

## Zoning Commission

1 **Rezoning Application #ZON-21-02**

March 16, 2021

### 2 3 **LEGAL NOTICE**

4  
5 Notice is hereby given that the Orange Township Zoning Commission will hold a public hearing on  
6 Tuesday, March 16, 2021 at 7:00 p.m. to consider the following application and discussion:  
7

8 **Rezoning Application #ZON-21-02, Real Property Design and Development LLC**, Requesting to  
9 rezone 4.96 +/- acres of a 5.474 parcel currently zoned Farm Residential District (FR-1) to Planned Elderly  
10 Residential District (PERD) to allow 22 attached residential rental units, restricted to ages 55 and older,  
11 and associated amenities. The subject property is currently owned by Iraj Haghazari and is located at 8119  
12 South Old State Road, Lewis Center, OH 43035 with parcel number 318-423-01-011-000.  
13

14 **Zoning Resolution Discussion**, Discussion involving a rewrite to the Zoning Resolution.  
15

16 The hearing will be held virtually using electronic means and can be accessed by the public on the internet  
17 on the Zoom application at

18 <https://us02web.zoom.us/j/88049028207?pwd=K012TktFa3plVmNyeHkxTW8yQ05pdz09>  
19

20 During the hearing the public may submit questions and comments to the Board by sending messages  
21 to Development and Zoning Director, Michele Boni via the Zoom meeting chat room.  
22

23 To help in limiting the spread of the Coronavirus (COVID-19), residents are urged to contact our office at  
24 740-548-5430 or [orangezoning@orangetwp.org](mailto:orangezoning@orangetwp.org) to review the application and plans.  
25

26 After the conclusion of the hearing, the matter will be submitted to the Orange Township Board of  
27 Township Trustees for its action.  
28

29 Michele Boni, Development and Zoning Director is the person responsible for giving notice of the hearing  
30 by publication.

31 *Adam Pychewicz, Chairperson*

32 *Michele Boni, Orange Township Zoning*

33  
34 *Publish one time on or before Friday, March 5, 2021 in the Delaware Gazette.*  
35

36 Roll Call: Adam Pychewicz, Dennis McNulty, Christine Trebellas, Leslie Pierce, Ciara Harris  
37

38 Township Officials Present: Michele Boni, Development and Zoning Director  
39 Jeff Beard, Senior Zoning Officer  
40

41 Mr. Pychewicz: We're here tonight to discuss Rezoning Application #ZON-21-02, Real Property Design  
42 and Development, LLC. Before starting, I'm going to go through some ground rules. When the Board is  
43 ready for public comment, there will be an opportunity for members of the public to speak during the  
44 hearing via Zoom statements made or written in any chat rooms shall not serve as public comment. If you  
45 would like to speak, please unmute yourself, state your name and address, and limit your comments to 3  
46 minutes. Residents wishing to speak shall keep their comments limited to the merits of the application;  
47 personal attacks on the applicant, Township officials or other residents will not be tolerated, and residents  
48 may lose their right to speak. The Chair reserves the right to have residents muted who engage in personal  
49 attacks.  
50

## Zoning Commission

51 Ms. Boni: I prepared a Staff Report that was sent to the Board members in advance but this is application  
52 #ZON-21-02, the applicant is Real Property Design and Development, LLC, co-owned by John C. Wicks  
53 This is located at 8119 S. Old State Road in Lewis Center, just north of The Inn at Bear Trail. The  
54 applicant is requesting to rezone 4.96 acres from FR-1 to a PER District to allow for 22 attached units.  
55 This will be restricted to ages 55 and older, and associated amenities will be included. The site is  
56 currently zoned Farm Residential with an existing residence as well as accessory structures. The property  
57 is primarily surrounded by Residential Districts; the only thing different from Single Family is that  
58 Planned Elderly Residential District (PERD) which is The Inn at Bear Trail and that is an assisted living  
59 facility. Per the 2018 Comprehensive Land Use Plan the Commission and Staff refer to typically for  
60 guidance, this property is referred to as Sub-area 6. This sub-area recommends density generally at 2 units  
61 per acre with centralized sanitary sewer. However, an addition in this area may be appropriate for a PERD  
62 which would be up to 4 dwelling units per acre. They are proposing a net density of 4.44 dwelling units  
63 per acre and a gross density at 4.2 dwelling units per acre. This is an independent living facility, they are  
64 proposing a 57.06 percentage of open space, parking will be 4 spaces per unit and each unit will have a 2  
65 car garage and 2 parking spaces in the driveway with minimum floor area of 1200 square feet. As far as  
66 development standards, I wanted to make it clear that I provided the setbacks that are proposed for this  
67 district but the Orange Township Zoning Resolution does not provide setback standards for a PERD, so  
68 this is what the applicant is proposing and it's up to the Zoning Commission's recommendation to move  
69 forward with it. The applicant is proposing two divergences, one under Section 15.02 for the minimum  
70 acreage requirement. This site is 4.96 acres, so they are requesting a divergence to be less than the 10  
71 acres. The second is density. The density allows for 4 dwelling units per acre and this is 4.2 for the gross  
72 density. Staff had additional comments, the first few being technical things as far as the use of words such  
73 as preliminary, proposed, etc. and we need to modify the disclaimer in the application. We want to add to  
74 include the open space calculations in the development text. I know some of the residents have concern  
75 about that. A couple of technical issues are errors we would like to change is remove the setbacks from  
76 the table and I can talk with the applicant further on that. I recommended providing some landscape  
77 buffer along the eastern side of the property line based on some of our residents' concerns; landscaping  
78 seemed to be one of the bigger ones. Staff questions the use of vinyl siding. I'm sure the Board will talk  
79 about that but I just wanted to make note of that. We've had some prohibited materials including vinyl in  
80 the past. And Staff always encourages communication and transparency with adjacent neighbors and  
81 property owners. For Tech Review, I reached out to the Orange Township Fire Department, and they have  
82 not reviewed any plans for this at this time but because of recent discussion, I think the applicant has  
83 heard from the County Engineer that the access needs to be reconfigured, and I'll let John talk about that  
84 further. The application was heard at the Delaware County Regional Planning Commission, and they  
85 recommended conditional approval at their hearing on February 25, 2021 with only one condition and that  
86 was consulting with the Delaware County Engineer and Fire Department on the final configuration of  
87 Monroe Drive and fire access road.

