

## Zoning Commission

1 **Route 23 Corridor Overlay District Application #RCOD-21-03**

August 3, 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, August 3, 2021 at 7:00 p.m. to consider the following application:  
7

8 **Route 23 Corridor Overlay District Application #RCOD-21-03, Caliber Collision**, Requesting  
9 approval of a development plan for 74 Parkway Drive, having parcel numbers 31823403006000, and  
10 31823401005000. The development proposed includes an automotive collision repair center to be known  
11 as Caliber Collision.  
12

13 After the conclusion of the hearing, the matter will be submitted to the Orange Township Board of  
14 Township Trustees for its action.  
15

16 The hearing will be held at the Orange Township Hall, 1680 East Orange Road, Lewis Center, Ohio 43035.  
17  
18

19 *Adam Pychewicz, Chairperson*  
20 *Michele Boni, Orange Township Zoning*  
21

22 *Publish one time on or before Friday, July 30, 2021 in the Delaware Gazette.*  
23

24 Roll Call: Adam Pychewicz, Dennis McNulty, Christine Trebellas-absent, Ciara Harris-absent, Leslie  
25 Pierce  
26

27 Township Officials Present: Michele Boni, Development and Zoning Director  
28

29 Holly Mattei: This is the Caliber Collision proposal which is on the northwest corner of Route 23 and  
30 Parkway Drive, and the proposal is for a collision center and storage parking area. As you can see by the  
31 list you have in front of you and was emailed to you, there were quite a few comments submitted by staff  
32 and the other technical review agencies, but staff and the applicant met and went over a lot of the  
33 comments; a significant amount of them are going to be complied with and through the document you  
34 will see that. I have a list of about 10 things that I wanted to highlight and possibly have some further  
35 discussion on or at least just to highlight for you. The first is the setback both along US 23 and Parkway.  
36 The maximum setbacks are not being complied with. With the overlay district one of those purposes was  
37 to bring those buildings closer to the road. On US 23 a significant portion of it is within the 75' maximum  
38 setback but there is a portion that comes outside of it to about 80' or so, and the reason for that is the  
39 angle of the road, so we understand that justification and we ask you for a divergence from that. They do  
40 not meet the 40' maximum setback along Parkway but we're comfortable with diverting from that in a  
41 more significant manner because it's a corner lot and they need to provide their parking some place, so  
42 they are minimizing the parking spaces in that front elevation and getting it as close as they can, but they  
43 are outside of that 40' maximum with one row of parking in the front. The access point furthest to the east  
44 which is the closest to US 23 is too close to the intersection, so they need to revise their plans so to move  
45 that back further, and the Delaware County Engineer's Office has indicated that they are willing to work  
46 with them and find an appropriate location. They're fine with 2 access points, the fire department wants 2  
47 access points, it just needs to be moved and addressed to improve safety at that intersection. The  
48 Delaware County Engineer's Office is requesting an access easement to the north and is actually required  
49 by our regulations to have connectivity to the north as well. The Engineer's Office suggested having it all  
50 the way to the west, either aligning with where the dumpster location is so that it comes straight out that

