

## Zoning Commission

1 **Route 23 Corridor Overlay District Application #RCOD-21-01**

April 6, 2021

### LEGAL NOTICE

2  
3  
4  
5 Notice is hereby given that the Orange Township Zoning Commission will hold a special meeting on  
6 Tuesday, April 6, 2021 at 7:00 p.m. to consider the following application:  
7

8 **Route 23 Corridor Overlay District Application #RCOD-21-01, Sheetz Development,** Requesting a  
9 final development plan on the southwest corner of US 23 and Orange Road, having parcel number 318-  
10 321-02-004-000. The development proposed includes a fueling station and convenient store with carwash  
11 to be known as Sheetz.  
12

13 The meeting will be held virtually using electronic means and can be accessed by the public on the  
14 internet on the Orange Township Youtube Schannel at:  
15 <https://www.youtube.com/channel/UCIBwuLlPzVT0PPx3xF1M7iQ>  
16

17 To help in limiting the spread of the Coronavirus (COVID-19), residents are urged to contact our office at  
18 740-548-5430 or [orangezoning@orangetwp.org](mailto:orangezoning@orangetwp.org) to review the application and plans.  
19

20 After the conclusion of the hearing, the matter will be submitted to the Orange Township Board of  
21 Township Trustees for its action.  
22

23 *Adam Pychewicz, Chairperson*  
24 *Michele Boni, Orange Township Zoning*  
25

26 *Publish one time on or before Saturday, April 3, 2021 in the Delaware Gazette*  
27

28 Roll Call: Dennis McNulty, Christine Trebellas, Ciara Harris, Leslie Pierce, Rick Beer  
29

30 Township Officials Present: Michele Boni, Development and Zoning Director  
31

32 Ms. Boni: I would like to give a brief overview of this application then we can move forward with the  
33 applicant. We have the Route 23 Corridor Overlay District Application #RCOD-21-01 for the Sheetz  
34 proposed at the southwest corner of Orange and 23. We have been working quite a lot with the applicant,  
35 having several pre-application meetings before they formally submitted, so the Township knew this was  
36 coming. We had a technical review last week and had several comments that shared with the Board  
37 members also last week, so we'll probably be addressing and discussing a lot of those this evening. The  
38 review was done with the County Engineer's Office, Regional Planning, Township staff and our  
39 consultant Holly Mattei. I would like to open it up to the applicant and I can show some plans while you  
40 discuss them.  
41

42 Frank Petruziello, President of Development for Skilken & Gold, Beth Cotner our Project Manager, Mike  
43 Casale with Sheetz, Joe George with Cecil who is our civil engineer.  
44

45 Mr. Petruziello: It's no secret we propose to build a Sheetz at this location at Orange and 23. Sheetz, you  
46 can't miss them these days because there have been lots of commercials on television, and Sheetz is under  
47 construction in various locations. Sheetz has over 600 locations, a family owned business based out of  
48 Altoona, Pennsylvania, and they come from the food and hospitality industry, not the fuel industry, This  
49 facility has many multiple uses, selling fuel, there is a small convenience store, a full quick service  
50 restaurant including seating for between 30 and 40 people inside the building, and a 2 bay car wash. Sheetz

## Zoning Commission

51 wants to fit in and work with communities. You heard Michele say we have worked extensively with staff.  
52 I think we have had 4 pre-application meetings which were very fruitful. What we have tonight is the result  
53 of all of that collaboration. You got a long list of items last week. We have worked through them and have  
54 winnowed that down to very few. We are being cooperative on all if not most items. We started out with a  
55 site plan but, given the overlay code here, it's not quite conducive to the type of facility you would normally  
56 associate with a fuel station, quick serve restaurant and car wash. Your requirement for a certain amount of  
57 building frontage out on the street; certain width of the property, whatever percent we're over it; and you  
58 also have a requirement for sloped roof buildings. We have taken a Sheetz prototype and modified it  
59 specifically for this location. We have a commercially zoned property immediately to our south but not for  
60 our full property line. The front half of that property is commercial, the rear half is residential but it's an  
61 orphan lot, meaning there's no connection to any right-of-way in order to access it, associated adjacent to  
62 the cemetery. We anticipate that probably never being built as a residential property but probably going  
63 with commercial at some point or maybe an addition to the cemetery. Beth, can you tell us the result of the  
64 traffic study?

