

## Zoning Commission

1 **US 23 Overlay District**

**June 16, 2020**

2  
3 **LEGAL NOTICE**  
4

5 Notice is hereby given that the Orange Township Zoning Commission will hold a hearing on  
6 Tuesday, June 16, 2020 beginning at 7:00 p.m. to discuss the Route 23 Corridor Overlay District  
7 (RCOD).

8 **Route 23 Corridor Overlay District (RCOD)**  
9

10 The Township was awarded the opportunity to partner with Delaware County Economic Development to  
11 develop a new Article (XX) in the Orange Township Zoning Resolution that will create an overlay along  
12 the US 23 highway corridor. The first draft of the overlay text is complete and will now be presented to  
13 Orange Township Zoning Commission.

14  
15 Therefore, the purpose of this meeting is to review and discuss possible revisions to the Orange  
16 Township Zoning Resolution, with the assistance of Delaware County Economic Development and their  
17 contractual land use planning consultant, Crossroads Community Planning LLC.

18  
19 The hearing will be held virtually using electronic means and can be accessed by the public on the  
20 internet on the Zoom application at  
21 <https://us02web.zoom.us/j/84245256317?pwd=bTRzaFhaazBieW14Y1lwUF16Y0sxdz09>. You will  
22 also be able to access the meeting on Orange Township's Youtube Channel.

23 During the hearing the public may submit questions and comments to the Board by sending messages to  
24 Planning & Zoning Director, Michele Boni via the Zoom or Youtube meeting chat room.

25 The applications and plans are available for inspection for a period of at least 10 days prior to the  
26 hearing by e-mailing Michele Boni at [mboni@orangetwp.org](mailto:mboni@orangetwp.org). The Zoning Office is closed to the public  
27 during the public health emergency, however zoning staff is available by e-mail during normal business  
28 hours of Monday through Friday, 8 a.m. to 4:30 p.m., except legal holidays.

29 After the conclusion of the hearing, the matter will be submitted to the Orange Township Board of  
30 Township Trustees for its action.

31 The person responsible for the publication of this notice is Michele Boni, Orange Township  
32 Zoning Department.

33  
34 *Mark Duell, Chairman*  
35 *Michele Boni, Orange Township Zoning Department*  
36

37 *Please publish one time, on or before Saturday, June 6, 2020 in The Delaware Gazette*  
38

39 Roll: Mark Duell, Adam Pychewicz, Todd Dove, Dennis McNulty, Dustin Doherty  
40

41 Township Official Present: Michele Boni, Planning & Zoning Director  
42

43 Ms. Boni read the Legal Notice. For the public, if anyone wants to submit comments, feel free, and we  
44 will address those when ready. I would like to go over Regional Planning's recommendation.

## Zoning Commission

45 Mr. Duell: Regional Planning's recommendations are pretty lengthy and I don't want to rush through any  
46 of them, so I'd be very deliberate. You don't necessarily have to read the whole document but don't skip  
47 over anything; make sure you hit all the points.

48  
49 Ms. Boni: We will meet with Regional Planning after this hearing because we have a lot of items to  
50 discuss with them because we want to be partners with them. The first page of the RPC recommendation  
51 just gives an overview. Second page is the sub-area summaries, a chart which addresses the uses that are  
52 proposed, and that goes for commercial, office, advanced manufacturing logistics, single family, multi-  
53 family and mixed use. It is then broken down into the acreage which is key to see. This is a big area that  
54 is considered the draft boundary at this time. There are setback standards proposed, maximum height, lot  
55 coverage, and those are defined for each use. Scott Sanders commented on removing some areas off the  
56 map which is something we want to discuss with him. I think a lot of what he suggested makes sense  
57 because a lot of that is existing development, and we'll work with our Zoning Commission and Regional  
58 Planning on hashing out the area which should be defined in this district. The sub-area recommendations  
59 from staff, for some of the south side of Riverbend he is proposing should be low density; western part is  
60 Riverbend homeowners and that should be removed. JLP Orange is the site just south of Home Depot. He  
61 recommends it should be commercial or mixed; not multi-family based on frontage on the highway and  
62 natural resources on the site. That will be a discussion point we'll have shortly. The northwest corner of  
63 Orange and 23, wants to see business backage roads proposed on previous plans, this area has been shown  
64 as commercial on land use plans but is left out of this overlay. That is an oversight I think we fixed after it  
65 went to Regional Planning because Orange/23 is a pretty prime intersection for development, so that is  
66 incorporated. North side of relocated Home Road west of 23 should be left out unless already agreed as  
67 unbuildable. That is something we will look into. Southern extension of North Road is proposed for  
68 detached single family or low density attached project. This might be okay but not at the allowable 4-5  
69 dwelling units per acre recommended density. Based on natural resources located on several of those  
70 parcels, this area should seek through a regular zoning process. Following that is the Chakroff properties  
71 which should include mixed use with Kerbler land to the east and west. The Meijer/Home Depot re-  
72 development area is noted as mixed use which allows a 60' building height and certain types of buildings.  
73 All the re- development of this site may not be in the near term; the allowance for a 60' building is not  
74 compatible with existing developments to the west. Again, these are all recommendations we will be  
75 addressing not only with all of you but also Regional Planning Staff. We're going to discuss the  
76 procedural steps as to how this overlay district will be handled which goes along with how the Zoning  
77 Commission will be reviewing this moving forward.

78  
79 Mr. Dove: Are you saying we will not be involved in the conversations of their recommendations and  
80 their comments?

81  
82 Ms. Boni: We suggested just staff meeting with him. This was a much more extensive review than he's  
83 done in previous applications, so we wanted to work with him to make sure we capture not only what all  
84 you want but what Regional Planning is suggesting too. He made a comment about our Comprehensive  
85 Plan. Since significant areas of the map, development standards and densities diverge from the existing  
86 Comprehensive Plan, is there a plan to update the current Plan to mirror this overlay? The answer is yes  
87 because not only are we going to have to completely update our Zoning Resolution, I hope to revisit our  
88 Comprehensive Land Use Plan. This is a change to it but in the 2018 Plan, this was recommended; before  
89 it was some type of 23 district plan in the text. The adult entertainment establishment was pointed out as a  
90 prohibition. He goes into detail about each of the sections too. Single family sites, staff questions if  
91 there's any allowances for single family uses in the overlay which would be intended to attract and  
92 encourage commercial, office and industrial. That will be a discussion we need to have. He questions the  
93 density and density bonuses for single family which I think is understandable. He mentions height  
94 requirements as a significant change but I think we have some justification behind that, and that goes for  
95 commercial and industrial areas. Multi-family which is a pretty big deviation from our current Code, and