### APPLICANT PRESENTATION/COMMISSION QUESTIONS & COMMENTS

91 John Wicks, Real Property Design and Development, 15 N. Liberty Street, Powell, Ohio 43065, I'm also  
92 a resident of Orange Township; I live off of Orange Road. This project is known as Independent Living at  
93 Old State right now. It's designed for aging residents in Orange Township who may have raised their  
94 families in the Township, no longer need to stay in their larger homes but still want to stay in the  
95 neighborhood. It's a rental community for those who prefer to rent but wish to stay in the Township. To  
96 give you a little background of how I came up with this concept, in 2018, Orange Township undertook a  
97 pretty exhaustive study for the best step forward in the Township which included input from nearly 500  
98 residents via 3 in person meetings and online surveys. A common theme among the findings of the study  
99 included a shortage and a need for senior housing. It was pretty clearly indicated throughout the study, in  
100 particular Sub-area 6 was mentioned specifically as a potential location for senior housing and this  
101 property is adjacent to The Inn at Bear Trail which is an assisted living facility, so in my mind this

## Zoning Commission

102 property always seemed like it made more sense to be some sort of PERD zoning classification than  
103 Single Family Housing. Within the Comp Plan it specifically shows input from residents and those who  
104 prepared the study that there is a lack of senior housing, and that's a weakness for the Township and  
105 further that new types of housing and in-fill development are opportunities for smart growth within the  
106 Township, both of which I think are accomplished with this PERD zoning request. Within the Goals and  
107 Strategies Section of the study done in 2018, there was a conclusion that the Zoning Commission should  
108 encourage more PERD's to accommodate the older residents of Orange Township, so I feel I was guided  
109 by this document that this was what exactly was called for in the Comp Plan. I saw some feedback from  
110 some of the neighbors and understand there are concerns about property values and traffic. Orange  
111 Township residents should feel confident this project as proposed will not have a negative impact on  
112 either. Daily traffic counts for senior housing is far less than for regular single family housing, and the  
113 property is completely segregated from any of the surrounding neighborhoods, like Walker Woods;  
114 there's no thru traffic from this project into the existing neighborhoods. The high quality of construction  
115 and architectural standards that are consistent with the area and are part of this proposal will ensure the  
116 neighboring property values will remain high and continue to build equity. Michele did mention about the  
117 County Engineer and Fire Department. There will be a change in the next submission, and we're going to  
118 do something a bit different with the terminus of Monroe Drive, most likely add a cul-de-sac that would  
119 be built to public standards that would allow fire trucks and all other vehicles to turn around and stay on  
120 the public infrastructure. At this time I'm happy to answer any questions. With me on the call is Michael  
121 Maistros with New Avenue Architects and Kyle Weber with Kleingers Group. They can answer any of  
122 the technical questions that I may not be able to.

123

124 Mr. Pychewicz: There was a comment from the residents to the east. There is screening on the north side  
125 of the property but nothing was shown on the east but if I remember correctly, it shows in the image you  
126 pulled up there are some trees there now that appear to be not on this property, and I would imagine most  
127 of those are to remain. Is that the intent or there will be some type of screening there?

128

129 Mr. Wicks: The existing landscaping is primarily on the Walker Wood open space site anyway, and those  
130 trees are far more mature than anything we would plant along the buffer on our property. It will grow into  
131 a nice mature buffer but the trees are pretty robust at this time, and we did not propose a significant buffer  
132 along the east side because of that reason. However, there are particular areas that have bare spots, and  
133 we'll be happy to work with the neighbors to come up with a better screening option on the east side.

134

135 Ms. Boni: John, would you be willing to ensure a continuous tree line along the eastern perimeter?

136

137 Mr. Wicks: Tree buffers aren't designed to be completely opaque the first year; they're designed to grow  
138 in and create a dense screening over time, but I would be willing to put additional trees in there to  
139 supplement the tree row that's already there and try to ultimately end up with a continuous buffer.

140

141 Mr. McNulty: I'm just curious about what decisions go into making something a rental versus condos.

142

143 Mr. Wicks: We've talked back and forth about potentially condominiumizing this. The answer is there are  
144 no rentals for 55 and over in Orange Township right now. I know there's a project by Evans Farms that's  
145 supposed to be that but they haven't broken ground yet either, so there are folks out there who prefer to  
146 rent, who don't want the burden of ownership and would like to have a nice quality residence to rent and  
147 not have that ownership or maintenance obligation. We are considering potentially condominiumizing  
148 this so in the future it could be sold off as the market changes as it always does, so that would be  
149 something I would want to have the right to do with this zoning category.

150

151 Mr. McNulty: I think sometimes condos and ownership work better than rentals, at least with people like  
152 us or Township Trustees, and since Michele referred to there aren't necessarily zoning setback standards,

## Zoning Commission

153 that was the other comment I saw that on the north side that was a 30'. Is there any possibility of making  
154 that larger?  
155

156 Mr. Wicks: Yes its 30' there and because we have a residential district abutting another residential  
157 district, that's pretty standard setback. From the back of the Walker Wood setback, that's 30' as well, so  
158 we're not any less than what that's platted out to be. I think there is room to possibly slide that a little  
159 further south to accommodate a slightly larger setback, but we have to see what other comments we have  
160 to address to make sure we could accommodate that. We're willing to work with the neighbors anyway  
161 we can to make everything easier for everybody as long as we can accomplish what we're trying to do  
162 with our plan.  
163

164 Mr. McNulty: Will these be maintained by a rental association and not maintained by Orange Township?  
165

166 Mr. Wicks: Correct; these are private streets.  
167

168 Mr. McNulty: And the vinyl which we've had questions about in the past, but I think we even approved  
169 another high quality unit because there are some high quality vinyls.  
170

171 Mr. Wicks: The quality of vinyl siding has really approved over the last 20 years. If you were to look at  
172 all the homes that surround the property, each and every one of those homes has vinyl siding, so it  
173 wouldn't change the character of what the neighborhood currently has or we would commit to putting in  
174 the newer higher quality vinyl siding that is an option today. I don't have a sample with me, but we'd be  
175 glad to deliver some to Michele or show on camera at the next hearing.  
176

177 Ms. Boni: I know in the past we've had a minimum requirement beaded.  
178

179 Ms. Trebellas: Generally I think we've requested a profile which would be like a beaded or something  
180 that's a little more substantial and a little less plastic looking. We've also required a certain mil thickness  
181 like we did on the US 23 overlay and like we've had on other multi-family units that have requested to  
182 use vinyl to make sure it doesn't get pock marks due to weathering or it doesn't fade in the sun. If you get  
183 the lesser quality vinyl it will fade, if you have a hail or windstorm or it will distort in the heat, so we  
184 request a thickness that I can't remember off the top of my head and Michele I was hoping you could  
185 provide them that information because I know we requested it on the 23 overlay.  
186