65  
66 Ms. Cotner: As 23 is controlled by ODOT and West Orange by the County, ODOT is requiring a decel lane  
67 for our site off 23, then I believe we're going to extend the decel lane on W. Orange, is that correct?  
68

69 Mr. George: They're going to maintain the left turn bound lane heading north and then on the west side of  
70 that lane they're going to have a 2 way left turn lane potentially for commercial property that could be on  
71 the north of Orange, and we're going to have to widen Orange slightly there.

72  
73 Mr. Petruziello: Have they approved that study?  
74

75 Mr. George: Yes, County and ODOT have approved it.  
76

77 Mr. Petruziello: The site plan and changes Joe just mentioned. Are they reflected on this site plan, Joe?  
78

79 Mr. George: Yes.  
80

81 Mr. Petruziello: There's going to be widenings and turn lanes on Orange and then a drop lane on 23. On  
82 the site plan, the rectangular shape all the way to the east to the right is the store building, the long narrow  
83 rectangle in the center is the canopy, and the building all the way to the west is the 2 bay car wash. There  
84 is a pavilion we are building there to get to the corner and also on the south side, there is a connection to  
85 the multi-use path and an undercover walkway to get to the store, and also an outdoor covered seating  
86 with brick piers and sloped roof. We've also put a little piece of that on the south side of the building, so  
87 we've provided a street wall to the structure to meet the objectives of the Township for this plan, and we  
88 have renderings that we will show. At the fuel station there are 10 dispenser machines that can be  
89 accessed on both sides, so there's 20 locations. The submarine shapes to the west of that are where the  
90 underground storage tanks are and then there are parking spaces there, so with the fuel station are the  
91 vacuum locations for the cars and then the 2 bay car wash, and this is an updated plan. We flipped the car  
92 wash such that the car wash now enters from the south side and exits on the north side and that allowed us  
93 to make sure we did not break the 100' building setback from the residentially zoned land to the west and  
94 south. You can see the property line along the south that divides the residentially zoned land to the left  
95 from the commercially zoned land to the right. We've also been asked by ODOT to provide a cross access  
96 area that will allow the commercially zoned land to access the right-in/right-out that we are building.  
97 What this drawing does not show is that we've been asked and have agreed to provide cross access to  
98 allow this residentially zoned property to get out to Orange. So that's the basic organization of the site.  
99 The store itself has two major entrance locations, one on the northwest corner, one on the south in the  
100 center, so there are multiple entrances to this building. Showed the 23 elevation looking northwest. The  
101 window features we have placed along the façade along with sloped roof canopies which are canopies that

