

Zoning Commission

1 **US 23 Overlay District**

August 4, 2020

2
3 **Route 23 Corridor Overlay District (RCOD)**

4
5 The Township was awarded the opportunity to partner with Delaware County Economic Development to
6 develop a new Article (XX) in the Orange Township Zoning Resolution that will create an overlay along
7 the US 23 highway corridor. The first draft of the overlay text is complete and will now be presented to
8 Orange Township Zoning Commission.

9
10 Therefore, the purpose of this meeting is to review and discuss possible revisions to the Orange
11 Township Zoning Resolution, with the assistance of Delaware County Economic Development and their
12 contractual land use planning consultant, Crossroads Community Planning LLC.

13
14 Roll: Adam Pychewicz, Todd Dove, Dustin Doherty-absent, Dennis McNulty-absent, Christine Trebellas

15
16 Township Officials Present: Michele Boni, Planning & Zoning Director
17 Jeff Beard, Zoning Enforcement Officer

18
19 Ms. Boni: I have not heard yet from Mr. McNulty on whether or not he's able to attend this meeting. I
20 just reached out to him so hopefully he can. Mr. Doherty is unable to attend.

21
22 Mr. Pychewicz administered the oath to those wanting to testify. When you testify, please state your
23 name, address and affirm that you have been sworn in. Anyone who intends to offer comments or
24 testimony through the online chat room also needs to be sworn in remotely. Before your initial comment,
25 please type your name and address and the words "I affirm" to indicate you solemnly swear that the
26 testimony you are offering is the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth.

27
28 **MOTION TO RETURN FROM RECESS FOR THE ROUTE 23 CORRIDOR OVERLAY**
29 **DISTRICT**

30
31 Mr. Pychewicz made a motion to return from recess for the Route 23 Corridor Overlay District; seconded
32 by Ms. Trebellas.

33
34 Vote on Motion: Mr. Pychewicz-yes, Mr. Dove-yes, Ms. Trebellas-yes
35 Motion carried

36
37 Ms. Boni: I'll leave it to Holly Mattei, our Planning Consultant for this project, to move forward with the
38 next agenda item if that's okay.

39
40 Mr. Pychewicz: Michele, do you want to run through what we got from legal or should we do that after?

41
42 Ms. Boni: Holly, do you mind giving an overview on that?

43
44 Holly Mattei with Crossroads Community Planning, 49 Stoney Bluff Way, Lithopolis, Ohio, we met with
45 legal counsel Brosius, Johnson & Griggs from Columbus since the last draft was prepared, and they have
46 provided us with a memo. It really encompasses two overarching comments, and we as a team as far as
47 staff from the Township, Delaware County and myself agree with both comments, and we plan to revise
48 the document based on these recommendations. The first one has to do with modifications. The way the
49 current draft is written there is what would be pre-development plan modifications and post-development

Zoning Commission

50 plan approval amendments. The pre-development plan approval modifications are split between minor
51 and major modifications, and the amendment after the development plan is approved would go to the
52 Zoning Commission if it's a major and the Trustees if it's a minor. The legal counsel feels it's a little
53 confusing having all those different processes tied into these two different modifications. They recom-
54 mended a more streamlined process and what they're calling pre-development plan approvals will be
55 referred to as divergences, which they feel is more consistent with the way you do that currently with
56 your PUD's, and those divergences would just be identified in their development plan when it's submitted
57 to the Zoning Inspector. The Zoning Inspector would then make a recommendation to the Trustees
58 whether or not those divergences should or should not be approved as part of that development plan.
59 There would be no minor or major; it would all just be divergences identified at the development plan
60 stage approved by the Trustees. Then they are recommending the post-development plan approvals be
61 referred to as modifications, and those be the major and minor modifications. Anything that's minor,
62 which we outlined previously in the regulations, could be approved administratively by the Zoning
63 Inspector. Anything major would be sent back to the Trustees for approval because they are considered a
64 major amendment to the development plan. They feel that keeping that consistent with the Trustees'
65 approval for both of those makes it a much clearer process and provides a more legally defensible
66 document in their mind, so we've agreed to both of those.

67

68 Mr. Dove: So it never goes back to the Zoning Commission?

69

70 Ms. Matei: It does not. They felt it needed to stay at that Trustees level because they're the ones that
71 originally approved it.

72

73 Mr. Dove: And whose attorneys are these?

74

75 Ms. Mattei: They were retained by the Delaware County Finance Authority.

76

77 Mr. Pychewicz: Just to clarify this, before we had the minor or major. If it was minor it would go directly
78 to the Trustees and skip over the Zoning Board. If it was major, then it would come through Zoning and
79 then go on. Are you saying now in the pre-review it would go to the Zoning Inspector who would make a
80 determination based on whatever the divergences are if it needs to go to Zoning or directly to the
81 Trustees?

82

83 Ms. Mattei: What's being recommended is that it stays with the Trustees; it would never go back to the
84 Zoning Commission, so the Zoning Inspector could approve administratively the minor modifications; the
85 major modifications would go to the Trustees and Trustees only because they're the original approving
86 body.

87

88 Mr. Dove: So the Zoning Commission is cut out entirely of the 23 corridor.

89

90 Ms. Mattei: There is the pre-application process where up to two Zoning Commission members can
91 attend that pre-application meeting, and provide insight and input during that process.