187 Ms. Boni: I will include that in the comments.  
188

189 Mr. McNulty: We approved a multi-family that I went out and looked at all the models, and it had vinyl  
190 and really looked good but you mentioned standards and I'm sure they were designed to those standards  
191 and that's what needs to happen; we need to put some numbers to it or some specifications to it.  
192

193 Ms. Trebellas: People might prefer fiber cement but fiber cement has its own issues, so we requested if  
194 you use vinyl, at least use a higher quality.  
195

196 Mr. Wicks: We plan to own the property and the project, so we certainly don't want to have something  
197 cheap looking or something that's going to require maintenance over time, so we're happy to provide  
198 samples to the Township prior to any approvals.  
199

200 Ms. Trebellas: How is Monroe Drive going to terminate. I guess you're going to redo that now for the  
201 Fire Department but my concern is where the existing house is, it looks like they're going to vacate off  
202 Old State and get a new driveway off Old State. My understanding is Engineering generally prefers that  
203 you vacate off of Old State because it's very difficult to make a left hand turn onto Old State at certain

## Zoning Commission

204 hours. It's a safety issue pulling in and out of a private drive onto Old State, so if you're re-engineering, I  
205 suggest please look at that connection. I know you have those bollards the Fire Department can get  
206 through but it's also very close to where that driveway is and I'm just waiting for that person to turn out  
207 of their driveway and into those bollards, so I request you take a look at that connection and see if you can  
208 come up with a better solution than what's going on there right now, and I'm assuming with input from  
209 Engineering and the Fire Department, that may be re-looked at anyway.

210

211 Mr. Wicks: That was a comment made by the Engineering Department and we discussed that at length.  
212 What we don't want is an FR-1 house that goes through private streets to access the public road.

213

214 Ms. Trebellas: Maybe make part of Monroe Drive extended to the public street and I understand the rest  
215 will be private, so just revisit that. I have some questions about density site issues having to do with the  
216 unit on the corner on the north side off Old State. I believe you have the setback greater than the current  
217 house. The current house is very, very close to Old State, especially when Old State was expanded. It  
218 looks like the standard at one time was around 70' but it's even closer to Old State than the houses above  
219 it in Walker Wood. Try and take a look at that because I think that's a little too close, especially if  
220 someone is going to be living in that house with their bedrooms there.

221

222 Mr. Wicks: We'll look at how we can possibly increase that setback. The point I was trying to make was  
223 as you're driving north on Old State and you look at the existing home, and that will be a side of a house,  
224 not a front, it will feel and appear to be further off the road than the existing home and then the next house  
225 to the north will even be further off the road.

226

227 Ms. Trebellas: I would try and line it up with the next house on the north because the older farm  
228 residences off of Old State since they widened the road are very close, and Old State in that vicinity is  
229 basically a 5-lane road that someone's residence is going to be off of. Granted they won't access it from  
230 Old State but it's just a concern. Michele already made the comment about labeling on your plan what  
231 the open space calculations are and also how your pond fits into those calculations, and only 10% of that  
232 pond can count toward your open space calculations. I'm not familiar with the PERD; we've only had a  
233 couple of them zoned this way throughout the Township as the zoning classification, but my under-  
234 standing is the PERD's are supposed to have walkways that connect the buildings to the green space and  
235 right now there's no sidewalks in front of the buildings, you walk outside your driveway and you have to  
236 walk in your street to get to a sidewalk. If this is supposed to be a walkable residential community for  
237 older people, I don't think they should be walking in the street to get to the sidewalk on the other side of  
238 the road or in some cases they don't even have a sidewalk on the other side of the road. I would prefer  
239 you have sidewalks in front of the residential units that then link up to the gazebo or if you have one in  
240 front of the mail kiosk which then also means you have to push your buildings around because you need  
241 5' for sidewalk and then you need 20' for your driveway so you can get your parking spot, and it all kind  
242 of rolls downhill from there but I believe our Code says they have to connect to the buildings but Michele  
243 can double check that for you. I know there were some comments from residents about site lighting.  
244 Generally in residential districts we don't have street lights. I think the only residential district I  
245 remember approving street lights for was Evans Farm and that was in the sort of commercial area where  
246 they also may have multi-family because they wanted that urban center old town feel. I'll leave it for the  
247 other Board members but it's not a standard for a residential property and other cases I know the  
248 developers have wanted them and we settled with making sure the lights were on the houses and that they  
249 were always on. This is an age restricted community, 55 and above, and as I understand, according to the  
250 PERD its limited to two permanent residents per dwelling unit, and I was curious about how you were  
251 going to make sure you're in compliance with that. There's usually a point of contact listed in the  
252 development plan and some sort of report that the Zoning Department is supposed to get to make sure that  
253 you're in compliance. because if not, this could just be a rental unit for anybody, and I think that would  
254 help some of the neighbors' concerns about this being a rental unit as long as you assure compliance and

## Zoning Commission

255 then you don't have to worry about burden on the schools and traffic and all those other things that people  
256 tend to be concerned about. Another comment I think the neighbors had as well, is there any relationship  
257 between this PERD and the one neighboring it? Are they going to share facilities or resources or anything  
258 like that? And if not, is there going to be a sales office or model unit or leasing office?

259  
260 Mr. Wicks: I've gotten several comments back that there are not a lot of people in favor of the street  
261 lighting. We can investigate some alternatives to that, maybe some street lamps in the front yard or  
262 lighting on the homes. Compliance with 55 and over, my attorney says there are legal documents to be  
263 able to enforce that. I don't have the details on how that would be accomplished at this time but I assure  
264 you we will follow those steps prior to any building approval. There is no affiliation with The Inn at Bear  
265 Trail. I have spoken to the owner a couple of times and they are supportive of this project. I did suggest to  
266 them that there may be an opportunity to share in these facilities, but we haven't gotten there yet, so as of  
267 right now, it's a completely independent living project.

268  
269 Ms. Trebellas: So how will your leasing occur? Is there an offsite office that people will go to?

270  
271 Mr. Wicks: There will be an offsite office. For something this small, it doesn't justify having an actual on  
272 premise office. My office is in Powell and when we hire a leasing company, we'd use their facility.

273  
274 Ms. Trebellas: I personally have no problem as a Commission member as well with the PERD being here  
275 because it is neighboring the other Planned Residential Development for 55 and above. I just want to  
276 make sure there is some method for compliance so it's not just open to anybody.