## Zoning Commission

51 access point or even further west where you see the green space setback. We, technical review, and staff  
52 suggested a cross-access more in line with the service drive that runs parallel to 23 just to provide a more  
53 frontage road that you would see on connecting properties. So that's up for discussion but they need to  
54 provide some kind of cross access to that north side. Their parking is currently not broken up into pods; it  
55 does not meet the maximum of 12 in one row and 24 spaces on the dual road but they have indicated that  
56 they can comply with that and they will revise the site plan for that. There's also no access to that rear  
57 parking row. That area is for their storage of vehicles but per the regulations, we require a drive aisle on  
58 the back side of that. They have indicated they will be putting that in. We also talked extensively about  
59 the screening of that area because it is where they are going to be storing cars they are working on to be  
60 sure it's properly screened and buffered from adjacent uses and the public rights-of-way. As far as  
61 signage, we had a lot of comments but I think we've narrowed it down to just a couple that need  
62 discussion. One is the monument sign is going to be more than 20' from the entrance to the property, and  
63 that's probably going to become more of a variance as they move that access point forward from 23  
64 because they want their sign out on 23. We support this variance so they can have their sign out along 23  
65 and have this safe access point as well. They mention Panel 1 and Panel 2 are wayfinding signs. They are  
66 too large for the wayfinding sign requirements so that will need a divergence. They are also asking for a  
67 divergence on the landscaping. They have street trees shown within their continuous hedgerow for their  
68 parking lot screening. They don't have enough spacing to get those trees out. That's their justification as  
69 they want to put the street trees in that hedgerow, so that needs discussion because they are going to be  
70 requesting a variance for that. The last thing is the architecture. There are three things we discussed with  
71 them in detail. The roof, they do actually have a pitched roof in the rear, so they are going to revise their  
72 front elevation where that parapet is to create more of a hipped roof and a pitched roof affect from 23 to  
73 comply with the regulations. They also do not have enough design elements on the south elevation, so  
74 they are willing to put those in; they don't have a problem with that and they're going to work on adding  
75 in the design elements to meet the requirements. The last thing is that they are utilizing in this current  
76 proposal CMU's which are split lots which are prohibited within the regulations. They can use EIFS  
77 which is a permitted material. They are also asking us to look at this structure rock but I will let them  
78 explain more about that material. It is not on our list of permitted materials but it is very similar to some  
79 of the materials we have on the list, and there is a provision in the regulations allowing us to provide  
80 alternative materials which are similar to the natural materials that are required.

81  
82 Nick Fore, Cross Development, 9461 Kenwood Road, Cincinnati, Ohio. As Holly mentioned, we worked  
83 with them and complied with a lot of the comments; there were a few we weren't able to comply with.  
84 We are working on these plans for resubmittal for next Monday, but we have already moved the front  
85 access point closer to 23 to the west side of the customer parking area to meet the County's requirement.  
86 We have also added the landscaping element at the parking to comply with the requirement and added the  
87 multi-use trail to comply as well, something I would like to discuss with you, and also in the rear we have  
88 pulled that back and instead of single row parking, we have doubled that up and moved closer to the  
89 building as per your requirements. As far as the cross access easement, we have been in contact with the  
90 County. Mike Love has agreed to allow us to go down to a 30' cross access easement on the west side of  
91 the lot which we think we've got enough room back there. Also, we have had some preliminary  
92 conversations on Pacer Drive that is more to the west side of our lot which is proposed for the future and  
93 that barely accesses the southwest corner of the parcel, so we would revisit to provide that access  
94 easement until Pacer Drive goes in, then that access would transfer over to Pacer Drive. As far as the  
95 elevations, structure rock panels are something we've been using at other cities. It's technically defined as  
96 an architectural metal panel but it looks very similar to EIFS. From my understanding, it's easier  
97 constructability out in the field. There's just one layer with the structure rock panel while with EIFS  
98 there's multiple layers so you're adding costs for labor, etc., so probably the biggest thing for us is the  
99 cost but it does look similar to the EIFS so we've been successful using it in other states so we're  
100 proposing it here as well.

101

## Zoning Commission

102 Mr. McNulty: What are the dimensions of that building?

103

104 Mr. Fore: It's a 16,000 square foot building. It's about 170' long and 95' in width.

105

106 Mr. McNulty: Where is this located on 23 and is that other drive south of the building?

107

108 Mr. Fore: Parkway Drive.

109

110 Mr. McNulty: How far north, are there any landmarks, just the general location?

111

112 Mr. Fore: Just north of Orange Road about ½ mile on the northwest corner of 23 and Parkway.

113 Orangepoint Drive is just north of us, Shoot Point Blank to the northeast, there's an auto type use on the

114 southwest and the hospital to the northwest.