## Zoning Commission

102 have metal roofs, they're not fabric awnings, and then we have the hipped roof pavilion pieces on the  
103 north and south side along with metal railings and places for people to eat. Showed view coming from the  
104 south looking north on 23 with the same façade, and the canopy for the pump island in the back and the  
105 canopy has a sloped roof. Showed from the parking lot looking northeast. You can see both major  
106 entrances with canopies with the hipped roofs that signal both entrances. There is a pavilion piece poking  
107 out on the right hand side and many more awnings. All these windows are all open and into the space. On  
108 Orange Road looking southeast, you can see the pavilion that is there along with the corner entrance and  
109 what we've already looked at. The canopy is a shed roof canopy with open trusses, has stone base to all of  
110 the columns along it and the hipped roof at the entrance to the store. We also have elevations of the car  
111 wash which is a very simple car wash building that has a hipped roof and the same brick and stone  
112 materials as the store. There is a requirement in your Code that no more than 20% of a wall be glass or  
113 80% needs to be materials on the approved list which stone and brick are. Since this is a car wash, it relies  
114 for vision in for people to see what's going on and people in cars not to feel claustrophobic. We prefer the  
115 building to be this way and would like your consideration for a divergence to allow this aesthetic. We are  
116 not out at either road; this is in the back of the property and that's what our desire is there. On the canopy  
117 elevations showed the end views, the sloped roof of the simple canopy, no big words on it, nothing fancy  
118 about it, very straight forward. There's indirect lighting that lights up the ceiling and there are no lights in  
119 the ceiling which generally is a problem for glare. Let's speak to the divergences. As I said earlier, we had  
120 a pretty extensive list we worked through. I believe we answered affirmatively on all of them except the  
121 few I'm going to list and that's assuming we have support of this Board for this project. One issue I  
122 already mentioned about the amount of glass on the car wash building. Then there's the issue of sloped  
123 roof. There is a requirement in your Code that buildings have a pitched roof. That has been solved in  
124 different ways, not the least of which is sticking mansards on the edges of a very plain building, adding  
125 the pavilions on either side of our building and also adding more than one of the hipped roof entrances to  
126 the building in addition to the awnings. Our canopy and car wash building are a sloped roof. If you look  
127 at all the frontages, count up all the facades that have sloped roofs on it and include the canopy fuel  
128 pumps, about  $\frac{3}{4}$ 's of the façade length of this property has some form of sloped roof on it and we feel we  
129 have acknowledged the reality of a commercial structure flat roof with equipment on it and also by  
130 developing the additional design elements we have done to meet the objective of your Zoning Code, so  
131 we believe we have done it in a more creative way than has been done in the past and we hope for your  
132 concurrence. The third thing is the signage. We've listed all the signs asking for their sizes and listed  
133 against what is allowable. The wall sign as we calculate it, we're allowed 125 square feet max and only  
134 one is allowed per frontage. The problem we have is we have two frontages but we also have three  
135 buildings, the car wash, fuel canopy and main building, and four different distinct uses. We're not asking  
136 for more square footage but we are asking to be able to use reduced signs on our major frontages on 23  
137 and Orange for the building as per the Code but we'd also like one sign on the car wash and one sign on  
138 the fuel station canopy and that gets us up to almost 86 square feet out of 125 that are allowable. There's  
139 also some incidental signage, some that are part of the fuel station canopy that signify which pumps have  
140 diesel and which do not. There are two each of those, that's 10 square feet and then there's more  
141 directional information having to do with what's in the pumps, so that's another 9 square feet so we're up  
142 to 105. The next issue is there are two ground signs allowable and both are allowed to be 36 square feet.  
143 We are under on the wall signs by 19 square feet, we are over on the number of signs however. The  
144 ground mounted signs we are over 13.68 square feet but we are in compliance with the number of signs.  
145 We've also done the calculation for our changeable copy and we're within the allowable 30% in order to  
146 have the changeable copy. Overall we are about 6 square feet under the gross allowable square footage,  
147 that would be the two times 36 ground signs which would be 72 plus the 125 for the building signs, that's  
148 197 and we're at 191; that's about 6 square feet that we're under. The ground sign at the corner, we've  
149 been asked to move that to the curb cut which we've agreed to do. There is a sign on the center of the  
150 façade on 23 and a sign facing Orange. Those are the two on the building, then one on the canopy facing  
151 Orange and one on the car wash facing into the parking lot. The ground sign is a masonry sign with the  
fuel pricers which we need to have located below the three dimensional Sheetz logo. This shows 8'9", so

## Zoning Commission

153 we're going to lower it down to the allowable height, so there is no divergence there. There is only one  
154 sign on the left end canopy within the truss work and it's pretty small given the size of that canopy. Then  
155 there is one just above the windows on the car wash. Michele, what did I miss?

156

157 Ms. Boni: I think you've given a pretty fair overview. I'd like to open it up to the Zoning Commission  
158 members to get their thoughts, particularly I wanted to talk to the Commission about the elevations as we  
159 have the architectural expertise on the Commission as opposed to the Staff directly, so I wanted to hear  
160 directly from them about that and obviously any other comments they have.