92

93 Mr. Dove: But in that text it says they may attend; it doesn't say they shall, so is that an invite thing?

94

95 Ms. Mattei: I have no problem changing that to shall.

96

97 Ms. Boni: I thought it was all modifications would have to be ultimately up to the Trustees because you
98 said minor versus major.

99

Zoning Commission

100 Ms. Mattei: No, they still wanted us to have minor and major for the post-development, and you can
101 administratively approve the minors. We talked about if somebody came in with a 40' height for a
102 commercial and they wanted to raise it to 43', that would be within the 5' of what they got approved for
103 and you could administratively approve it.

104
105 Mr. Pychewicz: If something comes in and has something that would have previously been under major
106 modifications, someone is asking for something well beyond what the Code allows, are the Trustees then
107 comfortable with taking that and not having our input or recommendation sent to them? Are they on
108 board with all these applications going directly to them?

109
110 Ms. Boni: From my understanding, yes, and then staff would review it as we would review any planned
111 district that comes in and identify all the listed divergences they are requesting, we would share that
112 report with the Trustees and they would ultimately decide on that, but it is my understanding that they are
113 comfortable with this process.

114
115 Ms. Trebellas: In the past they have been uncomfortable making these decisions or when they were made,
116 they created issues for the Township because they don't necessarily have a background in zoning and its
117 implications.

118
119 Ms. Boni: I believe that was prior boards.

120
121 Ms. Trebellas: So the new Boards have no problem with taking on zoning responsibilities?

122
123 Ms. Boni: Correct.

124
125 Ms. Mattei: The second has to do with the application and development plan content. We heard from the
126 development side of things and reiterated from the legal standpoint that contents of the development plan
127 were pretty stringent and compared to other communities was more than what's required in other Town-
128 ships and it can potentially be cost prohibitive for someone to pull down the cloud, and they may try to
129 avoid pulling down the cloud and go with the underlying zoning district instead. We made some modi-
130 fications to the text which are in the draft you reviewed today because we heard that from the develop-
131 ment side on a few things. Some had to do with detailed engineering. We had language in the first draft
132 about size of pipes and such. At a zoning stage, developers probably don't know exact sizes, so we
133 changed that to preliminary engineering, preliminary layouts of the buildings, etc. A couple things they
134 wanted us to do we said we want to keep in there. The lighting plan requirements we kept in there. The
135 development side wanted us to eliminate some language regarding the County Engineer's approval for
136 access and deed restrictions for keeping open space maintained. We kept the language for all of those but
137 we required a letter of intent of how they were going to maintain their open space and that they are
138 required to provide those covenants or restrictions to the Zoning Inspector before a Zoning Permit is
139 issued for construction; letter from the County Engineer's Office specifically stating they have reviewed
140 for access and access is feasible; letter from the County Sanitary Engineer's Office would say there is
141 sewer available; and from the water provider, whoever that it is has capacity to service the site, so saying
142 what we want in those letters instead of leaving it open ended to give the developers a little more
143 predictability of what we're looking for. Those changes are in your second draft that you reviewed for
144 tonight. What's not in the changes is some of the Traffic Studies. We made some changes to Traffic Study
145 requirements but legal counsel recommended further changes, so the draft you reviewed for tonight
146 created a tiered system for the Traffic Study. Previously, we required a Traffic Study and that caused
147 concerns that they have to pay for the study up front and possibly not get approved. So if you were under
148 a certain peak hour or new vehicle trips added, you didn't have to do a study at all. I believe its 100 peak
149 hour trips, so very small development. Then we created a middle level where the developer is required to
150 do a Traffic Study but could delay it until after the development plan is approved as long as he agreed to

Zoning Commission

151 include all the recommendations coming out of the Traffic Study as approved by the Delaware County
152 Engineer, ODOT or Township. So they have to implement all of those before a Zoning Permit is issued.
153 The third part is larger developments, I think over 750 peak hour trips or larger, would have to do the
154 Traffic Study up front with the development plan. Legal counsel felt that was not something that was
155 typically required at the zoning stage and recommended we do away with that third tier and leave
156 everything in that second tier. If we're going to include language in there, if they do not agree to any of
157 the recommendations that are approved by the permitting authority, then they have to come back to the
158 Township to get a revised development plan approved. So it's putting the burden on the developer to
159 make sure those things get done but allowing them to delay it until after that development plan process.

160
161 Mr. Dove: Is the Director of Zoning the legal entity determining when and if they need this traffic count?
162

163 Ms. Mattei: The Director of Zoning or Zoning Inspector is signing off on the Zoning Permit to move to
164 the construction stage, but that Zoning Inspector is relying on the permitting authorities of the roads to
165 say the Traffic Study has been done, reviewed, done to their requirements, and they approve of the
166 recommendations. So the Zoning Inspector is not making any kind of interpretation; the Zoning Inspector
167 is just strictly enforcing what the permitting authorities are saying needs to be done.
168

169 Mr. Dove: Who is determining the trip count amounts to determine when they need to do their Traffic
170 Study?
171

172 Ms. Mattei: In the Zoning Text it refers to the ITE document for studies, which is the Traffic Engineers'
173 document they all use to determine the trips per use. The developer would say this is the use we're
174 proposing, the ITE says this number of trips, and the permitting authority would have to agree that they're
175 using the correct numbers.
176