115

116 Mr. McNulty: It's a rather industrial looking building which we kind of heard about from the design

117 elements. Obviously you want to make it big; obviously you plan on doing great business. I love the

118 optimism.

119

120 Mr. Fore: I don't know if you know a lot about Caliber, but they've got a thousand stores across the

121 country. They're the largest auto body shop, a lot of minor repairs, some painting in paint booths, all

122 inside the building, all closed doors so you're not going to get the loud sound outside the doors.

123

124 Ms. Boni: So all auto work would be done inside?

125

126 Mr. Fore: All isolated inside.

127

128 Mr. McNulty: State of the art technology facility.

129

130 Mr. Fore: Yes I just walked through one the other day and it's very impressive.

131

132 Mr. McNulty: Is there another facility similar to this in another city that duplicates this construction

133 somewhere?

134

135 Mr. Fore: Yes. We've got 3 that are pretty close to opening up in the Columbus area. One in Dublin, one

136 in Columbus and one in Reynoldsburg.

137

138 Mr. McNulty: Similar to this design, same size?

139

140 Mr. Fore: Very similar. All 3 are the same size building.

141

142 Mr. Pierce: Where's the one in Dublin?

143

144 Mr. Fore: 5600 Innovation Drive.

145

146 Mr. Pierce: On the back side where you talk about the covered spot outside where you have cars that

147 haven't been brought in yet; what is that material going to be for the cover?

148

149 Mr. Fore: That is not covered; it will just be screened by landscaping and there will also be the fence,

150 whatever material is required we will be installing to screen the whole area. They only get in 3 or 4

151 deliveries a day; most of these are drive in vehicles.

## Zoning Commission

152 Ms. Boni: Will the vehicles be stored outside overnight?

153

154 Mr. Fore: Yes, but for a very short amount of time, only a few days at most but they do have to utilize  
155 that storage area.

156

157 Mr. Pierce: What kind of fencing would be required? Is it something where those cars won't be visible?

158

159 Ms. Mattei: Yes, there's a requirement for a 5' fence as well as landscaping to provide the buffer. They  
160 have not provided the detail to us. That's one thing we have noted and they will be providing with their  
161 resubmittal package.

162

163 Mr. Pychewicz: The fence looks like it goes across the access drive. Is there a gate there?

164

165 Mr. Fore: Yes. That second access drive to the west is only there per the Fire Department's requirement,  
166 so we're providing that for them but there would be a sliding gate at the access point and there's also a  
167 sliding gate north of the building on the northeast side of the building.

168

169 Mr. Pychewicz: If we could go back to the material, you said the alternative you're proposing is very  
170 similar to EIFS, at least has the same characteristics, you said it was like a panel, but does it have a foam  
171 core or something in there and then actual material is on the outside of that, similar to EIFS?

172

173 Mr. Fore: I believe it's just the panel; the outside is similar to EIFS. From my understanding that's the  
174 difference and that's why it's preferred in the field, because you don't have that multi-layer system versus  
175 this, which is just a single layer.

176

177 Mr. Pychewicz: How big are these panels, what's the largest they come in or what are you intending to  
178 use there? Are we going to have reveal lines every 4' to where it's going to have these lines carried across  
179 the building? Is it something that's going to create a lot of reveals or do they kind of butt up together and  
180 blend? From the picture it looks like you can see some reveals.

181

182 Mr. Fore: I think you can; I don't know the exact dimension, maybe every foot or so you're going to see  
183 it.

184

185 Mr. Pychewicz: With EIFS and having that foam core, especially in a situation where it's carrying down  
186 the side of the building and not up high like in this picture especially in any type of shop or environment  
187 where you're going to be working on cars or anything like that, you tend to have a lot of damage to the  
188 walls because with that foam core it doesn't tend to hold up very well. If this is just the panel with that  
189 cementitious face, I would prefer that because it sounds like something that would be more durable.