161

162 Mr. McNulty: I'm okay with all the divergences. I think the glass on the car wash is a good idea; that  
163 looks great. I think you've done a creative job with respect to the requirement for the sloped roof. I get it  
164 for all of the modern buildings you need the flat roofs for all the equipment that's been plaguing us for a  
165 decade. I also agree with moving that 23 sign to the other end because there are still a lot of trees and  
166 obstructions on the north side of 23 on the north side of Orange Road. I think your sign will be seen  
167 putting it closer to that deceleration entrance; I think that's really a plus. I think you've done a good,  
168 creative job, paying attention to the Code and done what you can. I'm not sure why that was there with  
169 respect to the 80% of materials versus glass. There may have been some reason but not sure what the  
170 original intention was. But I'm good with it.

171

172 Ms. Boni: The breezeway that Sheetz has created is a unique concept for Sheetz, correct?

173

174 Mr. Petruziello: An absolutely new look for Sheetz and this had to go all the way to the last names of  
175 Sheetz to approve, and I was impressed with the ability to be flexible.

176

177 Mr. Beer: I do like that, especially in these days and time. You're going to have seating out in that area,  
178 correct?

179

180 Mr. Petruziello: Yes.

181

182 Mr. Beer: If you go with charging stations in the future, would you bring that off to the south or you have  
183 not even discussed that?

184

185 Mr. Petruziello: We have charging stations. I didn't even add that; that's a fifth use.

186

187 Mr. Beer: That's what I was concerned about because I know a lot of the competitors are going with that.

188

189 Mr. Pierce: The building that's facing 23 looks like it's going to be a solid brick wall. Any reason there  
190 isn't any more glass on that side?

191

192 Mr. Petruziello: That is a balancing act for all the service areas of our facility, kitchen, storage, etc., so  
193 what we put there is simulation of windows and we felt that was a reasonable break up of that façade  
194 given the fact that we had wings on either side of that pop out and pop up of that central bay. We tried to  
195 respect the locations of the downspouts by putting windows in between each one.

196

197 Mr. Pierce: Just aesthetically looking at it since 23 is the main road and the back of the building so to  
198 speak. Just openness.

199

200 Mr. Petruziello: We tried to make it as approachable as we could. What this is not showing is any  
201 landscaping which there will be considerable, so I think we did ourselves a disservice by not showing  
202 anything in the environment here.

203

## Zoning Commission

204 Mr. Pierce: Then over to the right, that little walkway, coverage, what's going to be there?  
205

206 Mr. Petruziello: All the way out to the corner is seating and then some of it is walkway to get from the  
207 multi-use path at the corner to the entrance of the store.  
208

209 Mr. Beer: Did I hear you correctly that you have an agreement for an ingress/egress for that residential to  
210 Orange Road?  
211

212 Mr. Petruziello: No. The State of Ohio said we will grant the right-in/right-out curb cut on 23 as long as  
213 there is cross access to the south. Staff has asked that we also incorporate a cross access to this residential  
214 parcel there. We're not that wild about that but also not that against it either. We're just uncertain as to all  
215 of that but it's not drawn on here but it will be added back if you would like us to do that.  
216

217 Mr. Pierce: So you made the decision to add that or you're not sure you're going to add that?  
218

219 Mr. Petruziello: We would prefer not to have it but Staff seemed to want to have it, so I'm looking for the  
220 Board's opinion.  
221

222 Ms. Trebellas: I would have provision for that but you might not need it. It's unclear what's going to  
223 happen to that lot. If it becomes part of the cemetery it probably won't be used because they have their  
224 own internal access in the cemetery. This is the logical way; to have that provision and not need it.  
225

226 Ms. Boni: Just for the Commission's understanding, that parcel is not part of the future land use in the  
227 Comprehensive Plan to be commercial but if the commercial does grow along 23, could we expand the  
228 commercial boundaries and could that be commercial in the future?  
229

230 Mr. Petruziello: Here's one caveat I would like if we do that. If the two parcels are joined into one  
231 project, which is most likely, I don't believe we should be required to provide two cross access locations,  
232 so I would like to have something in the agreement that if they are joined as a parcel that only one access  
233 point would be allowable, and I'd have to ask Sheetz which one.  
234