## Zoning Commission

96 we can explain that further when we get to it. It doesn't seem he's completely opposed to it but he has a  
97 few questions on how some of the text was laid out. He questions recommending some more definitions  
98 to the mixed use area. We've never had a mixed use district before, so I think this will be a conversation  
99 that is much needed. On the development standards, Regional Planning commented that a lot of this is  
100 just language we need to revisit, provide more clarity. He suggested incorporating more graphics which  
101 I'm very adamant about too. I think graphics definitely share our vision and purpose of this a lot more  
102 clearly. Signage standards, there are several things we want to look at and Jeff Beard is our signage  
103 expert, so we had him look over the text, and we will be having a conversation with our consultant on  
104 making some of those changes Regional is suggesting in this text as well as a few additional items.  
105 Regional Planning recommended conditional approval of the amendments to the Orange Township  
106 Zoning Resolution, and this request is forwarded to Regional Planning Commission, Orange Township  
107 Zoning Commission, Orange Township Trustees, subject to the review of issues raised in the Staff  
108 Report. We did a little different approach thinking it would be a conditional approval with some  
109 stipulations but that's why we want to have this conversation with him. Each Board member has a packet  
110 that is divided into six sections: the executive summary prepared by Delaware County Economic  
111 Development which gives a brief overview of the intent of this project; the draft text; the boundary maps  
112 that are in draft form; Regional Planning's comments, examples I think were provided from Berlin and  
113 Berkshire, and both plans are in draft form and have not been approved by their Trustees yet, and Violet  
114 Township's that has been approved and is the one that is the most relevant out of all the examples; and the  
115 last section is the US 23 study which was done last year and was kind of the kick off on this. That was not  
116 done by the Township or the County but was funded by Delaware Now at the time, a non-profit  
117 organization. I would like to move it over to Kelsey Scott, the Economic Development Coordinator for  
118 the County.

119  
120 Ms. Scott: I was at the Zoning Commission meeting when Bob Lamb, Director of the Economic  
121 Development Department, initially presented the US 23 Corridor Study. I'm here to present one piece of  
122 that study, which is the branding component. Michele touched on this, but the fund raising for the study  
123 was done by One Delaware, formerly Delaware Now, who brought private and public sponsors together  
124 to hire MKSK, a planning consultant, to evaluate the entirety of 23 in Delaware County. The purpose of  
125 that was, with anticipated growth, the group wanted to make sure the community had tools, ideas and  
126 strategies to best implement common sense development, so this is not the full extent but the two most  
127 relevant major recommendations in this study for today's purpose was the creation of overlay districts in  
128 the communities along 23 as well as creating a brand for the overall corridor because 23 has kind of a  
129 reputation, especially in Delaware County, that the communities lose their sense of place. In its sense, it's  
130 so much of a transportation corridor, so that was one big recommendation and the big initiative that we  
131 wanted to first launch. With the branding component, we had a steering committee that we touched base  
132 with multiple times; Michele and Trustee Rivers are both on that steering committee. We had stake holder  
133 groups of the schools, utility providers, a few businesses, just a good representation of different key  
134 demographics sustainable groups. We also had focus groups and a public survey, and the public survey  
135 was County-wide, not just in Orange Township, for this branding component of the corridor project. We  
136 got 773 participants, 70% which live near the 23 corridor. 75% of the people who took the survey said  
137 they have to use the corridor as opposed to want to or they find the corridor convenient, and 53% don't  
138 find the corridor attractive at all. What would influence folks to use the corridor more often? The three  
139 big things were less congestion, easier to navigate, and additional retail and dining. The top three  
140 concerns for the future of the corridor are increase in traffic and congestion, neglect and deterioration, and  
141 updated development. There are quite a few parallels between this survey and the Orange survey that I'm  
142 going to cover in a minute. With our consulting guide studio, who I know Orange Township has also  
143 worked with, we created Delaware Connection 23. The big vision for that is the connection of the rural  
144 northern part of Delaware, and how it makes that transition and connection into that urban use in Orange  
145 Township as we move south getting closer to Franklin County. The overall theme is green and growing,  
146 and that really speaks to Delaware's beautiful landscapes, great quality of life residents have as well as

## Zoning Commission

147 residents' active lifestyles, and growth of the County. The words of inspiration for us were sustainable  
148 growth, family friendly, business friendly, business casual, and we have a few photos that we thought  
149 represented what we were trying to go for. So why are we talking about this, how can we use this? As you  
150 can see on the left hand side, we have two colors, vibrant green and blue, then we have four secondary  
151 colors which include a handsome orange, and I like how it captures the beautiful colors of the different  
152 Ohio seasons, so I thought that was an added bonus. One campaign thought was to have these stickers for  
153 businesses to put on their windows to showcase their pride in being part of 23 and part of the Delaware  
154 Connection 23 and then for new development coming, again just showcasing you're part of that corridor  
155 community. Then have banners line that corridor, that kind of sense of place is the really big one that we  
156 wanted to hit. We have it branded to the community, we're in Orange Township, not in Franklin County,  
157 not in Columbus, owning that we're in Orange Township while we're driving Route 23. And lastly,  
158 incorporating it in an active lifestyle. Our residents are extremely active, especially in Orange Township,  
159 and this was a major insight we got from the 23 general survey but also a huge take away from the  
160 Orange survey. For the dedicated Orange survey for this overlay project, we're going to dig deep a little  
161 bit, but for the sake of time, not as deep as I'd like. We had 314 responses. Our first question is for them  
162 to share their relationship with Orange Township; there are a lot of residents. We had a couple of bonus  
163 responses, a couple little typos, but we also had a boomerang, someone who is trying to move back to  
164 Orange Township. The majority of the ages are between 35 and 54 which is a good representation of the  
165 demographics that we see in Orange Township today but also that seems to be the meat of the  
166 demographics that we're seeing move in as new residents. School age children, looks like we got about  
167 double, so that's a good representation of our residents. How long have you lived or worked in the  
168 Township? The majority have been residents for a while, so we have folks who have seen the transition of  
169 Orange Township to today but are also hopefully sticking around for a while. We also got a pretty good  
170 amount of newer ones. How frequently do you drive through Orange Township via 23? If it's not daily,  
171 it's weekly, so again we have 23 experts answering this survey. We also wanted to know how people  
172 utilize 23, and I think this says a lot because 23, regionally and historically, is known as a transportation  
173 corridor but for Orange Township residents, it's very much a quality of life corridor. They're doing their  
174 errands, running kids to school, going to the gym, to doctors' appointments, shopping and dining, to  
175 parks, and Columbus State and Delaware Area Career Center. The trends are pretty obvious as we keep  
176 going through. Rate how well you agree with the following statements regarding the 23 corridor; we  
177 wanted to gauge how much participants agreed with these few statements we had, and it ranges from  
178 strongly agree to strongly disagree. You can tell a lot of people might not have thought about these  
179 questions before or were just neutral in general, so the corridor is attractive. The majority really don't  
180 have an opinion but more people disagree than agree. I think these next two are interesting as a contrast.  
181 Most people don't have an opinion but a good amount of people agree they want to use it but it's  
182 staggering to compare to the over 80% who have to use it; that's similar to what we saw in the general 23  
183 survey as well. The corridor lacks the right type of businesses. People kind of agree but still pretty  
184 neutral. We have a few bonus comments where people for the most part want more retail shops, more  
185 dining, one person thinks Delaware County offers this but maybe not necessarily in need in Orange  
186 Township but a lot would like the corridor look better. Traffic is another big one we'll probably see  
187 throughout this and will hopefully be addressed as we move forward with the development projects.  
188 Which of the following improvements and developments are needed in Orange Township along 23? Most  
189 people think additional retail, dining and entertainment are somewhat needed if not very needed. A lot of  
190 folks don't think new office buildings are needed but then they say additional highly skilled and  
191 professional employment opportunities are needed, so a little contrast there. You'll see we definitely love  
192 our green space, streetscapes and bike paths, and additional multi-use walk paths in Orange Township, so  
193 that is a big thing and you'll see that in the plan. Re-development of existing buildings was pretty even.  
194 People thought it was somewhat needed but most folks were in the middle. A few bonuses; a lot of people  
195 are against dentist offices in Orange Township; we saw a lot of that, but some people have mixed feelings  
196 about apartments, a lot of people want restaurants and a lot of people want to make sure we preserve the  
197 beautiful trees of Orange Township still along the corridor. When you consider future development of the