277  
278 Mr. Wicks: And we are committed to that.

279  
280 Ms. Boni: Christine, one of the points you made since we do have a lot of new members on the  
281 Commission, this Planned Elderly Residential District is a new district. Not too new but I think there  
282 might only be one, maybe two of this kind in the Township.

283  
284 Ms. Trebellas: I believe there's one built and this one, and I think there was a suggestion in Evans Farm  
285 but I don't think it's come to fruition.

286  
287 Ms. Boni: No, the Evans Farm, if it is going to be assisted or independent living, it's going to fall under  
288 the Commercial District, so to my knowledge there's only one PERD which is just south of this, The Inn  
289 at Bear Trail.

290  
291 Mr. Pychewicz: I get that you guys are going to take a look at the lighting and possibly so an alternate or  
292 something, but at the bottom at the proposed line, some of those numbers or values in the chart on the  
293 property line the max is .4 which I believe is to Code but the average is .06 which I was just a little bit  
294 confused by. I just wanted to make sure that at the property line we are at a .4 or lower and then when we  
295 take a look at re-doing that light, just make sure we're still at that light value for foot candles.

296  
297 Mr. Wicks: That average came from all the readings along the east side that are 0, so it's a statistical  
298 average that ended up being .06.

299  
300 Mr. Pychewicz: The drainage along the north side of the property, you can kind of see the existing grades  
301 there a little bit more aggressive toward Old State Road but when you get past that first building to the  
302 northwest, I get why you're grading away from the building but as that grades down to 974 and you have  
303 all those residents and you have this low point between the two properties which now it's a little bit  
304 flatter, how is that being drained with those two properties going down to that low point in the middle?

## Zoning Commission

305 Are there any concerns about ponding or anything that could happen back there that isn't occurring right  
306 now with those residents?

307  
308 Mr. Wicks: To be honest with you, yes. Because of some concern, I think the intent was to have some  
309 storm sewer back there but for some reason didn't make it on this plan. We certainly don't want to create  
310 any low spots or potential for flooding, so there may be a missing line of storm sewer that would run west  
311 to east and then tie into the basin there.

312  
313 Mr. Pychewicz: That would be great if we could do that just to make sure there weren't any problems for  
314 those neighboring residences. To reiterate what Christine said, I don't have a problem with what you're  
315 proposing here at all; I think this is a good fit especially with the property down to the south. The density  
316 is fairly close to what is required; I don't have an issue with that divergence at all. Are there any other  
317 comments from the Board as of right now?

318  
319 Ms. Harris: The property down to the south, I noticed it's been on the market for 166 days and it's  
320 marketed towards developers or commercial property. Could that cause any conflict in the future?

321  
322 Mr. Wicks: The property to the south is developed; it's not for sale. There is a property north of this site  
323 that has been for sale for some time.

324  
325 Ms. Harris: The single family house down at the bottom there.

326  
327 Mr. Wicks: That's part of what I'm in contract to purchase.

328  
329 Ms. Boni: And that house will be existing and not part of the age restriction.

330  
331 Mr. Wicks: That's correct.

332  
333 Mr. Pierce: What's going to be in that house?

334  
335 Mr. Wicks: We're just going to split it off and sell it as a single family residence. It's actually a very nice  
336 house. The main structure was built in the 1860's but it's been updated since then.

337  
338 Mr. Pierce: I like your project and also that it's next to the existing assisted living. I like the idea that  
339 you're considering seeing if there's some shared amenities. You said you would ask for the ability to  
340 convert to condominiums as a part of this package. What would drive that decision to convert them?

341  
342 Mr. Wicks: To have the option to go from condos that are able to be rented is an easy one. To try to  
343 change something that's designated as an apartment package to condominiums is a much more arduous  
344 process, so my thought was if we condominiumize the project from the get go and made it a rental  
345 community, some point in the future it could be converted back to condominium for sale units, so it just  
346 gives us more options. We would maintain the 55 and over designation whether they were condominiums  
347 or rentals.

348  
349 Mr. Pierce: What's the rental rate you anticipate?

350  
351 Mr. Wicks: It's difficult to know because we don't know the full cost yet. The more restrictions put on the  
352 project, the higher the cost is going to be, so that's one of the reasons we suggested the vinyl, to keep the  
353 construction costs at a minimum or at least the extras that are necessary. I don't even want to guess what  
354 the rental rates would be at this point, but someone mentioned Section 8 and they'll be well above any  
355 Section 8 rental rates.

## Zoning Commission

356 Mr. Pierce: Are you planning on making any of these to be affordable or available to subsidized housing  
357 given they're 55 years and older who probably want to reside there and with the subsidy can meet the  
358 rental rate?

359  
360 Mr. Wicks: It is not an intent of mine to do that. We are trying to provide housing to people who live in  
361 Orange Township now and who are downsizing and selling their homes but want to stay in the area.

362  
363 Mr. Pierce: You said you're targeting people currently in this area, but I guess the people could move  
364 from anywhere and if they could afford the rent, you'd take them?

365  
366 Mr. Wicks: Yes, we're not going to restrict it to Orange Township residents but the intent is to provide an  
367 alternative housing commodity that doesn't exist in Orange Township right now.

368  
369 Mr. Pierce: I think you should give some consideration to affordable housing as well.

370  
371 Ms. Boni: I understand you're purchasing that existing home but are you considering that a part of the  
372 PERD?

373  
374 Mr. Wicks: No, we separated that out so the entire parcel is 5-1/2 acres but the PERD zoning is for 4.9  
375 acres.

376  
377 Ms. Boni: So that will still remain as a separate parcel?

378  
379 Mr. Wicks: It will.

380  
381 Ms. Trebellas: Does that mean that one small segment would remain Farm Residential even though it  
382 doesn't quite meet those guidelines anymore?

383  
384 Mr. Wicks: I've talked to Scott Sanders of Regional Planning about this and essentially it's considered a  
385 left over piece and even though you couldn't zone it in the FR-1 District today, it would not change its  
386 zoning designation today unless someone applied to do so. And as part of this project, it will have  
387 sanitary sewer hookup and is on public water as it stands now.

388  
389 Mr. Pychewicz: At this time we're going to open it up to public comment. Again, just to reiterate, when  
390 you would like to speak, just unmute yourself, state your name and address, and limit your comment to 3  
391 minutes.

392  
393 Ms. Boni: Also, if you're able to raise your hand on the Zoom application, that would be preferred. If not,  
394 I ask that everyone give a few seconds between each other's comments.