177 Ms. Trebellas: So the permitting authority is agreeing that they're using the correct number; the Zoning
178 Department has no stake in that?
179

180 Ms. Mattei: We've left it to the permitting authority because they're the ones who review Traffic Studies
181 on a daily basis and understand it. I feel they're the more experienced entity in that.
182

183 Ms. Boni: We do that now if anything comes in in a planned district. I communicate with the County
184 Engineer's Office that they're okay with that.
185

186 Ms. Trebellas: Say the developer says it's under 100 trips; we don't have to do anything. When does it go
187 to the permitting authority to get reviewed to say they're right or wrong?
188

189 Ms. Mattei: That would be identified at the development plan stage. The developer says I'm under 100
190 trips per day. It would be up to the Zoning Inspector to go to the permitting authorities and say, they're
191 telling me this, is this correct? If they say yes, they move forward without the Traffic Study. If they say
192 no, the Zoning Inspector says this is not correct; you need to revise it, or identify that when it goes in
193 front of the Trustees. They're telling me this but the permitting authority is telling me this is wrong.
194

195 Ms. Trebellas: Then the Trustees decide if they're going to go with the permitting authority as opposed to
196 the developer?
197

198 Ms. Mattei: Correct. It would have to be the Trustees making that decision because they're the body
199 approving that development plan.
200

Zoning Commission

201 Ms. Boni: But when it comes to permitting after the development plan is approved, the County reviews
202 our engineering plan, so if the County says this isn't going to work and the layout has to change, they
203 have to go back to the Trustees and start over.

204
205 Ms. Trebellas: What I was getting at was the agreement if ODOT says you can't put a curb cut there on
206 23.

207
208 Ms. Mattei: That's why we have the permitting authority as the entity. That's all I have on the legal
209 review. To review what we've done in the second draft, we've already discussed some of the changes;
210 we'll start at the beginning of the memo. The Purpose section, I added some language saying any word
211 we have defined in this section is capitalized throughout the document. That's just something I have
212 always done in the past and something that's been recommended to me as I've written codes over the
213 years just so people know that is a term that is defined. In the overlay established, there have been no
214 changes made at this point. In the sub-areas, at the last meeting we discussed removing single family sub-
215 area; we have done that, so that is out and areas referred to with single family uses has been removed
216 from the text, so not only the single family sub-area but also any uses within the mixed use area have also
217 been removed.

218
219 Mr. Dove: Remind me why we removed single family.

220
221 Ms. Mattei: Because there were concerns with the densities being proposed and it was decided the best
222 thing was to allow those areas to develop under their existing PUD requirements where those densities
223 have already been established, so they've just been removed out of the overlay.

224
225 Ms. Trebellas: So if a developer has a proposal for a single family development, they would have to go
226 through the traditional planned development as they have to do currently just for single family?

227
228 Ms. Mattei: Correct.

229
230 Mr. Dove: But single family can't go in the 23 overlay, correct because there's not an area zoned for that.

231
232 Ms. Mattei: They can't pull the cloud down for single family. If there's something that currently has a
233 PUD for a single family that's been approved, that zoning continues to run with the land and they can
234 choose to continue to move forward with that if not pull down this cloud.

235
236 Ms. Boni: Or they can file a rezoning.

237
238 Ms. Trebellas: If it's not already zoned single family, any new single family would have to be underneath
239 this overlay unless they go through the process of having the property rezoned?

240
241 Ms. Mattei: Yes, that's correct.

242
243 Mr. Dove: And the Trustees would do that rezoning?

244
245 Ms. Boni: The rezoning will still go through Zoning Commission. It would go as pursuant to the ORC;
246 Regional Planning, Zoning Commission and the Trustees.

247
248 Ms. Mattei: For Procedure, we added the additional stakeholders to the process; that's adding the Zoning
249 Commission members as well as some other entities. I can change that language to shall to help address
250 the issue that came up tonight. I've already talked about the changes to the submittal requirements, Traffic
251 Studies, and minor and major modifications and what we need to do to change that to meet our legal