## Zoning Commission

198 23 corridor in Orange Township in particular, what most concerns you? The first three are the biggest  
199 concerns: increased traffic congestion; neglect, deterioration and unplanned development; and loss of  
200 green space. Decreased property value is split across the board. People do not seem to be as concerned  
201 about missed opportunities to enhance lifestyle or missed economic opportunities. I think that's a good  
202 sign they have a great quality of life, and there is room for growth in that way. A few bonus comments,  
203 we'd like to see more restaurants, planned green space, bike paths, look at what happened to Sawmill  
204 Road due to lack of planning/zoning. That's what we're trying to avoid, so Holly will address that. We  
205 asked which commercial development is the most appealing. A lot voted Commercial B, so example B  
206 wins for that and people would prefer parking in the rear, definitely more landscaping up front and then  
207 question 12 is the same question but with an office development and again B wins with landscaping a  
208 little closer and parking in the rear. The last question with this is multi-family, and B wins but this one is  
209 a little closer of what people preferred but people like Georgian architecture, very residential and bonus  
210 number 3 came in dead last. What are the greatest opportunities that you see in US 23 in Orange  
211 Township? This was an open ended question, so I compiled the results and overwhelmingly people would  
212 love to see more restaurants, retail and entertainment. A close second is green space, walkability, bike  
213 paths and a few notes of making sure we address the congestion and a few folks think Orange Township  
214 is perfect the way it is. 13% are looking for office and professional uses. What are your thoughts on the  
215 current access of the US 23 corridor and Orange, and do you believe shared access, frontage and  
216 backroads should be required for future development? The majority said yes, we had a few no's and a few  
217 more extended comments but for the sake of time, we'll just move to the last question which is basically  
218 everyone's final thoughts or comments to share on the future development of US 23. A lot of people have  
219 mixed feelings about multi-family which I think is worth noting that the majority of the multi-family  
220 proposals in our overlay draft text is integrated into an overall design of multi-use and mixed-use  
221 development. When you think of the feedback in terms of we want walkability and bikes and alternative  
222 modes of transportation that it really adds to that overall urban walkability feel, so the multi-family is  
223 very much integrated but also can lead to a bit less traffic congestion as well and multi-family also  
224 provides tax dollars for road improvements like the Home Road Extension project. So although there are  
225 mixed feelings, there are a lot of folks looking for that diversification in housing as well. I want to pass it  
226 on to the main part of the presentation with Holly Mattei.

227  
228 Holly Mattei, owner of Crossroads Community Planning: What Kelsey went through is very helpful to  
229 understand what the community would like to see. My back ground is both city planning and economic  
230 development. I'm happy to be working with Delaware County Finance Authority through my consulting  
231 role to bring this opportunity to bring those two together. It is unusual for me to write a zoning text  
232 without talking with the Zoning Commission first, so I think a lot of questions are going to be asked and I  
233 think we're going to make revisions based upon your desires. As we go through this, know that we want  
234 to make a document that reflects your goals and reflects the plan that you desire for Orange Township,  
235 and I'm completely willing to work with you as we go through it. This is just a first draft. I'm going to  
236 start off with maps that are overlay maps showing the overlay boundaries and the different sub-areas that  
237 are within your text. The commercial/office is shown in red and kind of lines the 23 corridor. The  
238 residential/single family, there's very few of these and are mostly areas to buffer existing single family  
239 areas, so we only see one on this lower end of the corridor. Multi-family is the darker brownish color and  
240 we have removed some of those. That was one of the comments Regional Planning said and we had  
241 intended on removing some of those before it went to Regional Planning and missed that, so those have  
242 been removed and now we have very few that are included now and I think this might be one of those  
243 parcels we might be discussing if we really want that as multi-family. Then we have what's called  
244 manufacturing flexed or manufacturing logistics research and development uses which are mostly along  
245 the east side of the boundary along the rail line. There's existing industrial along this area and with the  
246 rail line there, it makes sense to continue up that corridor. We heard mixed use areas should be at  
247 keynotes, so we have placed those at key intersections throughout the corridor, so this is the southern end  
248 of the corridor, Powell Road, so this is a potential re-development of a mixed use area as that area is

## Zoning Commission

249 currently developed right now. Moving up to the middle area of the corridor, you continue those  
250 commercial/office districts along the 23 corridor. We have one multi-family area that abuts to an existing  
251 multi-family area, then we have the advanced manufacturing opportunities to the rear of the commercial  
252 and along the rail line, and another opportunity for some multi-family here. This is another key area for  
253 mixed use, the area where Mt. Carmel Wellness Center is, and it makes a lot of sense to create some  
254 walkable communities there because we already have the multi-use overpass over 23, and being able to  
255 connect additional neighborhoods to that walkable corridor makes a lot of sense through there. Moving  
256 toward Lewis Center, we have another single family area to buffer existing development on the east side,  
257 moving into multi-family and then extending the commercial corridor up 23. Moving north to the  
258 northern end of the Township is a lot of potential for future development as there's more vacant land in  
259 this area, and we continue to use that commercial/office along the corridor and then single family  
260 buffering again and then this is another area we saw mixed use opportunity with some residential in the  
261 vicinity. With a school campus just to the east, we thought that would be a good way to connect  
262 walkability in that area. Before going to the text of the document and go over that in detail, are there any  
263 questions on the maps.

264  
265 Mr. Duell: Why are we doing this?

266  
267 Ms. Mattei: Because it was a desire of Delaware County to look at the 23 corridor the MKSK plan called  
268 for. The Route 23 corridor, the Township Land Use Plan called for a 23 overlay district, so it was  
269 requested that we look into this type of development.

270  
271 Mr. Duell: Why do we need an overlay? What about the existing Code?

272  
273 Ms. Mattei: We will get into that when we get into the text because that overlay provides some review  
274 processes that the existing zoning does not and that is the purpose of the overlay.

275  
276 Mr. Duell: I know the overlay cuts out the Zoning Commission, cuts out referendum.

277  
278 Ms. Mattei: We will get into all of that in the next few slides. At the end of those slides, I will take  
279 questions about that.

280  
281 Mr. Duell: I notice there are areas in particular that are being developed now, a single family that have  
282 this residential/multi-family overlay on top of them, in particular where it says Lewis Center Road.

283  
284 Ms. Boni: Lewis Center Ravines is being developed there.

285  
286 Mr. Duell: That's one; there's another one down the west side of 23. There's a lot of dropping multi-  
287 family where people are expecting homes, and much of this map doesn't make any sense other than trying  
288 to shoot more apartments in somewhere. I just don't like it.

289  
290 Ms. Mattei: The basis of this map came from the MKSK study. We need to work with you as a Township  
291 Zoning Commission to tweak it to what makes sense to your community. We have to start some place, so  
292 we utilized a study that was already completed to create a first draft.