395

### PUBLIC COMMENT

396

397  
398 Ryan Stow, I live in Walker Wood at 2072 Maxwell, so we border the east side of where the proposed  
399 development is and currently looking out over the field that exists there. We've been here for about 5  
400 years and when we moved here, part of the appeal of our lot was not backing up to anybody and our lot  
401 being next to the access on the HOA area back there even put us further from our neighbors to the north,  
402 so it's a nice spot and we thought there would be development but we were hoping it would be single  
403 family, larger lots, higher end homes, definitely less dense. That's what I was hoping if anything ever  
404 happened. We have 3 small children that like to play back there and right now we don't have to worry  
405 about cars, other people, lights – didn't even think about that until this meeting and I'm just really not for  
406 this as everything is being proposed. For rentals, I don't think they have a vested interest in the property



## Zoning Commission

407 and I know it says 55 and over, I don't really know how that all works but I've heard it doesn't all have to  
408 be 55 and I wanted to know if that's actually true, if there's a minimum that can be any age, can there be  
409 people under 55? Do they have any children that live at home? Just not currently excited for this.

410

411 Ms. Boni: We'll go through all the public comment and then we'll respond to it.

412

413 Duttah Sandipan, 2000 Maxwell Avenue, that is the exact north side of the proposed property and I also  
414 have concerns like what Ryan just said. When we moved in. we definitely did not expect that it would be  
415 a lot for long but again, we expected something like single family homes because with apartments, one  
416 concern is they don't have any equity in the property and a lot of influx could happen in any apartment. If  
417 it is ownership 55 and above, it wouldn't be that bad but for a rental, we do have our concerns against  
418 that, particularly borrowing and a rental company. Also, I was going through the Orange Township  
419 guidelines for a PERD. It seems that 20% of the units can be occupied by 54 and below, one member in  
420 the unit has to be 55 and above, so we call it 55 and above but there are some gaps here in that but the  
421 more important concern is the rental aspect of it, #1, and #2, you said you are willing to push back the  
422 offset from the properties to the north and that is something I really appreciate because 30' seems to be a  
423 little bit less, particularly with the trees and everything in between.

424

425 Anthony Miranda, 2077 Hayer Court, what's the minimum rent that it would be? I know you can't say  
426 what it may end up being, but what's the minimum? And if we're talking about affordable housing, when  
427 we first started out we talked about it would not impact any of the property values but if we're talking  
428 about a true rental retirement community, why would it be 55? I'm not sure I know anyone who retired at  
429 55. Can we raise that to 62 and like the other gentleman said, if you have one person in there that's 62 and  
430 you have one who is 18 and inviting friends over or doing whatever, that's pretty much the loophole we  
431 would have, so can we raise it to 62, 65 and have people that have to be in the bracket? And it looks like  
432 from the site plan that it is very crammed in there and I'm not sure that would be appealing to anyone I  
433 know, so I'm not sure what the focus is for having it all jammed in there other than for revenue but I'm  
434 not sure that's going to be helpful for any of the residents around that property.

435

436 Scott Shaw, 2035 Maxwell, I would just echo the same concerns voiced, primarily the rental and the  
437 residents that would be in those properties would not have the same vested interest as a homeowner.  
438 Certainly condos would be more desirable but I agree with what Ryan said that if the land is going to be  
439 developed as such, I'd prefer to see it as single family homes and I agree with Tony Miranda's comment  
440 that the density seems quite high and would be less desirable and would impact the neighborhood, so  
441 those would be my biggest concerns with the property.

442

443 Corey Levaris, 2145 Hayer Court, the idea of putting an independent living community right next to the  
444 Inn I think is a very good idea. Personally I would like to see something like that happen. I think there is a  
445 demand for that type of housing in the area. However, my concern, to echo Mr. Miranda's and Mr.  
446 Shaw's comments, the fact that the 55+ age restriction seems to be very loosely defined and the way that  
447 requirement is written, there very possibly could be many people that end up residing in this community  
448 who are not even 55 or older but much younger and to point out what some of the members have  
449 mentioned jokingly tonight, people in their mid to late 50's aren't necessarily considered elderly or what  
450 most of us would think of when we think of seniors, and one of the developer's goals that Mr. Wicks  
451 pointed out is that when they did a survey was to encourage a proportionate senior retirement community.  
452 I think that's a good idea; however, I think that zoning this as a 55+ rental community, the rental aspect,  
453 first and foremost to me, that's not what I think of when I think of elderly retirement community or a  
454 PERD. So if it has to be a rental scenario, why would not making the rental obligation 62 and older make  
455 more sense to ultimately achieve the goal of developing a retirement community or community for retired  
456 empty nesters and people who to Mr. Wicks' point may already be in Orange Township and are  
457 downsizing and selling their homes. Again, I don't think many people in their 50's is the demographic

## Zoning Commission

458 we're thinking of when we're thinking of that type of community or those type of renters. I would much  
459 rather see a condo scenario where ownership is involved versus just a typical renter tenant. I think if these  
460 were condos, that would alleviate a lot of the community's concerns because the ownership aspect helps  
461 to maintain the community and the occupants of the units certainly have a more vested interest. Even if  
462 there wasn't an age designation, given the type of community that's proposed here, if this was just strictly  
463 a condo community with similar amenities of what has been proposed, it would most likely end up being  
464 a pseudo retirement community anyway, just given the nature of the housing market and the demand and  
465 supply right now. I think putting it as a 55+ rental community changes that completely as far as who is  
466 actually going to be living there ultimately, whether that's a year from now or a few years down the road  
467 once it's completed; things can change quite a bit as far as the enforcement of those rules, as far as the  
468 management goes, it could be sold, etc., and if it's designated as a 55+ community where only 80% of the  
469 units have to have one member 55 years or older, theoretically, although maybe not very likely, there  
470 could be 44 occupants in that community and 18 of them could be 55 or older and there could be 26  
471 people technically per their requirements.

472  
473 Mr. Pychewicz: Just for the sake of being redundant or repetitive, we would appreciate if you would limit  
474 it to new comments going forward. I think we only have a few more here but just state any new comments  
475 that haven't been mentioned.

476  
477 Terry McCarty, 2148 Maxwell Avenue, so a little bit east of this proposed community. The two main  
478 concerns that I have that have not been addressed are this is the first time we had seen the grading map  
479 and the retention pond is actually moving to a completely different place from kind of the middle of the  
480 property to the southeast property. I know the field behind our home is prone to flooding and I know he  
481 mentioned the drain that may go on the north face but we're just hoping that this won't give more prone  
482 to flooding to the east side where we live. The other question is if the initial PERD application is for a  
483 rental of people 55 and up, if it eventually switches to condos, do you still maintain that 55 and over or is  
484 there anything that changes with the designation from rental to condo?