190

191 Mr. Pierce: Do you have an alternate in mind already if you need one?

192

193 Mr. Fore: I think it would be the EIFS which meets the Code and it has been successful.

194

195 Ms. Boni: Is the Commission overall okay with this proposed material? I just want to be able to pass this  
196 on to the Trustees.

197

198 Mr. Pychewicz: I'm okay with it for the reasons I stated.

199

200 Mr. McNulty: Is that what you're using on your other facilities that you just recently built?

201

## Zoning Commission

202 Mr. Fore: Yes. Every city is different, but we've been using it a lot more. A lot of cities are going away  
203 from low buildings and that's a material that would be used for those and this is the material we've been  
204 proposing.

205  
206 Mr. Pierce: And the cities that have rejected it, what was their reasoning? Was it just because of their  
207 Code or did someone speak of their experience and what they've seen elsewhere?

208  
209 Mr. Fore: I don't know that I've had any rejected yet. I've got a couple other areas that are going through  
210 it right now but we've been successful in a couple places in Missouri.

211  
212 Mr. Pierce: But that's the same material you used in Dublin and Reynoldsburg?

213  
214 Mr. Fore: I will have to pull up those elevations and you can check it out.

215  
216 Mr. McNulty: My guess is that it's a relatively new material

217  
218 Mr. Fore: From my understanding it is. It's something our architects have proposed within the last six  
219 months just because we've run into this issue so many times. One thing we are changing is the bottom  
220 quarter of the building; it will be stone all the way around.

221  
222 Ms. Mattei: One of the design element choices is a stone water course table, so they're going to change  
223 that to the stone.

224  
225 Mr. McNulty: Does Delaware County propose a road behind your building? Is that for the future because  
226 I know right now there's nothing there?

227  
228 Mr. Fore: From my understanding it's a developer driven project but it is proposed. We're going to do a  
229 lot of utility work, run a sewer line from Pacer Drive and bring down a 12" water line for service.

230  
231 Mr. Pychewicz: Going back to the elevations. I'm assuming that's some type of exhausting, those taller  
232 stacks on there. Are those going to be screened at all?

233  
234 Ms. Boni: How tall are those?

235  
236 Ms. Mattei: We had a comment asking about the height and the screening. The response letter said they're  
237 going to reduce the height so they're down to 6' in height and they will be screened.

238  
239 Mr. McNulty: What are those for? Those make this building look really industrial.

240  
241 Mr. Pierce: Could those be put on the side or anything like that?

242  
243 Mr. Fore: No, but to Holly's point, we are going to be bringing them down and screening.

244  
245 Mr. Pierce: What are those for?

246  
247 Mr. Fore: Those are part of the state of the art system for the paint booths. There are 2 paint booths in  
248 there and I've been told they're so good they don't have to wear masks inside them. They have fans inside  
249 them from the floor going up.

250  
251 Mr. Pychewicz: Are those going to be screened by bringing up the exterior wall or are you going to do