293  
294 Mr. Duell: We're talking about the 23 corridor yet we've got a lot of stuff going on by the railroad tracks  
295 which from some you can't even see 23 from that area. I fail to see why that ends up getting in and why  
296 overlay on top of it, why is it that we need to do something with it today with the existing industrial area,  
297 no one is clamoring for anything over there, the little cross section, that Turkey Hill. No one is clamoring  
298 for anything going on over there, the existing buildings are there, they're being used. I fail to see why we  
299 need to start monkeying with that over by the railroad tracks, especially when it's not even in many

## Zoning Commission

300 instances even visible from 23 if the idea is to make 23 more visually appealing, better functioning  
301 corridor for everything else. That was one of my concerns when we had the first meeting with Mr. Lamb.  
302 I asked him how wide is this going to be and he never could give me an answer, so it's not like this is the  
303 first crack at it. Some of this up against the railroad tracks doesn't make sense to me.

304  
305 Mr. Doherty: I think being able to take everything between 23 and the railroad tracks makes the most  
306 sense. Part of it is the fact that in order to be able to lay in the development standards that you need along  
307 that corridor, you have to look at it a little more regionally so the connections with the other uses,  
308 particularly to the west of that railroad tracks, are able to blend in with everything you want to do along  
309 that corridor, so I think you've got to be able to look outside of just the frontage and start looking at some  
310 of the ancillary uses aside to it, and I think the railroad tracks is a nice little clean break in transition  
311 between everything that happens to the east and everything we want to occur along that corridor.

312  
313 Ms. Mattei: We need to address the traffic issues and if we are only looking at the strip of land along 23,  
314 we're never going to get an internal circulation within the development to create traffic through the  
315 developments and off the main corridor to help alleviate that congestion that everybody's concerned with  
316 and we need to look at a broader perspective.

317  
318 Mr. Duell: Many of those roads have been in the plans going back several years and some of them are in  
319 the process of being built.

320  
321 Ms. Mattei: In some locations there probably are some that are planned but as you move farther north,  
322 that area there doesn't have as many planned.

323  
324 Mr. Duell: For instance. Green Meadows and Graphics Way are planned to go considerably further north  
325 on the east side, and I forget the name of the road on the west side being developed all the way up to  
326 Home Road, so it's not like the existing plans don't call for those and they don't exist; they do.

327  
328 Mr. Mattei: A lot of times it takes economic opportunities to move those infrastructure projects forward, it  
329 takes those larger projects, so we need to have development and land uses that will more support that  
330 infrastructure development. We'll start getting into the actual documents that were sent. I wanted to first  
331 talk about the process adopting the overlay text and maps. It will go through the regular process for  
332 rezoning; it's initiated by the Township, goes to Regional Planning, they make a recommendation to the  
333 Zoning Commission and then the Zoning Commission makes a recommendation to the Township  
334 Trustees who ultimately take action on the text and maps. Right now we are at the Township Zoning  
335 Commission process. We have already been through Regional Planning and received their  
336 recommendation and comments, and we know there's going to be some back and forth with Regional  
337 Planning and the Zoning Commission before we get to the Trustees. However, once we do get to the  
338 Trustees, upon their adoption, the map amendments would go into effect 30 days later just as any zoning  
339 text or zoning map amendment. After that date, property owners and developers could apply for  
340 development plan approval. There's two different processes for development plan approval. First,  
341 somebody that can come in and comply with all the development standards and text whereas only  
342 requiring minor modifications. Minor modifications are things that do not affect the overall intent, maybe  
343 they couldn't meet the setback by a couple inches or needed just a deviation to something from maximum  
344 ground coverage or their sign was a little bit off from the sign regulations. The Zoning Inspector is  
345 allowed to make the determination it's a minor modification and it does not affect the overall intent of the  
346 district as planned by the Township. If that determination is made, then the application is submitted with  
347 the minor modifications and within 30 days, the Township Trustees are required to hold a public hearing.  
348 Within that timeframe, a 10 day notice will go to adjacent property owners so that they have the  
349 opportunity to attend the public hearing held by the Trustees and provide input to the Trustees to as far as  
350 whether it should be approved or not. After the Trustees close the public hearing, they have 30 days to

## Zoning Commission

351 take action. The thing is we work hard with the Zoning Commission to create a document that will result  
352 in the planned communities that are desired but provide a process that will help them move at business  
353 speed. Businesses need that speed to keep going and to move forward and on track. This creates a process  
354 that allows the Zoning Commission to create those standards they want but allows them that as long as  
355 they can meet those standards, to move at a quicker pace. There are times that a developer might be able  
356 to meet the intent of the original district and need a major modification. They may need to increase the  
357 densities or the floor area ratio for a mixed use building to meet some expectation they need to meet or  
358 they want to move parking to the front of the building, but that's something we really don't want because  
359 we've heard over and over we don't want to see parking along 23. Those are all major modifications.  
360 They go against the intent of the planning behind it, access and connectivity we hear over and over, and  
361 we saw in the surveys people want to be able to go from development to development without going back  
362 on to 23. If someone is coming in and they want to do a curb cut along 23 and nothing else, they can't do  
363 it; they have to come in for a major modification and would have to get a recommendation from the  
364 Zoning Commission. Those major things have been put into a major modification category and would go  
365 back to the Zoning Commission for a public hearing, the Zoning Commission would make a recom-  
366 mendation on that modification being proposed, that would go to the Trustees, and the Trustees would  
367 hold a public hearing including the development plan and any major or minor modifications proposed,  
368 and the Trustees would take action on that. So that's the process that's proposed. I'm going to keep going  
369 through the regulations and then we'll take questions. I lumped the commercial office/advanced  
370 manufacturing and multi-family sub-areas into one slide because they're very typical sub-areas with  
371 typical design requirements with side setbacks, rear setbacks, building height and ground coverage. The  
372 one thing I want to highlight is the no parking allowed in the right-of-way setback, and I call it a right-of-  
373 way setback instead of a front setback because if you're on a corner lot and have frontage on two right-of-  
374 ways, you need to meet that right-of-way setback and not just a front setback, so anytime you abut a right-  
375 of-way, you have to comply with those requirements, and the parking cannot be in front of the building or  
376 that right-of-way setback line. Something that's a little unique in this proposal is something I came across  
377 when doing research and preparing for some of these public meetings. You'll notice the two pictures on  
378 the left side of the screen were something that were in the survey. They're out of Indiana and right across  
379 the street from each other; the right hand side is the aerial of those two. The top photo is on your left and  
380 the bottom photo is on the right, and it was clear in the survey that everyone liked the top photo better and  
381 really what that's doing is creating a nice streetscape with a nice amount of building fronting on the road  
382 but not so much that it's creating a wall, but there's spacing between the buildings. On the bottom side,  
383 you just have a little Starbucks and then a sea of parking around it, so I've created a building to lot width  
384 ratio. The top photo which is the left side of the area, shows a 43% building width to walk width ratio for  
385 the top building. Across the street at Starbucks is 20%, so what I did was put in that they have to have a  
386 minimum of 40% building to lot width ratio and no more than 70%, that way we don't get the wall that  
387 we're avoiding as well. That's proposed in the commercial district to help that along the 23 corridor. I  
388 don't want to dwell on single family because there's not a ton of it in there; they're just surface buffers to  
389 existing single family areas. They have the typical front side, rear side setbacks of the lots, minimum open  
390 space requirement of 20%, and maximum density requirements. We included density bonuses with added  
391 amenities, and the bonuses are related to the cost and elaborateness of the amenity. There were some  
392 Regional Planning comments on the amenities and some of them maybe in the wrong category, and I  
393 agree with that, so we'll make some changes to that. There were some density comments from Regional  
394 Planning that I think if I sit down and talk to them and explain how that's all calculated, I think those will  
395 be addressed. They also had questions where they thought the single family was included with the multi-  
396 family, which is not the case. I think there was some confusion on the definition section, so I need to  
397 clarify that with them and point out that is not the intent; this would strictly be a detached single family  
398 sub-area. The mixed use district is something that I think the survey showed they really want, and I think  
399 it's important because I've heard Michele say existing zoning does not allow mixed use, so that's an  
400 answer as to why we're doing an overlay. The existing zoning does not allow mixed use, and we saw in  
401 the survey, many people mentioned they wanted that lifestyle of community through mixed use develop-