Zoning Commission

252 review recommendations. Prohibited uses, this is an area we expanded and this is based on the feedback
253 from the last meeting. There was concern that the commercial uses specifically were too broad in the
254 commercial/office area and that anything that was commercial related could come in. It was identified
255 that the Commission wanted us to look at some of the negotiated approved land uses for some of the
256 PUD's in the area. When I reviewed them, the same broad commercial language was in those overlays but
257 then it prohibited a number of uses, so we mimicked that. We added the prohibited uses so that we could
258 keep it broad enough that it would create the ability to be creative and allow us to possibly include uses
259 we may not think of today or may not exist today, but then making sure we're honing back on that and
260 not opening it up for everything by including and expanding the prohibited use list. Commercial sub-
261 areas, that's the same thing we just discussed. We left that broad but then expanded the prohibited uses
262 and added some additional exhibits to help illustrate how various lots could be developed utilizing the
263 proposed standards. We included an internal lot that fronted on 23 and a corner lot that fronted on 23 to
264 try to show how those could be developed. Advanced manufacturing and logistics research and
265 development, there are no major changes that are proposed. Multi-family, we heard at the last meeting
266 that density was a concern, so we reduced the proposed density of 10 acres to 8 acres and then added
267 density bonuses so they can still get back up to the 10 units per acre but they have to provide amenities to
268 get those additional units. In the mixed use sub-area we made some changes to the permitted uses by
269 deleting single family as discussed and added home occupations. It came up at the last meeting that the
270 home occupations standards in the current Code, which was what was being referenced, weren't
271 conducive to the work at home environment we're experiencing today, so we put language in allowing
272 home occupations to be permissive if they're not changing the character of the neighborhood, no more
273 than 20% of the livable area, no outside employees, so somebody working an office job that just wants to
274 set up their computer in their home can do that without jumping through a number of hoops. It's very
275 typical of what we see in communities around Ohio. Mix of uses, we adjusted mix of uses because we
276 eliminated the single family component so now that only addresses multi-family in the mixed use areas
277 and showing what those types of mixtures must be in each of the mix use areas. We added an additional
278 drawing to show how a mixed use development could be laid out with townhomes, mixed use buildings
279 with green space and how all that can meet the standards. The next big things we changed are the
280 architectural requirements. We received a lot of comment at the last meeting, mostly about use of newer
281 materials. I defined a new material as anything that does not exist as of the adoption date of the overlay
282 district, so the purpose of newer materials is new technology may come along in the future that allows
283 manufactured materials that look like natural materials. So if there is something that meets the intent,
284 looks like a natural material that's permitted but is manufactured, it gives the Trustees the ability to
285 approve that if it's something of a newer technology after the adoption date of the overlay district. We
286 made other minor modifications to the architectural requirements to help clarify some of the text and
287 concerns that we received. In the Landscaping section, we increased the height of the parking lot
288 screening to 36"; that was previously 30". One comment we received wanted it at 36". Parking, there's no
289 major changes; however, Michele reached out to a couple of developers since the second draft went out
290 and there was one comment from them regarding the residential parking areas, that the maximum parking
291 for those may not be enough to meet the demand for residential units, so we're looking into that and may
292 need to make changes for the next draft. Access and connectivity, no major changes. Lighting, we had a
293 height requirement for the lights that was not consistent with what the Township currently requires, so we
294 changed that to 20' to remain consistent with the Township's current practices. Signs, we've done a
295 number of different things with that. We talked about murals last time, about how murals could be an
296 artistic way to brighten up a mixed use area, so we decided we wanted to allow murals but we had an
297 issue with a permit being required because of it possibly being content based, so we took out the permit
298 requirement to avoid that legal issue. We clarified that maximum sign area is 36 square feet for the
299 monument signs per sign face. There was concern last time that read that was for the whole sign. We
300 added language to the temporary sign section that allowed the Zoning Inspector to grant a one time, 90
301 day extension for large temporary signs. The way it's currently written is they can get three 30 day
302 permits but there was concern from Jeff who does the sign permits that there were some of these

Zoning Commission

303 temporary signs for developments out there for 6 months. This would give another one 90 day extension
304 that would end up giving them the full 6 months and anything above and beyond that would have to be
305 approved through the development plan. We added additional restrictions to the electronic message
306 displays. Those are written in a way that will only apply to the gas station signs by regulating the size of
307 them, and we added language regarding the regulation of the luminance levels and requiring them to be
308 turned off after business hours. In the Utility section, we encouraged regional detention. That was
309 something Regional Planning wanted us to include and also compliance with the OEPA's Olentangy
310 permit. Accessory structures, we removed the areas referring to single family uses, both for accessory
311 structures and fences. I already talked about home occupations. In the Definition section, we added a
312 definition for auto oriented uses. This is something we referred to as being prohibited within the mixed
313 use area but there was no definition for what the auto oriented uses were, and this includes drive thru's
314 and such because we want it to be a walkable community. We also removed any definitions that applied
315 to single family uses, added a definition for home occupation, and we defined a townhome. Those are a
316 broad overview of the changes, and I open it up for questions.

317
318 Mr. Dove: The self-storage units that were removed, are those removed from all of the 23 overlay or is it
319 just one of the areas?

320
321 Ms. Mattei: The prohibited uses apply to all sub-areas within the 23 overlay, but if they don't pull down
322 the cloud and the underlying district allows it, they would be allowed under the underlying district.

323
324 Mr. Dove: Are we calling the cloud this overlay?

325
326 Ms. Mattei: Yes.

327
328 Ms. Trebellas: So a developer or property owner has the choice to use what the existing zoning is or to
329 use the overlay?

330
331 Ms. Mattei: Correct. Once they use the overlay though the existing zoning goes away.

332
333 Ms. Trebellas: Other jurisdictions also include RV and boat storage facilities as part of the outdoor
334 storage facilities. It looks like we don't have anything. Is this prohibiting RV or boat storage off 23?

335
336 Mr. Dove: I think that would be no exterior storage is allowed.

337
338 Ms. Trebellas: That's of inoperable, unlicensed or unused vehicles.

339
340 Ms. Mattei: We can clarify that if you want to make sure that those are prohibited.

341
342 Ms. Trebellas: I know besides self-storage facilities, because we are close to Alum Creek, there are also
343 storage facilities for people with RV's and boats. Some are restricted in areas, some are not. My personal
344 preference is that they would be restricted. It just does not seem to be included in this current document.

345
346 Mr. Dove: I personally don't have a problem depending on where they go. The toy box that was approved
347 which is all interior storage and the orange storage place on 23, but there's no exterior storage allowed at
348 either one of those locations.

349
350 Ms. Trebellas: And the Toy Box was done as a condo, not storage facility; that was one of the uses.

