say exclusive  
130 elderly which would be age restricted, so that’s another way to define it. So there’s a couple of ways to  
131 define it to clamp it down on specifics. I sense little desire to push above 2, so, put it 2 units per acre and  
132 we’ll continue doing what we’ve been doing when asked and try to justify.  
133
- 134 Mr. McNulty: There are a number of places in this plan that people are asking for the empty nester,  
135 condo style, higher density, so that means it came up a lot during those discussions.  
136
- 137 Mr. Duell: At the kick off meeting, I encouraged them to consider recommendations regarding that  
138 because that’s the one request we’ve been getting....  
139
- 140 Ms. Trebellas: A lot that doesn’t fit in here.  
141
- 142 Mr. McCarthy: Outside of that I would probably just say read Appendix B-4 and be careful.  
143
- 144 Ms. Boni: Under 2 in that, there’s a typo.  
145
- 146 Ms. Trebellas: I have no problem with the considers and reviews and maybe even encourage, but #19  
147 “appropriately rezone site locations.....”. So there’s a typo in #2, and #19 I would rewrite. Right now  
148 #19 implies that we’re going to rezone areas for gateway features; I don’t know how I feel about that. Or  
149 just give it a “consider”.  
150
- 151 Ms. Boni: Maybe just “Consider site locations”; would that be....  
152
- 153 Mr. Duell: It’s under a section called Potential Zoning Changes, so I don’t think we’d be held to it.

## Zoning Commission

154 Ms. Trebellas: It sounds like people are already upset that the trails are taking away their land. The last  
155 thing they're going to want is to have their land taken away so we can have a nice sign for Orange  
156 Township.

157  
158 Mr. Dove: On Page 49, under T.2.3, did we miss a "requiring"? "Connect between neighborhoods by  
159 requiring new developments...". And Page 59, the map, is there some sort of legend or something that  
160 goes with this?

161  
162 Ms. Boni: This wasn't anything informative by any means, it was just a pretty picture. I think we have  
163 the land use map with the legend in another area.

164  
165 Mr. Dove: Is it for the zoning and land use or for economic development; I don't know the purpose of it.  
166

167 Ms. Trebellas: It needs a title and page number.  
168

169 Mr. McCarthy: It's kind of just there.  
170

171 Ms. Boni: I was just kind of filling in with some pictures but I can get rid of that. I ended up getting rid  
172 of another map earlier because I didn't understand the purpose of it, so that's not a problem removing it.  
173

174 Mr. McNulty: When I was going thru this I missed the large implementation thing in the back of this. Is  
175 that just to be looked at as a guide?  
176

177 Ms. Boni: We ended up moving that and all of those strategies are in this plan, just in specific chapters  
178 now, but if the Commission wants that as a guide, once this gets adopted I can put something like that  
179 together again, just to have a little cheat sheet.  
180

181 Mr. McCarthy: I think it was Ms. Stenman who raised the fact that it was creating a to do list when it  
182 should be a consider list and as I recall it was decided it would be easier just to take it out and leave the  
183 text in.  
184

185 Mr. McNulty: I just noticed it was quite large and extensive.  
186

187 Ms. Trebellas: And it was, like you said, a to do list that if it was a separate consider addendum because  
188 it was also trying to provide ownership to responsibility to various entities that may or may not agree to  
189 take said responsibility; I found somewhat problematic. The only other thing is change the manufacturing  
190 on Page 20, Delaware County Census Data Employment.  
191

192 Mr. Duell: Are you sure it's supposed to be 8.1 or should we double check the number?  
193

194 Ms. Trebellas: I think it's 8.1. When I checked the numbers on my calculator, it was either 8.1 or 8.2.  
195 So double check what it's supposed to be but whatever it is, it definitely isn't 81%.  
196

197 Mr. Duell: How do you want to do this?  
198

199 Mr. McCarthy: I'll leave it to you. You have a modified resolution that has a fill in the blank for  
200 stipulations. If you've got a little bit we can hash out the stipulations or you can go another way.  
201

202 Mr. Duell: Do we want to trust Mike to accurately reflect the stipulations?  
203

204 Mr. McCarthy: Mike's going to work with Ms. Boni on those.

## Zoning Commission

205 Mr. Dove: I trust the 2 of them 100%.

206

207 Ms. Stenman/Ms. Trebellas: Yes.

208

209 Mr. Duell: I didn't think there was anything substantive.

210

211 Mr. McCarthy: No, it's consistency for the most part.

212

213 Mr. Duell: So that's fine.

214

215 Ms. Trebellas: I see no need to do a formal list and have to come back.

216

217 Mr. Duell: He was wondering if we need to fill everything out tonight.

218

219 Mr. McCarthy: I was suggesting 2 ways, and I've seen it done both ways. Everyone knows me so you  
220 know what I think, but we can do it; distribute it; if there's any comment or correction, we'll identify it,  
221 share it with the members and, if necessary, think about it or if we feel it's appropriate, we'll put it in.

222

223 Mr. Duell: Do you want to fill in here with the following stipulations as identified and discussed?

224

225 Mr. McCarthy: Yes, in this meeting. And if you have any comments, we can just forward them on to the  
226 Trustees together with the draft we prepare.

227

228 Ms. Boni: Just so I understand since we had this hearing for participation, but we would only be asking  
229 for a vote from....