## Zoning Commission

402 ments. It would require a variety of uses, including commercial, various residential types; in this case it  
403 would be maybe twin family units, townhomes, and then also mixed use buildings with residential on the  
404 top with different types of living spaces available on the upper floor of those mixed use buildings.  
405 Commercial/office uses would always be required on the ground level and the purpose of this is to create  
406 that density, create that walkable communities. If we don't have the densities, we're not going to create  
407 that active use throughout the district. There are the typical design requirements for minimum front, side  
408 and rear yard setbacks. There's also the minimum open space requirement. It's still 20% like the other  
409 sub-areas but 10% of it must be reserved as a central green space, and the development needs to be  
410 created around the green space. The buildings need to orient to it, the walkability needs to be integrated  
411 with it, and they really need to create the sense of place within these mixed use sub-areas. This is an  
412 example of how a mixed used building within a mixed use area could be developed. It shows a 2 acre lot  
413 utilizing floor area ratios. With a 2 acre lot, the maximum floor to area ratio is .5 in the draft document.  
414 That would allow them 43,560 square feet of building size spread out over 4 floors which is 10,890  
415 square feet per floor. This is just one way they could distribute that floor area. The first floor could be  
416 split between restaurants, coffee shops and retail, then the upper floors, and it says second and third floors  
417 but it would actually be all upper floors including fourth floors, that's just a typo. It could be spread out  
418 with eleven 600 square foot studio units, two 950 square foot bedroom units, and three 1000 square foot  
419 three bedroom units. Backup hallways, elevator, mechanicals run about 20% of the building to get to the  
420 43,560 square feet. That's just an example utilizing the minimum square footages for the residential units.  
421 Those are all negotiable; we could talk about whether or not those are appropriate, if those need to be  
422 changed. Again, this is a first draft; that's how it's been written to get some discussion and feedback. And  
423 then there's a sketch drawing showing how the setbacks and all the different regulations can be met. It  
424 shows the 50' setback on 23, 40' setback along the existing collector roads and then how they're sharing  
425 access, so instead of direct access to 23 or closer to the collector road, they would actually create a road,  
426 shared access with the property to the north, so this is the property line and half of that drive is on their  
427 property, half is on the property on the other side, and that would be extended all the way down so that  
428 future development in this area could have access off that shared driveway and then this shows how that  
429 would go into the property. The parking meets the requirements for shared parking because we have  
430 allowed some shared parking when there's a mixture of uses that allow that, so it is something that can fit  
431 on a 2 acre parcel. We have general development standards that all developments have to meet, archi-  
432 tectural requirements, 360 degree architecture so we're seeing it from all angles, we're seeing the  
433 aesthetic quality because we need to have that property fronting the roads. We want all sides of it from  
434 any right-of-way to have that aesthetic quality with the parking in the back, have it aesthetically pleasing  
435 as you're entering the building from the rear of the property. No blank walls, there's a minimum of sign  
436 elements required per face. There is a street tree requirement. That is something we have heard from the  
437 Engineer's Office and utilities, they don't like them within the right-of-way, so they're required but  
438 required just outside the right-of-way in an easement. Parking lot screening is something that any time the  
439 parking lot is on the side of the building but abuts the right-of-way needs to screening provided and  
440 general right-of-way screening to create the aesthetic beauty as you're driving down the 23 corridor, any  
441 of the right-of-ways within it. This picture shows how once you plant something and it matures, how it  
442 will create an aesthetically pleasing drive down that right-of-way. It also has requirements for screening  
443 between uses, more of the incompatible uses, so when there's industrial against residential, there are  
444 certain requirements for those screenings of uses. There are parking requirements we've mixed up a little.  
445 You normally have minimum requirements and we've seen the big box retailers put in the amount of  
446 parking they need for Christmas Eve or Black Friday and they don't use it the rest of the year, so we've  
447 done some studies on the parking, looked into ways to balance that out to make sure we're getting ample  
448 parking, but we're not creating a sea of asphalt as well. We have put some maximum requirements in  
449 using the Urban Land Institute recommendations in studies they have provided. There's also some shared  
450 parking that allows parking to be reduced when there are users with different peak times that they can  
451 share those parking spaces so that we're not creating two spaces where one of them is never being used at  
452 the same time the other one is. So we don't get large spans of parking spaces, we are requiring they be

## Zoning Commission

453 separated by landscape islands; I think it's a maximum of 12 spaces on one side and 24 all together. I  
454 think for industrial uses it's a little larger if it's a parking bay area, but always making sure we have those  
455 landscape islands as you see in the illustration. Access and connectivity is huge in order for us to be able  
456 to relieve congestion along 23. I'm a firm believer in connecting our parking lots and creating access  
457 roads. They help in reducing traffic and creating an internal system that will help the overall commuting  
458 patterns. Requiring a multi-use path on all arterial and collector roads on one side and a sidewalk on the  
459 other side is aesthetically pleasing, it works and it helps create connection between developments and  
460 people can get from one thing to another without utilizing their car. Looking at the lighting standards, of  
461 course requiring cut off fixtures; looking at the different amounts of light they are allowed to emit, the  
462 ability for the exterior lighting to be turned off after business hours with the exception of security lighting  
463 and looking at the ability for them to use automatic switches that will turn that lighting off when they  
464 don't need it, and just to help reduce the overall glow of the 23 corridor. I've heard a lot about signs  
465 through the stakeholder process and public process, so we're taking a deep dive into the signs. What you  
466 see in the current draft is going to have a lot of changes to it. Michele, Jeff and I sat down, I understand  
467 some of the concerns and we're going to go back and revise those, also putting in some simple graphics to  
468 show how channel lettering is measured when it's on a wall sign, how the area of a ground sign is  
469 measured and the height of the ground sign. We have another graphic where there's pillars on a ground  
470 sign but showing the height of the sign is actually the top of the pillars even though the area of the sign  
471 might be lower than that. Projecting signs is something you don't have now but with these walkable  
472 communities, we have to make sure businesses have a street pedestrian walking area with an identi-  
473 fication sign into their buildings, making sure they have a minimum height so people can walk under  
474 them without hitting their heads but a maximum height so they're not way up in the air. One thing we also  
475 need to look at that was brought to our attention today when Kelsey introduced the branding of the 23  
476 corridor. We need to make adjustments to the sign regulations as proposed to make sure we can get some  
477 of this branding stuff in that complies with the regulations, so we'll be taking a deeper dive into that as  
478 well.