235 Mr. Pierce: And that would be dependent upon its use, right?  
236

237 Mr. Petruziello: I'm okay to keep that flexible as long as we can say only one connection and not two in  
238 case the properties are combined.  
239

240 Ms. Trebellas: If the properties are combined, it would make sense that they have one access and not two.  
241 It's the same property owner, same development.  
242

243 Mr. Petruziello: And I don't want to fight about which one it is at this point. I think that could resolve  
244 itself in the future because whoever said it, it probably depends on what the use is, although to assume  
245 that there's going to be housing between a commercially zoned land and cemetery is I think a bit of a  
246 stretch and the cemetery's not going anywhere.  
247

248 Ms. Trebellas: As far as the architecture and elevations, I don't have a problem with the roof line. I  
249 noticed that it was flat and you just had the pavilions, but I think with the awnings that are shed or hipped  
250 roof and then the hipped roof pavilions and the extension, I think you provide enough on the major  
251 building so that it doesn't just look like a box and I think that's why we had that in the Code in the first  
252 place, because we didn't want concrete boxes. I don't have a problem with that divergence. The car wash,  
253 I understand the need for windows but I don't know how big those windows are in terms of scale to a car  
254 and how large they need to be, but I don't have a problem with the thought of the windows. If they could

## Zoning Commission

255 be smaller; I don't need to see the bottom of someone's car that's going through the car wash. The sign  
256 along 23, in some places it's shown on the right of that access and other places like your sign plan it's  
257 shown on the left.

258

259 Mr. Petruziello: There was a grade issue on the west side of that sign plus there is a heavy tree line there,  
260 so it's much more visible to move it on the right, so that is the correct location.

261

262 Ms. Trebellas: Just clarify that and I prefer it on that side because one of the issues I was going to discuss  
263 is that the property to the west which I believe are residential properties, one thing that wasn't in the  
264 application that we have sometimes are lines of sight when you have a commercial building next to a  
265 residential building so the residential people don't get upset because they're hearing and seeing your car  
266 wash and things of that nature or also if you have landscaping along where the residential part is so they  
267 won't see the car wash or it won't be impacting them.

268

269 Mr. Peturziello: The sight line studies apparently are in the application. I have to admit I haven't looked at  
270 them but I know Michele has them.

271

272 Ms. Boni: Can I just share a sight line example because I did see that in the plans but didn't call it out  
273 specifically. The way previous applications have done it; it's easier to understand what the residents  
274 would be able to see.

275

276 Mr. Peturziello: We did this extensively at Seldom Seen and Sawmill; I haven't done it as extensively  
277 here. We know how to do it; we'll fix it.

278

279 Ms. Trebellas: It's just to make sure that because you're right next to a residential area and there will be  
280 cars and headlights associated with the gas station and car wash.

281

282 Ms. Boni showed an example of what we would like to see and she'll add it to the comments.

283

284 Mr. Peturziello: And we can mound on that west side without any problem. There's a lot of land there and  
285 we have a lot of topsoil to deal with, so I think mounding is very much appropriate there.

286

287 Ms. Trebellas: Usually we get dumpster screening, how we're going to screen it so people don't see it. I  
288 couldn't find an elevation on it.

289

290 Ms. Boni: We noticed that and asked them to provide that.

291

292 Mr. Peturziello: It will be brick to match the building on three sides with opaque gates.

293

294 Ms. Trebellas: The building looks like it's going to be brick and stone but I didn't see what type. I'm  
295 assuming its real brick as opposed to a thin veneer.

296

297 Mr. Peturziello: It's all full depth; it's not lick and stick. It's cultured stone but its full thickness, its 4"  
298 thick laid masonry stone.

299

300 Ms. Trebellas: The elevations aren't really labeled or I couldn't find that in the application. I just wanted  
301 to make sure that it's not lick and stick.

302

303 Mr. Peturziello: There are no fake materials and there are no thin materials.

304

305 Ms. Trebellas: If you could clarify that.

## Zoning Commission

306 Mr. Peturziello: We will take care of that.

307

308 Ms. Boni: Beth, I know you sent me some of the stuff today but if you could label it on the building  
309 elevations.