485  
486 Tom Carpenter, I echo most of the concerns from the other folks tonight very strongly. I do have a couple  
487 of points I would like to add about the two divergences, and I'm not an expert in how zoning works but it  
488 seems to me that the first divergence for the 10 acre minimum we're going to sort of add on The Inn at  
489 Bear Trail property to get around that minimum. I'm not sure if that's the typical procedure or not; it just  
490 seems kind of strange to me to grab on to a neighboring property to meet that requirement. Similarly with  
491 the divergence 15.09, the 23 units. We heard that the existing house is going to be carved out but for  
492 purposes of meeting the 4 units per acre, we're now going to include that property, so again I'm confused  
493 on the appropriateness of that and if it's a common practice or not. Regarding the over 55 policy, I'm  
494 concerned as the others about the 80% rule and I did research and found some meeting minutes from this  
495 Zoning Commission from 2018 where there was a big discussion about this topic and pretty clearly the  
496 Commission members were admitting that it's almost impossible to enforce this and it seems to be, in my  
497 words not theirs, a bit of a fool's errand and that creates a big concern on my part as to how viable that  
498 is to have a true control and what do you do when there's a violation? Can you throw somebody out as a  
499 consequence of that?

500  
501 Mr. Pychewicz: Jeff, is there anybody else?

502  
503 Mr. Beard: I don't see anybody else with their hand raised.

504  
505 Ms. Boni: I think it's safe to say we can close public comment.

506  
507 Mr. Pychewicz: At this time we're going to close public comment and John, if you want to respond to  
508 those comments.

## Zoning Commission

509 Mr. Wicks: I hear a consistent concern about being able to police the 55 and over, and also the 55 and  
510 over guideline is potentially not enforceable. When I proposed this concept, my intent was just to follow  
511 the Township's way they have spelled out the PERD, so their definitions would govern how this thing  
512 would be policed. If they say 80% of the units must have at least one resident 55 and over, that's what we  
513 intended to comply with. I don't know a lot of people 55 and over that have younger, like students, living  
514 with them but I'm sure there are some and maybe the intent isn't that you have 0 students here but you  
515 have less than if you have no age restriction whatsoever, so we're not looking to do a special zoning  
516 district; we're looking to do the PERD the way it is written and the Township has defined what the age  
517 restriction requires.

518  
519 Ms. Boni: John, is there a legal counsel present for this meeting?  
520

521 Mr. Wicks: No.  
522

523 Ms. Boni: I'm not an expert with the age restriction, but I know there's some type of law that mandates  
524 restricting it, and maybe at the second hearing if counsel can provide it; I think there's a lot of confusion  
525 on whether or not this will stay as enforced and if so, how's that going to happen.  
526

527 Mr. Wicks: We'll certainly get a better understanding on that for the next hearing. There were a couple of  
528 folks that suggested the age be raised to 62. Again, we're just trying to comply with what's written by the  
529 Township but by raising the age from 55 to 62 is going to further restrict the number of folks who can  
530 actually live here. A lot of people seem to support the condo versus the apartment concept. We're trying  
531 to provide something that doesn't exist in the Township. Literally this is the only one right now that  
532 would be a rental community, 22 units out of the 18,000 that exist in Orange Township. It's something  
533 new, it's an opportunity for only 22 families or couples to be able to find a place to rent in Orange  
534 Township. If there's a big problem with that from the ZC or the Trustees or even the community, I guess  
535 we can condominiumize it and make them all for sale, but I wouldn't want to restrict the opportunity to  
536 rent them because I'd be willing to bet that there's a population of people that would take advantage of  
537 this property and this project. As far as the flooding goes, I didn't understand Ms. McCarty's comment of  
538 the basin moving from the center of the site to the southeast corner. There's an existing pond that is not a  
539 retention pond but an old farm pond that will be filled in that's spring fed, so we'll have to tie the spring  
540 into the storm system and drain it out it's natural path. There were some questions about the divergences  
541 and the density issue. There was more right-of-way taken for S. Old State Road than is conventional and  
542 because of that the parent parcel went down from 6 acres to 5-1/2 acres. We're not using the existing  
543 house to get to the 4 units per acre. I put some math in the application to show that if the typical amount  
544 of right-of-way had been taken for Old State and you add that house in, we'd be under 4 units per acre.  
545 We're actually asking for 4.2 units for the gross density, so that's where that divergence comes in; that  
546 does not include that existing house. That's all I see that I needed to address but if I missed something,  
547 I'll be happy to address them. And when we come back, I'm sure we'll be able to view this video, and  
548 address the comments more thoroughly in writing.  
549

550 Ms. Boni: I took notes too. There was a question on are you able to provide even a minimum rent cost?  
551

552 Mr. Wicks: I just hesitate to do it because invariably it's going to be dictated on cost of what it costs to  
553 build this development out. If you start losing units, and I know there were a couple of people who  
554 thought the density was too high, it really impacts the rent rates and prices because the amount of  
555 infrastructure you have to build is basically going to be the same.  
556

557 Ms. Boni: I think the last thing discussed that we have not hit was the other divergence you're requesting  
558 based on the amount of acreage, the reason behind that.  
559

## Zoning Commission

560 Mr. Wicks: The reason is because this is a land locked piece of property, If it were a 10 acre piece, we'd  
561 be able to do it. The reason I thought it was justifiable was because it is adjacent to another PERD parcel  
562 and together they will be a PERD zoning classification greater than 10 acres. It's not like we were trying  
563 to piggyback it or do anything sneaky.

564

565 Ms. Boni: And this is not part of The Inn at Bear Trail acreage; this is 4.96 acres alone.

566

567 Mr. Wicks: I was trying to use that as a justification for the divergence.

568

569 Mr. McNulty: I think a lot of people are concerned about, and me included, lower end apartments. I heard  
570 someone say affordable and I'm not sure what that number is, but it needs to fit with the neighborhood,  
571 Walker Wood and everything that's in Orange Township. The Commission made a huge mistake a couple  
572 decades ago and there was some Section 8 housing, but we don't want anything like that.

573

574 Mr. Wicks: We're proposing market rate rents. On the other hand, I'm not sure you can omit the  
575 opportunity for someone to come in and say there's no affordable housing in this area.