## Zoning Commission

252 something similar to how you screen the mechanical?  
253  
254 Mr. Fore: I think it will be similar as to how we screen the mechanicals.  
255  
256 Mr. Pychewicz: And those will be brought down to about 6' in height?  
257  
258 Ms. Mattei: That 6' complies with the regulations. What they have now doesn't.  
259  
260 Mr. Pychewicz: Is there screening or enclosure for the dumpster as well or is the fence that's surrounding  
261 all that parking intended to be the screening for that?  
262  
263 Mr. Fore: There's an enclosure.  
264  
265 Ms. Mattei: It was not included in the packet. It was noted as a missing item, and they responded they  
266 will comply with the regulations and will have that on their revised plans.  
267  
268 Mr. McNulty: I heard they were requiring a drive into your storage parking on the west side.  
269  
270 Mr. Fore: The Fire Department is requesting that.  
271  
272 Mr. McNulty: And you already answered my question that they are intending to build a road back there.  
273  
274 Ms. Boni: Most of the parcels around the site are proposed for commercial per our Comp Plan.  
275  
276 Mr. Pychewicz: In regard to the street scape, what is the reasoning behind putting the trees within the  
277 hedge row and not the location the Code is saying? Is there a hardship or something that those can't be  
278 moved to be compliant? Is that a divergence?  
279  
280 Ms. Mattei: They are proposing a divergence. I am not quite sure why they can't move the hedge row to  
281 run parallel with the service drive and then have the street trees in the normal location. I think we might  
282 need some better justification as to why you can't do that.  
283  
284 Mr. Fore: I will have to get with the architect on that. I'm not quite up to speed on that and will bring  
285 back a better justification.  
286  
287 Ms. Boni: Just for clarification, would that be for Parkway or both?  
288  
289 Ms. Mattei: It would be for both. It doesn't look like Parkway has as much room as 23 but along the 23  
290 frontage I don't see why they can't get that in.  
291  
292 Ms. Boni: Have you contacted the property owners or residents about your project yet?  
293  
294 Mr. Fore: We have not, just the one that's under contract as a part of this deal. Is there a certain  
295 requirement?  
296  
297 Ms. Boni: We always notify them but we suggest you reach out. We send out a notice prior to the public  
298 hearing but it wouldn't hurt for them to be aware of what's coming.  
299  
300 Mr. McNulty: Did I hear about a divergence for the monument sign on 23?

## Zoning Commission

301 Ms. Mattei: Yes because the regulations require it to be within 20' of their access point, but their access  
302 point is on Parkway Drive, so to have their sign on 23 they need a divergence from that setback  
303 requirement.

304

305 Ms. Boni: Is there a sign plan?

306

307 Ms. Mattei: There is.

308

309 Mr. McNulty: Does the sign meet the requirements for the size?

310

311 Ms. Mattei: Yes.

312

313 Mr. McNulty: It's just its location, setback?

314

315 Ms. Mattei: Correct.

316

317 Mr. Fore: We ran into that a couple of times when we were trying to meet all the requirements. Typically  
318 customer parking is in front of the store; we moved that. We tried to get the building as close as we could  
319 between the 50' zone and the setback and similar to that drive back.

320

321 Mr. Pychewicz: Are you doing the A-frame signs or have those been omitted? Those aren't allowed, are  
322 they?

323

324 Ms. Mattei: We questioned what the purpose of those were and it was indicated that they are for  
325 temporary purposes, so they will need to comply with the temporary sign requirements of the overlay.

326

327 Mr. Pychewicz: Is there a restriction on the amount of colors?

328

329 Ms. Mattei: Not in the overlay plan.

330

331 Mr. Pierce: What are those other 3 signs?

332

333 Ms. Mattei: Those are the wayfinding signs that are way too big. They will be asking for a divergence for  
334 those to allow them to be more than 3 square feet.

335

336 Mr. Pierce: But we're not sure where they're going to be?

337

338 Ms. Mattei: No. We didn't understand where they were in the original application and then the response  
339 letter said in the shop, so I didn't know what they were trying to say. I think it may have been a typo and  
340 that it should be on the shop. That needs some clarification.

341

342 Mr. Pierce: The monument sign on 23, that's not going to be a problem for people turning right I assume.

343

344 Ms. Mattei: No, I think its setback far enough on 23. The divergence is just how far it is from the access  
345 point.

346

347 Mr. Fore: The other thing I want to talk about is the multi-use trail. To get a better understanding, and we  
348 want to comply as much as we can, we just wanted to get everybody's thoughts. We had in our original  
349 proposal to provide along 23 which is required but was eliminated heading west along that Pacer project  
350 that will be done ultimately, so we didn't see a reason for it just to save some costs there.