479  
480 Mr. Duell: For signs and lighting, setting aside the issue of projecting signs, I understand what you're  
481 trying to do with that, is there a reason why we don't just site to the existing Code?  
482

483 Ms. Mattei: I heard a lot from both staff and others that the existing Code is very difficult to navigate and  
484 there's some inconsistencies, and I was told there really was a lot we need to do and that maybe even if  
485 we get it in a really good place, which it's not right now, there are changes we need to do, that might  
486 create some amendments to your overall Sign Code.  
487

488 Ms. Boni: I agree wholly.  
489

490 Mr. Duell: Can you work through the model of the existing Code and at least make sure your proposed  
491 regulations here are the same as the proposed regulations there?  
492

493 Ms. Boni: They are the same but this provides more restrictions. As far as landscaping goes, there are  
494 really no landscaping requirements in our Code; it says it should be landscaped, that's about it. As far as  
495 signage goes, inconsistencies in our Sign Code are very difficult to interpret, so we were looking at  
496 revisiting our entire Zoning Resolution prior to this project that was initiated by the Trustees, but with the  
497 new Trustee Board, this became the priority, so we're taking advantage of this text now, updating what  
498 needs to be done in our overall Code and then we can refer to this when we revisit the entire Zoning  
499 Resolution.  
500

501 Mr. Duell: What I don't want is new signs or new lighting that has been prohibited in the past because  
502 that's going to potentially cause issues. I'd like it to be as consistent as possible.  
503

## Zoning Commission

504 Ms. Boni: I think signage would have potentially a little more flexibility; that's something we would want  
505 to review with the Board in detail. When we had our stakeholder meetings, open houses, that came up a  
506 lot. We get continuous complaints and it's a hard thing to work with. We get complaints from residents  
507 with the amount of temporary signs along 23, and Jeff and I are not big fans of having to go pull those  
508 every weekend. Then we get complaints that businesses are not able to advertise their openings or events  
509 because we have too strict of a Sign Code. There has to be some middle ground that we can work with  
510 and that would be my goal with the list.

511  
512 Ms. Mattei: I think the temporary sign section is something Michele, Jeff and I discussed a lot. We have  
513 to be very careful. The current Code is content based and that's setting yourself up for some challenges  
514 down the road, so I did write it in a content neutral way. There are things that need to be addressed in that  
515 still as far as limiting it to one per parcel and then making sure a sign permit is obtained for every one of  
516 the larger ones. We're going to make some tweaks; I recommend that we stick to the content neutral  
517 language instead of utilizing the existing content based.

518  
519 Ms. Boni: There are a lot of things in our current Sign Code that are stated but legally or ethically we  
520 cannot enforce anymore just because of the content affiliation with it.

521  
522 Mr. Duell: As far as single family and multi-family, those densities would be something I would not  
523 consider to support under any circumstances. The single family, I believe Regional Planning's comment  
524 was 4 units per acre is going to be tough and then with bonuses trying to raise it up to 5. It's too dense and  
525 I'm afraid we'll end up with something like what we have on Powell Road in the City of Columbus that  
526 are just small, dinky little houses stacked one on top of another, and that's not really anything I'm  
527 interested in. Many of us moved to Orange Township to get out of Columbus, not to bring Columbus with  
528 us. I'm curious as to those densities. 10 units per acre; there's only one development like that in the  
529 Township. When it happened I said never again am I going to do that. That was kind of zoning at the end  
530 of a gun with the Home Road Extension and I'm not interested in ever going forward with that again and  
531 it's provided for in each phase, so that's a concern to me as well.

532  
533 Ms. Mattei: Do you have a density in mind that you would support?

534  
535 Mr. Duell: The existing Code says 4 and we've had discussions and we've talked perhaps we could go as  
536 high, and I'm not going to speak for anybody else, maybe 6 but what I don't want is a Columbus and in  
537 recent years Polaris Parkway and 23 within Columbus has got apartment buildings popping up and we  
538 hear complaints about that even though we have nothing to do with it, and you saw in the comments, I  
539 didn't see anybody asking for more apartments. What I did see were a lot of comments that said no more  
540 apartments and it's going to be very stealth in getting them in because without referendum, the com-  
541 munity would only have limited chances to have their say. Without any specific proposals on the table,  
542 they're not likely to show up. When apartments come on the calendar where nobody gets a letter in the  
543 mail, like the apartments near Mt. Carmel, people didn't show up. We've got apartments on the calendar  
544 now in another area and because it's close to single family, we had overflow in our digital rooms here of  
545 people showing up and none of them were in favor. I think we've got to be very careful about apartments  
546 with what the density is, how many there are, and it's not just where you've got multi-family, it's also  
547 everywhere you've labeled for mixed use. We could have significant apartments and people moved up  
548 here to get away from Columbus, not bring Columbus here.

549  
550 Ms. Mattei: I believe that the residential within the mixed use buildings creates a different feel than just a  
551 regular multi-family apartment building within a multi-family sub-area, so to me, it's hard to compare the  
552 two as apples to apples; they're a little more apples to oranges. The multi-family sub-area, I think we can  
553 take into consideration the density concerns and maybe look at some more amenity requirements. You

## Zoning Commission

554 have to have the density there to encourage the amenities. I think that's a balancing act that we have to  
555 play and figure out.

556

557 Mr. Dove: The single family you talk about using as a buffer but then when we increase the density like is  
558 proposed, the single family we're buffering isn't going to be too happy because, like Mark said, a lot of  
559 people moved here because we're all at least 25' from our neighbor and then we're going to start putting  
560 that in our back yard. I think a lot of residents did their survey, but my experience being on the Zoning  
561 Commission is residents don't know what they want but they know what they don't want when it's going  
562 to be in their back yard. My biggest concern is this is going to go through. I know the Trustees are going  
563 to vote this through. I see our job as getting this document as close as we can to what the Zoning Com-  
564 mission feels comfortable with and the Trustees are going to do what they want. My concern is then the  
565 residents are going to show up at the Trustees' meetings and not be happy at all and the Trustees are  
566 going to say it meets our overall overlay district, so they're going to approve it. I don't know that I'm  
567 against the overlay but I think there's an awful lot of conversation. And that's my other concern, everyone  
568 complains about how long it takes the Zoning Commission to do things, which I call we try and be  
569 diligent, and I don't know how quickly the Trustees are expecting all of this back for their approval so  
570 developers can get in line and start their developments. There's a reason why we didn't have Trustees  
571 doing zoning for years and now we're just putting it right back in their lap. Every Trustee meeting I go to  
572 where they approve it, they always thank their Zoning Commission for their diligence, their hard work  
573 and being so thorough, and now they're taking control of all that in this district.

574

575 Ms. Mattei: I see your concern but I go back to a couple of sentences that you mention and that you need  
576 to make this the best document you can because the Trustees are going to approve it, so if you're getting  
577 all that design up front, it's not that we're skipping the Zoning Commission; it's we're doing it up front so  
578 when a developer is there, they have the certainty that they know what they need to do to meet the  
579 requirements.