576

577 Mr. McNulty: Affordable can mean a lot of things. I guess it was the Section 8 type of thing. Affordable  
578 is not a problem because that's just an arbitrary number that can mean lots of things.

579

580 Mr. Wicks: We're going to make the rent as affordable as we can based on the cost of the project.

581

582 Mr. Pierce: Just for the record, when you talk about "Section 8", the housing that's already there provides  
583 the additional subsidy and insures that the owner gets the right amount of rent, so it's not any lesser  
584 affordability or lesser rent than anything else, so I just want to make sure we're in agreement on Section  
585 8. It's a program that's available around the nation and a very good program.

586

587 Ms. Trebellas: On the age restrictions. I was there for part of the conversations but I was not a part of the  
588 zoning rewrite for the PERD, but in the past when we have discussed 66 and above or age restricted  
589 communities, one of the reasons we discussed the 80%/20% is say for example my husband's almost 55;  
590 I'm not near that. If I moved into one of these places and heaven forbid my husband had a heart attack  
591 and it was 100% 55 or above, I would have to sell or move out. Or if you're a grandparent and something  
592 happens to your children and you end up with your grandkids and have to take care of them for a while.  
593 We wanted to try and keep it open for life events that nobody planned but happened, so that was sort of  
594 the 80/20 compromise in that sense. You're correct, it's not 100% at 55 and above, but that extra 20% is  
595 for life events that might happen like that. Also, according to our Code, these are restricted to two  
596 permanent inhabitants in each residence, so it's a husband and wife, a person and a caregiver, or an  
597 extended family, but it's not a family of five or four living in one of these which also restricts that it's not  
598 going to be a bunch of young people having parties or something like that. The question of enforcement,  
599 we will hear back from the lawyers and, Michele, is it possible to reach out to our counsel as well?

600

601 Ms. Boni: Yes, I can invite our counsel to attend the next hearing too just to provide further explanation.

602

603 Mr. Pierce: One additional thought on 55 and older, that is not a new concept. It's been around and there  
604 are millions of properties around the United States that are 55 and older and some would put property in  
605 Orange Township to shame as to how well they're maintained, how expensive they are, so 55 and older is  
606 a concept that's been out there, well maintained, rules have been established extraordinarily well. They  
607 can enforce that idea of 55 and older solely or like Christine said life events happen or some people are  
608 married to people older than them, whatever the circumstances may be, but at the end of the day it turns  
609 out to be an incredible program and properties that are very well maintained, so it's a good project to see  
610 that's potentially coming to Lewis Center.

## Zoning Commission

611 Mr. Pychewicz: John, I know you still have some things to work out with the Fire Marshall. How long do  
612 you think it would take you to make the revisions based on the comments and feedback tonight? When  
613 would you look to reschedule for the next hearing?

614  
615 Mr. Wicks: I'd like to do a date and time certain at least 30 days out.  
616

617 Ms. Boni: We would recommend that too, so what I'll do, probably next week I'll send you the comments  
618 that came from the Commission, residents and staff, and put them in a master memo and send that out to  
619 you. As far as the revised submittal, we ask to have that at least a week before the next hearing, so if  
620 you're thinking is a turnaround in 30 days, you may want to look at the end of April as the next hearing  
621 date.  
622

623 Mr. Wicks: Can you tell me what's available in April?  
624

625 Ms. Boni: Our April 27<sup>th</sup> regular meeting is still available as we don't have any applications, so if we did  
626 April 27<sup>th</sup>, we'd need materials by April 20<sup>th</sup>.  
627

628 Mr. Wicks: I'm comfortable with April 27<sup>th</sup> if you are.  
629

### **MOTION TO CONTINUE HEARING FOR REZONING APPLICATION #ZON-21-02**

630  
631  
632 Mr. McNulty made a motion to continue Rezoning Application #ZON-21-02, Real Property Design and  
633 Development, LLC, until Tuesday, April 27, 2021 at 7:00 p.m. via Zoom; seconded by Mr. Pierce.  
634

635 Vote on Motion: Mr. Pychewicz-yes, Mr. McNulty-yes, Ms. Trebellas-yes, Mr. Pierce-yes, Ms. Harris-  
636 yes  
637

638 Motion carried  
639

### **OTHER BUSINESS**

#### **Zoning Resolution Rewrite**

642  
643  
644 Ms. Boni: As long as I've been with the Township, over 5 years, Staff has been wanting to do a Zoning  
645 Resolution rewrite, and this rewrite is not just minor amendments that we do every year. It is completely  
646 looking from the top of the page to the end of this resolution and rewriting it. I think we are long past due  
647 on this; it's been several decades since we really did rewrite our Zoning Resolution, so we have worked  
648 with our legal counsel to provide a Request for Proposals (RFP) which I did send out to the Board. The  
649 next step would be to ask the Zoning Commission to make a motion to approve moving forward with the  
650 Zoning Resolution rewrite and letting us select a consultant.  
651

652 Mr. Pierce: Do we still have the time to make a comment on this?  
653

654 Ms. Boni: Yes. When we were putting the RFP together, we tried to be as broad in the scope as possible  
655 as when we start having these meetings, I think things are going to come along the line. My team and I  
656 have a running list of things we would like changed in the Code just because of things we keep having  
657 problems with. Obviously we all see these new residential products coming in; we just don't have a Code  
658 that fits it. So, there's a lot of things we're going to be considering with this. Les, if you don't have any  
659 comments right now, feel free to tune in; this is going to take up to a year. This is a very long and  
660 intensive project which I did get the appropriations approved by the Board of Trustees.  
661

## Zoning Commission

662 Ms. Trebellas: Can you explain what the process will be because this is just an RFP? I assume one will be  
663 accepted, at some point we'll have meetings with the public, with the Commission. How exactly is that  
664 going to play out?

665  
666 Ms. Boni: Because of the amount this is going to cost, we are doing a bidding project, so we will be  
667 publishing RFP's for a consultant to apply to do our Zoning Resolution rewrite. Within that we do have a  
668 timeframe that will be published; when you can submit, when the deadline is. Once we get all the  
669 submittals, we will create a rating committee. We haven't established who will be on the committee yet  
670 but we would like at least one or two members from the Zoning Commission and maybe a member from  
671 the BZA, and it will probably be Jeff and I rating these consultants' applications. After we rate them, we  
672 will identify the top 3 and will most likely have interviews with each of those top 3. Then we will present  
673 the top candidate to the Zoning Commission, and the Commission will have to take action on accepting  
674 the consultant to move forward with the Zoning Resolution rewrite.