351
352 Ms. Boni: I think boats could be stored; they just can't be parked in front of the building line.

353

Zoning Commission

354 Ms. Trebellas: I have no problem with it in a garage. I have a problem if it's just shrink wrapped lying
355 outside or if it's an RV lying outside. But then it also looks like you've established self-storage facilities
356 are prohibited as well.

357
358 Ms. Mattei: And that was added based upon comments at the last meeting, so that was not in the first draft
359 and when it came up that we were too broad, that was one of the uses that was a concern and that the
360 existing PUD's prohibited, so we added that in.

361
362 Ms. Trebellas: I don't have a problem with restricting self-storage facilities; I believe in our current Code
363 they're allowed but in Industrial. I have no problem if they're along the railroad tracks; I do have a
364 problem if they're along 23.

365
366 Mr. Dove: Industrial is where they should be.

367
368 Ms. Trebellas: So how to craft that into this document, I don't know.

369
370 Ms. Mattei: If you're okay with self-storage and storage units in the Industrial area along the railroad, I'm
371 able to move it to that area and it's only permitted in that sub-area.

372
373 Ms. Trebellas: I also have no problem if they have RV's and boats as long as they're enclosed; not a
374 bunch of RV's all lined up like a school bus garage.

375
376 Ms. Mattei: The permitted uses in the Advanced Manufacturing District are required to be within an
377 enclosed building, so if I move the storage to there, there wouldn't be any outside storage allowed.
378 Everybody agree to that one?

379
380 Mr. Dove/Ms. Trebellas: Yes.

381
382 Mr. Dove: We talked earlier about the multi-family and you said density is from the 10 acres to 8 acres;
383 I'm assuming that's units per acre?

384
385 Ms. Mattei: Correct.

386
387 Mr. Dove: Michele, when we have these meetings that are going to the Trustees now, will we still have a
388 zoning sign on the property announcing it?

389
390 Ms. Boni: I would say yes.

391
392 Mr. Dove: We can't write anything into the text but I think that would be helpful for informing people
393 adjacent to the property which I assume means if they have property touching on the boundary they get
394 informed.

395
396 Ms. Boni: I think it's still the 200', right?

397
398 Ms. Mattei: It follows the Ohio Revised Code which is adjacent properties and across the street.

399
400 Mr. Dove: So it's not 200'?

401
402 Ms. Mattei: I did not write 200'; I followed the Ohio Revised Code.

403
404 Ms. Boni: Can we do the 200' or not? For some reason I thought that was part of the Revised Code.

Zoning Commission

405 Ms. Mattei: No, the Ohio Revised Code says all adjoining properties and across the street.
406
407 Ms. Trebellas: If I have a property that's less than 200' from the property that's potentially going to be
408 rezoned or under this new overlay district, but we don't have an adjoining property line or I'm not
409 directly across the street, I won't know about it?
410
411 Ms. Mattei: The way this is written, you would not be notified by mail.
412
413 Mr. Dove: That's why I'm asking for the signs.
414
415 Ms. Trebellas: I am the property owner, I get notified, do I get invited to the pre-application meeting?
416 How do I find out what's happening next door to me?
417
418 Ms. Mattei: The notification would be of the Trustees' meeting.
419
420 Ms. Trebellas: So I don't know what's going to happen until it goes to the Trustees?
421
422 Ms. Mattei: Correct. That is the official process, the official application, when it goes to the Trustees.
423
424 Ms. Trebellas: The developer/new property owner doesn't have to have a preliminary discussion with me
425 on what's happening next door?
426
427 Ms. Mattei: They're not required to have any discussion with the neighbors. In my 20 years in the
428 planning world, we have always encouraged developers to have neighborhood meetings.
429
430 Ms. Trebellas: We have also asked them to have neighborhood meetings just to avoid complications at a
431 zoning meeting, but it sounds like now potentially this could go before the Trustees and all of a sudden
432 neighbors could come out of the woodwork.
433
434 Ms. Mattei: I don't think there's anything in your Code that requires them to meet with adjoining
435 neighbors. It's encouraged, and Michele and staff would encourage that to happen and I think most
436 developers tend to do that to protect themselves and to get people more on board and more comfortable
437 with it before they go before these public boards.
438
439 Mr. Dove: But it's usually if they're not meeting our Code. If a developer comes in with a strip center
440 adjoining to someone's property but it meets our Code, they don't meet with the neighbors because
441 there's no pushback; there's nothing the Trustees are going to say.
442
443 Ms. Mattei: If it does meet the Code, I think the Trustees are hard pushed, it would be hard not for them
444 to approve it.
445
446 Mr. Dove: Page 41, I, Accessory Structures, the very first sentence; I don't understand it. Accessory
447 structures for all uses except for those on individual....
448
449 Ms. Mattei: I saw that today; it's a typo.
450
451 Mr. Dove: Then on second map, we're removing the multi-family along Lewis Center Road?
452
453 Ms. Mattei: Yes.
454
455 Mr. Dove: That's not part of the district?

Zoning Commission

456 Ms. Mattei: That's correct; it'll be shown as white now.

457

458 Mr. Dove: Not the whole stretch?

459

460 Ms. Mattei: Not the whole stretch; just that white area.

461

462 Mr. Dove: And there's no talk about removing that?

463

464 Ms. Mattei: The whole strip?

465

466 Mr. Dove: Yes.

467

468 Ms. Mattei: We've had conversations on our team level and the thought is to keep that in there except for
469 the part that's....