580

581 Mr. Dove: I think they've pretty much had that certainty; I think this is trying to speed up the process in  
582 my opinion. We have a Zoning Resolution, so they know what the requirements are, now it's, in my  
583 opinion, we're increasing density, we're increasing height, so we're allowing developers to come in and  
584 basically do what they want to do in Orange Township, and that's develop it. Taxes are high and we all  
585 knew that coming in here, and we want commercial growth to come in and help with that, but I don't  
586 know that we need this much of that as quickly as it's going to come, because it is going to come quickly.

587

588 Ms. Mattei: Do you think that it's strictly a matter of reducing the densities in the text or are there map  
589 areas that you believe need to be addressed with the multi-family?

590

591 Mr. Duell: I would say both.

592

593 Ms. Mattei: We can either go over those concerns tonight or if you would like to put them in writing over  
594 the next week, I would be happy to take a look at what those specific comments are.

595

596 Mr. Dove: I personally went through more of the text than the overview of everything with all the  
597 documents that were in the book. I really didn't compare the maps and what our districts are now, what  
598 we're proposing them to be and does all of this make sense, so I don't know if others are prepared to talk  
599 about the maps.

600

601 Ms. Mattei: I'm fine with you taking some time to look at that and get comments back to Michele, and  
602 then we'll work on getting those revisions made.

603

## Zoning Commission

604 Ms. Scott: Before we move forward, I wanted to check with Michele as to if there were any comments on  
605 the YouTube page.

606  
607 Ms. Boni: We had a couple. Mark Adams made a comment about defining the landscaping more, what  
608 vegetation would be permitted. That is something we'll have to define more in the overview.

609  
610 Mr. McNulty: I'm going to differ from Mark and Todd, I think this is actually long overdue. I see this as a  
611 long time future. You've done a great job on this report because I think what happens in long time future  
612 is there will be a bypass after Delaware that will bypass Delaware City and this area to keep trucks  
613 moving because there's just simply too much traffic. That's what people would also be concerned about  
614 especially with multi-family and apartments, and they're already dealing with traffic on 23 and they want  
615 to avoid that. As I view eastern Polaris Parkway as you get close to State Street in Westerville, that's kind  
616 of what it reminds me of. Again, I think this is a good plan, long overdue. No doubt the Code needs to be  
617 written with respect to signs and other things to fit into this and regulate it a little more because I think of  
618 all those Zoning Commission meetings where somebody had an excellent point that got changed that  
619 would have never gotten changed from the Code, like direction of traffic in a parking lot; just the small  
620 things that make a difference. We definitely have to pay attention to what this document was that were the  
621 guidelines. I noticed there is no prohibition for small hotels and I think that's good because that's one of  
622 the things that's needed in Orange Township. If people want to stay here, you've got to drive out of the  
623 area. I'm glad Todd brought up to look at the areas where multi-family is and we can talk about those, but  
624 I love the concept. I see this as something 20 or 30 years in the future when the bypass is done, when you  
625 have walkable districts, way past what it is today. If this would have been in place 10-15 years ago, 23  
626 would look much different. We've had a variety of Zoning Commissions that have made decisions about  
627 it, not that anyone has made bad decisions, but there's no continuity because of the difference of people  
628 and there were always things to be questioned about where it went. We just need to write that text with  
629 our direction. I agree with Todd and Mark, let's take a look at where those apartment areas are.

630  
631 Mr. Pychewicz: Just to kind of reiterate what you're saying, I'm definitely in agreement with a lot of what  
632 you said. I view this as an opportunity to promote development and help this corridor from the perspec-  
633 tive of the community and the needs they're asking for but I also certainly understand both Todd and  
634 Mark's concerns. I feel like it's an opportunity for us to help define what that is and how this would work.  
635 If we would go back to almost the beginning of this presentation where we were talking about what's  
636 considered a minor or major modification, I think if we really dive into some of those aspects to where  
637 just, using the setbacks is the first to come to mind, under the minor modifications, if someone is to  
638 violate that, then it doesn't have to go through zoning. Maybe we get specific on that and say you can be  
639 within 10' of a side yard setback and you don't have to go through zoning, but I don't see this as we're  
640 just trying to fast track and skip over zoning. I think we still have influence. At the end of the day we can  
641 make a recommendation to the Trustees and this is no different than any other thing where they could just  
642 over turn it or change it to begin with, and the same aspect if someone was to come in and a piece of  
643 undeveloped property was already zoned and they don't need any divergences; there's really no reason  
644 for them to go through the process either. If we define what those regulations are, what the Code should  
645 say with density and all these things, we put them in place and if a developer is going to meet all those  
646 and the minor modifications, dive into them a little deeper and define those better, I don't have any issue  
647 with this process at all. I think this is going to help curb development along this corridor and improve the  
648 Township. I see both perspectives for sure.

649  
650 Mr. Duell: I don't have a problem with the commercial aspect per se, definitely the single family and  
651 multi-family housing. The densities are way too high, they're too expansive. I've been on the Zoning  
652 Commission for 10+ years. The things we get complaints about, traffic and apartments; too many people,  
653 too many cars. We hear it all the time. Like you said, the ones by Mt. Carmel, there's no houses near that,  
654 there's nobody to complain but in other areas, we've got someone trying to put up apartments, you'd

## Zoning Commission

655 think we did something terrible and none of us have even been close to saying we approve of that.  
656 Apartments are going to be the hot button issue and if they start going up, especially close to peoples'  
657 houses, there is going to be hell to pay. Like I said, with the overlay district, you basically have to express  
658 your objections now because if you don't, there's no Zoning Commission to go through, there's no  
659 referendum, and if the Trustees approve it, that's it. That's their one and only chance to have your say  
660 about it. I'm not sure the Trustees' meeting is the best forum for that. So commercial, we can talk about. I  
661 didn't give you any comments on commercial because that is probably something we can do, we can talk  
662 about, but the multi-family and the strange density levels on single family have my radar perked up.  
663

664 Ms. Mattei: That's good to know, and I think we can work with that.  
665

666 Ms. Boni: For Adam's point, what page of the text is it that defines what is a major and what is a minor?  
667

668 Ms. Mattei: Page 8.  
669

670 Ms. Boni: Again, this is a draft and we did try and define what would be major and minor to determine if  
671 it has to go through the Zoning Commission. Maybe that's something we can visit further and if any of  
672 the Board members have comments, we would be happy to relay those over to Holly to revise.  
673

674 Mr. Dove: Can the Trustees overrule you, Michele? If anyone is aggrieved by the Zoning Inspector as to  
675 the determination as to the classification of a modification, the Zoning Inspector's decision may be  
676 appealed by the Board of Trustees. So they can say no it's not a minor or major?  
677

678 Ms. Boni: You're referring to something in the overlay text right now, Todd?  
679

680 Mr. Dove: It's on Page 7 under J-1.  
681

682 Ms. Mattei: You're right. Let me change that because I believe that that would be a 2506.  
683

684 Ms. Boni: We started having our legal review on this and it hasn't been completed yet, but our counsel  
685 did bring that up, so I wonder if that's the point he was talking about.  
686

687 Ms. Mattei: That might be it; that needs to be changed, that is not correct.  
688

689 Mr. Dove: Has there been any conversation on are these going to be separate meetings for the Trustees to  
690 do zoning or is it going to be rolled into their standard meetings?  
691

692 Ms. Boni: That would be ultimately up to the Trustees to decide on that.  
693

694 Mr. Dove: I would hope it would either be a separate meeting or they would do it at 7:00 p.m., not their  
695 10:00 a.m. meetings so public can attend and voice their opinions.  
696

697 Ms. Boni: I don't know if that could be defined in the text.  
698

699 Ms. Mattei: That's more of a policy decision. Normally the text just requires the Trustees to schedule a  
700 public hearing. I've never seen a Zoning Code that requires them to do it in the evening.  
701

702 Mr. Dove: I don't want it to be one of those special meetings on Thursday at 2:00.  
703

## Zoning Commission

704 Ms. Mattei: We can certainly have that conversation with the Trustees, that that's feedback from the  
705 Zoning Commission and see how the best way to handle that is because I agree, there should be an  
706 opportunity for residents to provide input.