230

231 Mr. McCarthy: The regular members.

232

### 233 **A MOTION OF THE ORANGE TOWNSHIP ZONING COMMISSION RECOMMENDING** 234 ***PLANNING ORANGE, WITH STIPULATIONS.***

235

236 Ms. Trebellas moved adoption of the following Motion:

237

238 WHEREAS, graduate students of The Ohio State University's City and Regional Planning  
239 Department, as part of the Autumn 2017 Graduate Comprehensive Planning Studio under the supervision  
240 of Chad D. Gibson, AICP, Associated Faculty, The Ohio State University, were engaged to coordinate an  
241 update to Orange Township's 2010 Land Use Plan, doing so without fee to the Township; and

242

243 WHEREAS, The Zoning Commission, as a benefit of Orange Township's membership in the  
244 Delaware Regional Planning Commission, also received professional land use planning assistance from  
245 Scott Sanders, Executive Director, Delaware County Regional Planning Commission, in revising its  
246 comprehensive plan; and

247

248 WHEREAS, the revision process has been completed;

249

250 WHEREAS, *Planning Orange* is a set of policies, goals, maps and recommendations for the  
251 future development of the Township and descriptive of its vision of the future;

252

253 NOW THEREFORE, it is moved that *Planning Orange* is recommended to be adopted and  
254 accepted as a guide to Township development, with the following stipulations:

255

## Zoning Commission

- 256 1) On page 20, correct the Manufacturing employment data to “8.1%”.  
257
- 258 2) On page 46, delete “At-Grade Railroad Crossings”, including the following text.  
259
- 260 3) On page 49, Goal T-1, delete all references to “on-street parking”.  
261
- 262 4) On page 49, Strategy T-2.3, replace the word “requiring” to “considering”.  
263
- 264 5) On page 50, delete Goal T-3, titled “Reduce At-Grade Railroad Crossings.”  
265
- 266 6) Remove image on page 59. Page should be remain blank.  
267
- 268 7) On page 66, Strategy Z-3.4, Change “encourage” to “consider.”  
269
- 270 8) On page 66, Strategy Z-4.4, remove words “and amend”, and move period after the word “districts”.  
271
- 272 9) On page 66, delete Strategy Z-4.5.  
273
- 274 10) On page 75, rephrase Strategy H-1.4 to read: “Consider a Detached Condos Zoned District, such as  
275 “R- 3” zoning district in Liberty Township: One- and Two-Family Residence District, to implement  
276 in areas buffering US-23 to serve 'empty-nesters' and thus avoid multi-family while serving a  
277 community need in targeted areas.  
278
- 279 11) On page 83, delete Strategy CI-1.3.  
280
- 281 12) On page 89, in the text under *Public Meeting 10/5: Poster Presentations*, delete the language  
282 regarding conservation easements (i.e., from “One of the most ...” to “of the Township”).  
283
- 284 13) On page 91, Strategy NR-1.2, Strategy NR-1.3, Strategy NR-1.4, Strategy NR-1.6, Strategy NR-1.7  
285 and Strategy NR-1.8, replace the first word in each with “consider”. As to Strategy NR-1.5, replace  
286 “Partner” with “Consider partnering”.  
287
- 288 14) On page 99, Subarea 5-4, revise to state “The site north of the existing Walmart may be appropriate  
289 for multi-family residential uses while maintaining commercial uses in the front”.  
290
- 291 15) On page 102, Subarea 8-4, correct the word “unites” to units.  
292
- 293 16) On page 102, Subarea 8-7, revise to state “Condominiums for empty nester or exclusive elderly  
294 housing at a minimum of 2 units per acre may fill in some small pockets that are too oddly configured  
295 for single family homes.”  
296
- 297 17) On page 103, Subarea 9 - US 23 Northern Corridor, delete 9-8.  
298
- 299 18) On page 108, Subarea 14-5, replace “with decorative street lighting” to “has decorative street  
300 lighting”.  
301
- 302 19) On page 117, Appendix B.4, correct the spelling in Item #2 to “Consider”.  
303
- 304 20) On page 117, Appendix B.4, correct Item #18 by replacing the word “Encourage” with “Consider”  
305 and by replacing “impermeable” with “permeable”.  
306

## Zoning Commission

307 21) On page 117, Appendix B.4, correct Item #19 to state “Consider site locations for new gateway  
308 features”.

309

310 IT IS FURTHER MOVED that the version of Planning Orange recommended is that submitted to the  
311 Zoning Commission and dated *October 2<sup>nd</sup> 2018* on its cover, the contents of which are incorporated by  
312 reference herein.

313

314 Seconded by Ms. Stenman

315

316 Vote on Motion: Mr. Duell-yes, Ms. Trebellas-yes, Ms. Stenman-yes, Mr. Dove-yes, Mr. McNulty-yes

317

318 Motion carried

319

320 Mr. Dove: And they have already set a date, correct?

321

322 Ms. Boni: Yes, the Trustees hearing date will be on November 19 at 6:00 pm.

323

324 Mr. Rivers: And I'd like to thank everyone as well.

325

326 Ms. Boni: And going to Regional Planning Commission on October 25 for their recommendation.

327

328 Meeting adjourned at 7:30 p.m.

329

330 Minutes prepared by Cindy Davis, Zoning Secretary

331

332 On December 11, 2018, Mr. McNulty moved to approve the meeting minutes of the Orange Township  
333 Zoning Commission dated October 9, 2018 for the Comprehensive Land Use Plan Update as written;  
334 seconded by Mr. Pychiewicz.

335

336 Vote on Motion: Ms. Trebellas-yes, Mr. Dove-yes, Mr. McNulty-yes, Mr. Pychiewicz-yes

337

338 Motion carried