470

471 Mr. Dove: The developers, right?

472

473 Ms. Mattei: No, Orange Township, Delaware County.

474

475 Ms. Boni: The Zoning Commission can do a stipulation if we don't adjust the maps.

476

477 Mr. Dove: I'd like to see that part and the main part of MU-2 which is adjacent not part of the corridor.

478

479 Ms. Trebellas: Having them part of the corridor flags certain stipulations in the corridor that concern me.

480

481 Mr. Dove: I would be very, very upset if I just built an Epcon house, did my research and everyone
482 around me I thought was going to be single family residential and here it comes.

483

484 Ms. Trebellas: That is also my comment, but not only the people who just bought a house but also some
485 of these residential single family residential communities that are abutting the overlay has me concerned
486 because the 100' buffer we used to have to the residential and other uses has been substantially reduced.
487 So I'm an existing property owner or just spent over 1/2 million dollars on an Epcon home and all of a
488 sudden I find out that I can get a mixed use building within 50' of my backyard.

489

490 Ms. Mattei: The Epcon is where it says remove from this district, correct?

491

492 Ms. Trebellas: Correct, but all those properties right now for the most part are single family residential.

493

494 Ms. Boni: Those are all farm residential.

495

496 Ms. Trebellas: One of comment I had is some of these adjacencies in between the single family residential
497 and the uses in the overlay don't correspond with our current zoning which is fine except if I bought a
498 house or buy one of those properties and all of a sudden have commercial next door, the setback is 25'
499 from my home where it used to be 100'.

500

501 Ms. Mattei: All of the sub-areas require 50' that are abutting a residential district. It's currently 100' and
502 that would be reduced but it would not be 25', it would be 50'.

503

504 Ms. Boni: Then MU-2 or at least a big part of it we purposely did not add these on here, so it would have
505 even a larger buffer.

506

Zoning Commission

507 Mr. Dove: I just hate surrounding our town of Lewis Center with Evans Farm across the street, multi-
508 family and then multi-use. Right now we have that big part of MU-2; wasn't that to be part of the Home
509 Road Extension that was all going to be single family?

510
511 Ms. Boni: It is still.

512
513 Mr. Dove: My comment is get rid of multi-family and the big part of MU-2 and not have that as part of
514 this corridor. I think we have enough in this corridor right now.

515
516 Ms. Mattei: I think what we need to do is let Michele recommend it and have that be a stipulation when
517 the Zoning Commission makes its recommendation to the Trustees.

518
519 Mr. Dove: Map 4 will need to reflect Map 3 because we're removing from the strip, we might as well do
520 it on 4 as well which might just be formatting. I still don't like some of the building heights and the only
521 comment on the murals is how are we making sure that it's not a billboard?

522
523 Ms. Mattei: That I believe that is a comment Jeff Beard just made to us today, that maybe the mural has to
524 be tied to the business on site in some way, otherwise it would be considered an off premise sign and that
525 helps you with your billboard comment.

526
527 Mr. Dove: But if it's tied to Verizon and Verizon does a mural and it's a big Verizon mural, isn't that a
528 billboard?

529
530 Ms. Mattei: I think it's going to be very difficult to regulate. Originally we had murals as being prohibited
531 for that reason. It was a recommendation of Regional Planning to include them because they could be
532 cool in a mixed use area. I don't want murals to hang up this overlay district. I would recommend just
533 making them prohibited if that's going to be a huge issue. I'd rather move forward and not focus on that.

534
535 Ms. Trebellas: I think murals could be cool as well but at what point is it no longer a mural and becomes a
536 sign or what if it's a mural that people object politically to?

537
538 Ms. Mattei: And with the Township's hands being tied on content base, you're very limited as to what
539 you can and cannot regulate, so you're probably better off just saying prohibited.

540
541 Mr. Beard: One of the big issues relating with signage is people saying it's considered art and not
542 signage, so there are some differences in courts. Some courts say it counts as a sign; some courts say it
543 doesn't, so that could be a catch 22. We prohibit it and then we go to court because someone says it's
544 deemed art, then they're going to take us to court for it or we allow it and people say it's signage. I can
545 definitely do some more research on some of the restrictions on it if that's something the Commission
546 wants.

547
548 Ms. Mattei: My opinion is that it's so minor to what we're trying to do with this overlay district, let's not
549 say they're prohibited or permitted; let's just stay silent on it and address that issue if and when it comes
550 up. You guys can decide at that time how you regulate it if you want to regulate it, but I wouldn't spend
551 hours researching something we're not sure is even going to be an issue and something that I don't want
552 to hold up this overlay district.

553
554 Mr. Dove: I just know people will try and push the envelope.

555
556 Ms. Mattei: Have you ever had murals come up in the past?

557

Zoning Commission

558 Mr. Dove: No, but as soon as we say you can't do a mural, we'll have Mt. Carmel in here wanting to do
559 an emergency room mural on the side of their building.

560
561 Ms. Mattei: That's what I'm saying; if we don't even mention murals in the text, the chances of it coming
562 up since it hasn't come up yet are probably pretty slim.

563
564 Ms. Trebellas: If you're fine removing it, and then if someone wants them, they can then go through a
565 process and try and get one on the side of the building, correct?