## Zoning Commission

351 Ms. Mattei; We did ask them to provide an in-lot crossing along Parkway Drive so the multi-use path gets  
352 built with the development to the south so they can cross easily to get to it. That's where they want to  
353 terminate the multi-use path. The more I have thought about it and talked to Michele about it, we just  
354 don't feel there's a justification to divert from that requirement. We have required it with every  
355 development. We want them to be stubbed in to adjacent properties so that if anything is ever re-  
356 developed, trails are required, so we want to have that all the way to the property line.

357  
358 Mr. Fore: So wrapping around....

359  
360 Ms. Mattei: To your west property line.

361  
362 Mr. Fore: Michele and I have talked about it and I drove around like at the hospital, I didn't see one. Is  
363 that something new?

364  
365 Ms. Mattei: This is new with the overlay, so it is an overlay requirement, so you are the fourth or fifth  
366 project to come through the overlay and every single one of them has been required to stub.

367  
368 Mr. Fore: But to get a sidewalk in front of the hospital, is that something the Township would ultimately  
369 pay for to have it mesh up with ours?

370  
371 Ms. Boni: I think in working with our Roads and Parks Department if there is a connection if we could  
372 find the funding for it, we could work with them. It's already developed so we can't ask them to construct  
373 it.

374  
375 Mr. Fore: That's why I was curious why we were the only one putting a sidewalk out there with no one  
376 connected to it, so I was just trying to get a better understanding.

377  
378 Ms. Boni: The goal is for it all to be connected eventually.

379  
380 Mr. Pierce: Just out of curiosity, what drove them to place this in Lewis Center?

381  
382 Mr. Fore: Like I mentioned, we're active in the Columbus market and this is an area that seems to be  
383 growing a lot.

384  
385 Mr. McNulty: It would be interesting to find out if those signs for wayfinding are going to be on the  
386 building. I don't have an issue with it being mounted; it makes the most sense to me.

387  
388 Mr. Fore: I will get some clarification for you on that.

389  
390 Mr. McNulty: And you'll have to get some clarification from Delaware County as to what that road to the  
391 west looks like so you can create that access point because right now you don't know what you're putting  
392 it in for.

393  
394 Mr. Fore: I think for now we're just the one in our site now and then Pacer Drive will be in the future so I  
395 don't think we're putting in anything there right now.

396  
397 Mr. McNulty: So the whole point is to get this approved without that road but is Fire saying they require  
398 it or are they leaving that open as well?

399  
400 Mr. Fore: From my understanding the County is just requiring an easement running across our parcel and



## Zoning Commission

401 the parcels north of us and then Pacer Drive is a separate project.

402

403 Ms. Boni: The Fire Department typically likes two accesses so whether it's on the north or somewhere  
404 else.

405

406 Mr. Fore: I think Pacer Drive runs across the back of our parcel.

407

408 Mr. McNulty: Future?

409

410 Mr. Fore: Future.

411

412 Ms. Boni: And that will most likely have sidewalks; any new road has to have them.

413

414 Ms. Mattei: And then that will connect up to the north so another reason to have that.

415

416 Mr. Pychewicz: Number 4, on the northeast corner, a transformer, underground electric, so your cross  
417 access easement won't really work there so you're proposing it on the west side near the dumpster,  
418 correct?

419

420 Mr. Fore: That's correct; we just have a little more room.

421

422 Ms. Mattei: Next steps would be they will revise their plans in accordance with the comments and what  
423 they heard tonight, resubmit by August 9 and then be on the Trustees' agenda for August 16 at 6 p.m.  
424 here.

425

426 Mr. Fore: As I mentioned, we're extending that sewer roughly 1,000 feet and then that water main at least  
427 250 feet. Is there any kind of vehicle in place that would help us with the cost?

428

429 Ms. Boni: I would advise you to contact Delaware County Economic Development.

430

431 Ms. Mattei: I sent the application on to Zach in Economic Development but I can connect you with  
432 Kelsey as well and let her know you have some specific questions about that.

433

434 Meeting adjourned at 7:45 p.m.

435 Minutes prepared by Cindy Davis, Zoning Secretary.

436

437

438