675  
676 Mr. Pierce: Do you expect to select just one firm or will it be multiple firms?

677  
678 Ms. Boni: My experience here, we just selected a consultant for our Parks Master Plan. Typically it would  
679 be one consultant that we would work with but that consultant could potentially hire sub-consultants, so  
680 depending on if they want to hire a GIS or mapping consultant to help with the graphics, they would  
681 partner with them but we wouldn't have separate consultants on our end.

682  
683 Mr. Pierce: Do you have a list of firms that you will send this to? Sometimes you have a list that you send  
684 it out to while you publish it too.

685  
686 Ms. Boni: We are doing a fair bidding process, so we are not going out of our way to directly reach out to  
687 consultants, but it will be published in our newspaper, our website and the American Planning  
688 Association which most planning firms and zoning firms take a look at on a daily basis and reach out.  
689 That also avoids us creating any type of bias during this review process. I'm pretty well connected in the  
690 community, so the communication needs to be fair and transparent. And I will be the project manager for  
691 this project.

692  
693 Mr. Pierce: Is there any incentive for partnering with women owned businesses or anything like that to  
694 potentially bring some different perspective to the table?

695  
696 Ms. Boni: I hope that diversity would be considered. I'm only going to be one rater out of the five of us.

697  
698 Mr. Pierce: From the proposer, whoever is the proposer, either they consider partnering with a woman  
699 owned business to deliver this rewrite for us or they themselves have the necessary diversity.

700  
701 Ms. Boni: I really don't know what we will see, but I know the Township would appreciate any.

702  
703 Mr. Pierce: Sometimes proposals specify if you partner with a subcontractor that's a woman owned  
704 business or small business, you get 5 extra points or whatever. Just something to consider.

705  
706 Ms. Trebellas: We're going to have a consultant rewrite or review and rewrite our Zoning Resolution, but  
707 what role does the public, Zoning Commission or BZA have in this rewrite process? Are we going to  
708 have formal meetings, workshops?

709  
710 Ms. Boni: Probably all. Again, this is a very extensive project. When we did the Comp Plan in 2018, that  
711 took six months.

712

## Zoning Commission

713 Ms. Trebellas: That's what I was thinking but I didn't want to make a direct comparison but that had a  
714 whole variety of surveys to the public, open houses, workshops and perhaps that hasn't been realized yet  
715 but that is part of the thought process that will occur once we get this off.

716  
717 Ms. Boni: I don't expect to do as much engagement as we did for the Comp Plan because the Comp Plan  
718 really is defined by the community and their vision, but the Zoning Resolution is creating the law, so we  
719 need experts to focus on that which is the Zoning Commission and Staff. We will have plenty of  
720 stakeholder meetings throughout the community just to get feedback, and we will do some outreach, but I  
721 can't see us doing a full blown survey like we did because that we had over 500 results.

722  
723 Mr. McNulty: I agree; I'm not sure the public has any spot in this. I think you're right; it's Commission,  
724 BZA, and people in the Township. We actually tried to do this probably in 2005-2006 and it was a  
725 disaster. It wasn't organized. This is organized and has a much greater chance of success than that fiasco  
726 did 14 years ago.

727  
728 Ms. Boni: And we're kind of leaving it up to the consultant to provide a timeline and what it is going to  
729 take for this process, and we will rate these on that too, so that will all be shared with the Zoning  
730 Commission once we identify the top candidate.

731  
732 **MOTION TO MOVE FORWARD WITH THE REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS FOR THE**  
733 **ORANGE TOWNSHIP ZONING RESOLUTION REVIEW AND UPDATE**

734  
735 Ms. Trebellas made a motion to move forward with the Request for Proposals for the Orange Township  
736 Zoning Resolution review and update; seconded by Mr. Pierce.

737  
738 Vote on Motion: Mr. Pychewicz-yes, Mr. McNulty-yes, Ms. Trebellas-yes, Mr. Pierce-yes, Ms. Harris-  
739 yes  
740 Motion carried

741  
742 Ms. Boni: I will keep you updated along the way, probably monthly emails and then try and start the  
743 meetings this summer.

### 744 **Approval of Meeting Minutes**

745  
746  
747 Mr. McNulty made a motion to approve the January 5, 2021 meeting minutes of the Orange Township  
748 Zoning Commission for Route 23 Corridor Overlay District Application #RCOD-20-02, TBM  
749 Investments, LLC with the following corrections:

- 750
- 751 • Line 68: correct the spelling of the last name of Anna Vaggeties
  - 752 • Line 373: correct the spelling of Ms. Trebellas' last name
  - 753 • Line 373 should read: "And it's not 23, so it could be worse. It's what I consider a feeder road or  
754 a service road, but I don't see it as being feasible or as available as the other based on the  
755 location".

756  
757 Seconded by Ms. Trebellas

758 Vote on Motion: Mr. Pychewicz-yes, Mr. McNulty-yes, Ms. Trebellas-yes, Mr. Pierce-yes, Ms. Harris-  
759 yes  
760 Motion carried

761

## Zoning Commission

762 Mr. McNulty made a motion to approve the January 26, 2021 minutes of the Orange Township Zoning  
763 Commission for Rezoning Application #ZON-20-03, Kerbler Farms, LLC/Kebler Builders, as written;  
764 seconded by Ms. Trebellas.

765

766 Vote on Motion: Mr. Pychewicz-yes, Mr. McNulty-yes, Ms. Trebellas-yes, Mr. Pierce-yes, Ms. Harris-  
767 yes

768 Motion carried

769

770 Meeting adjourned at 8:30 p.m.

771 Minutes prepared by Cindy Davis, Zoning Secretary

772

773 On May 11, 2021, Ms. Trebellas made a motion to approve the March 16, 2021 meeting minutes of the  
774 Orange Township Zoning Commission for Rezoning Application #ZON-21-02, Real Property Design &  
775 Development, LLC, with the following corrections:

776

777 • Line 44: “and” should read “in”

778 • Line 57 “District” should read “Districts”

779 • Line 82 should read: “...I think the applicant has heard from the County Engineer that the access  
780 needs to be reconfigured....”

781 • Line 292: “property” should read “proposed”

782 • Line 552: “Mt.” should read “Mr.”

783 • Line 569: “ate” should read “are”

784

785 Seconded by Mr. Pierce

786

787 Vote on Motion: Mr. Pychewicz-yes, Mr. McNulty-yes, Ms. Trebellas-yes, Mr. Pierce-yes, Ms. Harris-  
788 yes

789 Motion carried

790