566
567 Ms. Mattei: Yes.

568
569 Ms. Trebellas: Then remove it.

570
571 Mr. Dove: Agree. Those are all my initial comments.

572
573 Mr. Pychewicz: Going back to the newer material comment under Materials, just for clarification if a
574 material would not fall under what we're specifying here and some newer technology came out, it still has
575 to go through a review, correct?

576
577 Ms. Mattei: Correct.

578
579 Mr. Pychewicz: Regarding home occupation, is this allowing individuals within their residence to run a
580 business out of it where there's people coming, customers essentially?

581
582 Ms. Mattei: It's basically allowing office type uses, so when customers are coming to and from, that's
583 when it's changing the character of the neighborhood and would not be permitted, so it's very unlikely
584 you're going to have a huge impact from a home occupation the way this is written.

585
586 Mr. Pychewicz: I just didn't want to open the door to people running businesses out of their homes as
587 opposed to me working in my basement doesn't necessarily make my home an office. It's not office use, I
588 reside here, but I'm working from home. I just want to make sure it was clarified; I don't want it to turn
589 into a certain percentage of residents are allowed to run an office out of residence.

590
591 Mr. Dove: I think between the 20% requirement, not allowing to change the appearance of it, and not
592 allowing additional parking or traffic or visitors, so someone couldn't do a hair salon in their basement.

593
594 Ms. Mattei: Exactly. In the definition it talks about financial planners, real estate agents, consultants,
595 lawyers, architects, engineers, accountants, professional services; those sorts of home occupations.

596
597 Mr. Dove: Can you have an employee?

598
599 Ms. Mattei: You cannot unless they are a resident of the house. For example, I work out of my home with
600 my consulting business. If I hired my child, they would be allowed because they live there.

601
602 Mr. Pychewicz: I don't know what if any risk would be associated with this, but I would be more
603 comfortable if the Zoning Inspector during the initial stage of review can make the determination if it
604 should go straight to the Trustees or still go through the Zoning Board. It doesn't change the process; it
605 just doesn't take zoning completely out of it. If it was extremely complicated, someone asking for major
606 modifications, bending a lot of what was written in this text, I would feel more comfortable if it was still
607 an option that after it has been reviewed then kicked over to Zoning to get a more thorough process and
608 review then go just directly to the Trustees. I'm not saying every application and it may only be one or

Zoning Commission

609 two total or maybe never at all, but I feel if we still had that as an option, the Zoning Inspector would
610 make that call and then determine if it just goes directly to the Trustees or not.

611

612 Mr. Dove: I've had major concerns from the get go. We changed the whole minor, major modification
613 because of a certain development that was approved as a minor modification by the Trustees and set a
614 precedent and we fought it for years, so I'm personally not sure, other than they feel they can speed the
615 process along, of why the Trustees want to get into the zoning. We all know what we put into these
616 applications for review and discussion. Are they just going to have a one hour meeting and open it up to
617 the public that shows up or are they going to really dive into what these applications are, so I just have a
618 major concern that there is no involvement from the Commission.

619

620 Mr. Pychewicz: I think that's the balance here that I'm suggesting. Don't entirely eliminate zoning all
621 together. If it's something that's a very complicated project that the Zoning Inspector has the ability to
622 make the call that that's something that doesn't go directly to the Trustees but feels like this should go
623 through Zoning to review this project and then it goes to the Trustees. I get this process and I agree 100%
624 that this will allow a much faster process and would be good all around for Orange Township and
625 everybody, but I think just adding or leaving in there that there is still an option to run specific projects
626 through zoning. I don't see how that would prohibit or go against what is trying to be achieved here.

627

628 Mr. Dove: We can say it's one meeting if we're worried about the process, the time and the Trustees want
629 to get it approved in 30 days. Give us one crack at in and one meeting and we can come up with
630 comments in that one meeting and send it off with these are Zoning's concerns and they totally agree with
631 this application.

632

633 Ms. Trebellas: It seems to me that it's going directly to the Trustees to make zoning decisions that the
634 Zoning Inspector isn't making any determination, the Zoning Commission isn't making any determina-
635 tion; it's going straight to the Trustees. I had some questions about what was considered a major and
636 minor modification. If the Zoning Department can make the determination this is minor, it can go straight
637 to the Trustees, or this has some red flags, it needs to be discussed, I also would feel more comfortable. I
638 understand we're trying to streamline the process, we're trying to encourage development. I know the
639 Township needs more offices and other types of development, but in the past, decisions have been made
640 by the Trustees that we're still dealing with in terms of zoning.

641

642 Ms. Mattei: I've raised this in the past as well, Michele has done a phenomenal job and is very
643 professional in her work, and I think this document provides her the ability to continue to play that
644 advisory role to the Trustees, and I think that's where you guys have to lay your trust in her to identify
645 what or what not should be approved as a modification and provide that recommendation to the Trustees.

646

647 Mr. Dove: Even with that, we still have no input because we've even taken the major and minor
648 modifications out of it now; it all just goes back to the Trustees.

649

650 Mr. Pychewicz: This process is not working if zoning is looking at every single applicant in this overlay
651 district; it doesn't function, there's no purpose in doing it. I'm only asking that we just still leave in, not
652 what we had before with major and minor modifications, the part that the Zoning Inspector can make the
653 call that the application has to go through zoning prior to going to the Trustees. If we want to put in there
654 it's one meeting or one review, I'm comfortable with that. But in the case of a very complicated applicant,
655 I feel it would be helpful for everybody to have an option to sending it to zoning if the Zoning Inspector
656 would determine that is a feasible solution at that time.