310

311 Ms. Trebellas: I did have some questions on the traffic study but I understand that has been worked out  
312 with ODOT, so as long as ODOT has approved it, that's fine. I just questioned some of the numbers  
313 because during COVID we really don't have rush hour and that was a very busy intersection before  
314 COVID.

315

316 Mr. Peturziello: We have been dealing with this in a number of locations and what we have done is use  
317 historic data and also an increased percentage with time. There are certain jurisdictions where  
318 development has stopped because you can't get a real traffic study but ODOT had some numbers from  
319 two years ago from this intersection so we were able to use those.

320

321 Ms. Trebellas: If ODOT and you have come to some sort of agreement, I will follow the County Engineer  
322 and ODOT; they are the professionals. The only other comment and I agree with Dennis that moving the  
323 sign on 23 to the south side of your property is a good idea especially since that's where the access is  
324 along 23, you won't have the trees to the north blocking it and its right by your building, by your drive.

325

326 Ms. Harris: I agree with all the commentary thus far. I think this looks great. I love the pavilions that lead  
327 out to the multi-use walkways. My only comment was the landscaping. I do agree that some of the  
328 landscaping should be shown in the concepts but I did see a document in the application listing out the  
329 landscaping. I just think having a visual to see it with the conceptals would be great.

330

331 Mr. Peturziello: We're going to make sure that before it goes to the Trustees that all these things will be  
332 filled in. I think Michele even suggested that we'll hold off for a final vote from the Trustees for another  
333 month so we can make sure everything is clear and complete. There are some major changes in the site  
334 plan and the wetland area on Orange.

335

336 Mr. Beer: Are there overhead utilities at the Orange Road intersection?

337

338 Mr. George: I believe there's some power poles along 23, I don't think they extend along Orange, so there  
339 would be a couple at the intersection.

340

341 Mr. Beer: The reason I ask is a utility relocate would be my only concern. If there's a relocation, is your  
342 sign going to have to be approved by a utility for clearances?

343

344 Mr. Peturziello: The signs are 20' from the right-of-way so there's ample room there and we would have  
345 to work with the utility companies but we believe there is enough room for that to occur. And if we have  
346 to push the sign more from the right-of-way we will, but I don't believe we will need to.

347

348 Ms. Trebellas: I saw the environmental assessment with the wetlands, and I'm fine with that as long as  
349 you go to the proper permitting authorities. One of the problems we have in the Township is half of the  
350 Township drains into the Olentangy, the other half drains into Alum Creek and in the past they required  
351 permitting.

352

353 Mr. Peturziello: We're not going to disturb the wetlands.

354

355 Ms. Boni: I notice someone is in the waiting room by the name of Carolyn. Was the applicant accepting  
356 someone by that name?

## Zoning Commission

357 Mr. Peturziello: Not that I'm aware of.

358

359 Ms. Boni: Because this meeting is not open for public comment. It is a public meeting so people who do  
360 want to tune in can on our YouTube channel, so I will message her and let her know.

361

362 Mr. McNulty: Anything else from anybody? Thank you for a wonderful presentation; you guys did a  
363 great job with this.

364

365 Ms. Boni: I will take all the Commission's comments and add to our technical review comments and  
366 share that with the Board members and the applicant.

367

368

369 Meeting adjourned at 8:00 p.m.

370 Minutes prepared by Cindy Davis, Zoning Secretary

371

372 On May 11, 2021, Mr. McNulty made a motion to approve the meeting minutes of the Orange Township  
373 Zoning Commission dated April 6, 2021 for Route 23 Corridor Overlay District Application #RCOD-21-  
374 01, Sheetz Development, with the following correction:

375

- 376 • Line 50: "3o" should read "30"

377

378 Seconded by Ms. Trebellas

379

380 Vote on Motion: Mr. Pychewicz-abstain, Mr. McNulty-yes, Ms. Trebellas-yes, Mr. Pierce-yes, Ms.  
381 Harris-yes

382 Motion carried

383