707  
708 Ms. Scott: Chairman, going back to your point that you mentioned that you have a concern about density,  
709 I'm curious how that reflects in your opinion about multi-family mixed uses. Do you still feel  
710 uncomfortable with that or are you more open to conversations on density pertaining to mixed use  
711 development?

712  
713 Mr. Duell: It makes me feel uncomfortable with that too although it's more limited although mixed use is  
714 a greater number of areas. I'd like to see it somewhat limited so it doesn't all become mixed use up and  
715 down the street and it basically becomes the Short North, but we do have something resembling mixed  
716 use in Evans Farm. Evans Farm may end up being the great experiment to see how some of this stuff  
717 turns out. That's why I'm a little concerned that we're jumping into some of this stuff but if it were  
718 controlled and mixed use is going to lower the density a little bit because you'll have the retail on the first  
719 floor, so if you get your density down then it's maybe not as much of a concern but the other thing we  
720 need to talk about is building heights. That's another one I'm not in favor of. We've been holding the line  
721 firmly on that for as long as I can remember.

722  
723 Ms. Mattei: What's the height you've been holding everyone to?

724  
725 Ms. Boni: For commercial areas it is 50'.

726  
727 Mr. Dove: Industrial is currently 35' and they're going to 60' plus a 10' screen for rooftops. Multi-family  
728 is currently 35' and it's projected as 50'. And we don't have a mixed use development.

729  
730 Mr. Duell: Don't we have mixed use in Evans Farm?

731  
732 Ms. Boni: Evans Farm is a mixed use community but there's no mixed use district. We had to do a single  
733 family district and then create a divergence in the planned commercial district to allow for multi-family  
734 housing. That's a backwards way of doing it though.

735  
736 Mr. Duell: Yes, but it exists. So we did have the power in the Zoning Commission to suggest to do that,  
737 so we need this overlay to do that after we have done it but it requires some work.

738  
739 Ms. Mattei: I want to recap what I've heard tonight. Single family and multi-family densities are way too  
740 high; you want to see those come down; commercial seems to be something that is workable. Mixed use  
741 sounds like it's something that could be considered a positive as long as we're not lining 23 completely  
742 with mixed use. Building height is an issue although commercial is currently 50', so for commercial it's  
743 not so bad, but for multi-family and industrial we want to take a look at that.

744  
745 Mr. Duell: Yes, because there's brand new block-like apartments down 23; that I definitely don't want to  
746 see. I'm sure the people who bought the homes which are probably a little closer than what you'd get up  
747 here, behind them didn't expect to see 3 or 4 large apartment buildings right in front of them.

748  
749 Ms. Mattei: How does everybody feel about taking a good look at the text and getting written comments  
750 back to Michele within a week?

751  
752 Okay with Board

753  
754 Ms. Mattei: Michele, do we have any comments that we need to address from YouTube?

## Zoning Commission

755 Ms. Boni: Yes, there were several. I explained to those commenting that we had the two open house  
756 meetings and we got a lot of public feedback then, but if we weren't able to address all these comments  
757 this evening, I copied and saved all of them and would share them with the Board members, but I'll give  
758 an overview of some of them. Mark Freeman states what about 3-story apartment buildings with land-  
759 scape buffer separating from single family. There were some people that agreed with that. I'm sure  
760 popular businesses would be happy to have customers living closer or even the employees. Someone said  
761 Epcon condos are nice. Mark Freeman mentioned what's so terrible about the Short North? I like visiting  
762 there; it brings in a lot of money. There are a few more but I'll put this together and share with everybody.  
763 We got some positive feedback, and at least two individuals who commented now were at the open  
764 houses and hopefully they understand the intent of this meeting this evening. If the Commission is okay  
765 with submitting comments to me, I'll put together a memo. I did ask Christine Trebellas to also review  
766 this text. She's not part of the quorum for this but that's because she couldn't predict being able to attend  
767 meetings because of some other study she's working on, but she did have some good feedback which I'd  
768 also like to put together to share with everybody as well. Once I get everyone's comments, I'll put a  
769 master one together and if I can get overall consensus that you all are okay with those, we'll get started  
770 working on the revisions. Then the next step would be to recess this to a new hearing date. In talking with  
771 Holly earlier, if we get revisions in a week or so, we need another two weeks to put something together,  
772 so we're looking at early to mid-July to reschedule this.

773  
774 Mr. Duell: When's your meeting with Regional Planning?

775  
776 Ms. Boni: We haven't scheduled that, we wanted to get everybody's feedback, but I'll reach out to Scott  
777 Sanders next week.

778  
779 Mr. Duell: Part of what I say will echo what he says as far as some of those areas to be removed and some  
780 of his other comments, so make sure you make the time to talk to him.

781  
782 Ms. Boni: And I'll share what transpires at that meeting too. As far as the calendar for July, the only thing  
783 we have on the agenda so far is the Reserve at North Farms on July 28, so I'm leaning toward July 7<sup>th</sup> if  
784 everyone is available?

785  
786 Mr. Duell: What's our first normally scheduled?

787  
788 Ms. Boni: The 7<sup>th</sup> and we don't have any new applications in.

### **MOTION TO RECESS ROUTE 23 OVERLAY CORRIDOR DISTRICT TEXT**

790  
791  
792 Motion made by Mr. Pychewicz to recess the Route 23 Overlay Corridor Text until Tuesday, July 7, 2020  
793 at 7:00 p.m. via in virtual matters Zoom; seconded by Mr. Dove.

794  
795 Vote on Motion: Mr. Duell-yes, Mr. Pychewicz-yes, Mr. Dove-yes, Mr. McNulty-yes, Mr. Doherty-yes  
796 Motion carried

797  
798 Meeting adjourned at 9:00 p.m.

799 Minutes prepared by Cindy Davis, Zoning Secretary

800  
801 On September 15, 2020, Mr. Pychewicz made a motion to approve the June 16, 2020 meeting minutes of  
802 the Orange Township Zoning Commission for the Route 23 Corridor Overlay District with the following  
803 corrections:

804



## Zoning Commission

805       • Line 297 should read: "...no one is clamoring for anything over there, the little cross section, that  
806       Turkey Hill..."

807       • Line 568: the word "compares" should read "complains"

808

809       Seconded by Ms. Trebellas

810

811       Vote on Motion: Mr. Pychewicz-yes, Ms. Trebellas-yes, Mr. McNulty-yes, Mr. Doherty-yes

812       Motion carried

813

814