657

658 Ms. Mattei: All I can offer at this point is we'll take that into consideration and talk internally as a team,
659 understanding your concern and also weigh in the legal opinion that we have received and come back to

Zoning Commission

660 you with how we plan to proceed. I don't know if I can agree to anything tonight. I just need to have
661 conversations with the whole team regarding this.

662

663 Ms. Boni: I agree with Holly. We need to either talk to legal or revisit the team and see if there's another
664 option.

665

666 Ms. Trebellas: I was just curious on how you determined what's a major modification versus a minor
667 modification. What some people might think is minor, other people think is major. I know you've tried to
668 outline that then we've done away with it. It just seems to open to a lot of potential issues for me.

669

670 Ms. Boni: I think going back and forth between having a major versus minor modification, it does make it
671 tricky to identify that and at times we'll have situations that it's kind of in middle and we thought getting
672 rid of that completely was a better move, and the final stage still go to the Trustees but, as Holly said, I
673 don't think we have an answer for this today but we can revisit it and talk further on it.

674

675 Mr. Pychewicz: I'm fine even if it's Michele or somebody else on staff who says I think this might have
676 to go through zoning. Maybe that never happens, but at least it's an option.

677

678 Ms. Trebellas: I'm quite content for it to go through staff. I don't want to attend all these meetings unless
679 necessary and, like Adam said, one meeting is considered something substantial. Michele or whoever is
680 on staff says maybe they should take a look at it. We give our 2 cents worth, end of story.

681

682 Mr. Dove: And I would think that could even be established at that pre-meeting, couldn't it be?

683

684 Ms. Boni: But that's only two members.

685

686 Mr. Dove: But during that discussion with Michele and Trustees or whoever is involved and the
687 applicant, you or Zoning or Trustees could say I think this is a bit more than we thought it was going to be
688 and instead of coming to the Trustees, it's going to go to Zoning for one meeting.

689

690 Ms. Mattei: We'll take these comments into consideration and report back to you at the next meeting.

691

692 Ms. Trebellas: That is fine. I have some comments and questions and again, this is because I haven't been
693 involved in the past. I had one question in the Definitions section where you have multi-family stub areas
694 or these mixed use, you keep using the word condominium, and I was wondering what you mean by
695 condominium because I always understood condominium is a form of land ownership; not a building
696 type, so for me it opens a whole can of worms when you're using the term condominium in what's
697 supposed to be a multi-family complex.

698

699 Ms. Mattei: That's a good point. I'm going to refer to everything as multi-family units or townhomes
700 because you are correct, condominium is a type of land ownership.

701

702 Ms. Trebellas: Or if you could just define it but make sure that's what you mean because it's open to
703 interpretation. Underneath multi-family sub-areas, there are still a few references to single family,

704

705 Ms. Mattei: I will check that.

706

707 Ms. Trebellas: Like Todd, I did have a little concern about height. I'm less worried now that you've
708 removed that current existing single family out of this sort of overlay. I wouldn't want someone who just
709 spent ½ million dollars on an Epcon house to have a 50' or 60' building right next to their house. Those
710 heights don't bother me as much if it's multi-family but it does bother me if it's abutting single family

Zoning Commission

711 because they've purchased their property with the understanding of what will be next to them, and that
712 might change. In one of your charts you have the statement saying "tract boundaries setback when
713 abutting designated residential area"; what do you mean by a designated residential area?

714

715 Ms. Mattei: Michele and I talked about that today, and I'm going to change that to a designated single
716 family or farm residential use.

717

718 Ms. Trebellas: So that's the area we talked about earlier by Lewis Center Road where we have some of
719 those existing residents?

720

721 Ms. Mattei: Yes.

722

723 Ms. Trebellas: When you were laying out your development and talked about where the central green
724 space was going to be, I was wondering why you have parking off your central green space as opposed to
725 building, parking in the middle, and then another building.

726

727 Ms. Mattei: That goes back to wanting to create the streetscape and making sure the buildings are facing
728 that street with the parking in the back. The only other option is to create two small green areas where the
729 parking is and put the parking in the middle, but I don't think you want to eliminate the buildings or move
730 the buildings from the street right-of-way and mess up that streetscape.

731

732 Ms. Trebellas: I think the central green space would have more of an impact on the development if I was
733 in a building or even residential and I was overlooking the green space as opposed to the parking lot.

734

735 Ms. Mattei: I could move a couple of the buildings around to face the green spaces and move the parking
736 in between the buildings.

737

738 Ms. Trebellas: Have two rows of buildings and parking in the middle, but have parking off your central
739 green space sort of lessens the impact of the central green space and why you have it.

740

741 Ms. Boni: I like that idea too.

742

743 Ms. Trebellas: That's why you have a central green space and why people would be more likely to lease
744 or purchase buildings along a central green because people would rather look at green than parking. I
745 know we have new technology coming out in terms of synthetic materials developed all the time, but
746 when you're talking about predominant building materials, you're suggesting that 80% of the exterior
747 walls of the building be natural materials such as brick, stone, cultured stone, I'm assuming cast stone,
748 stucco or wood. I work in architecture and do mixed use and multi-family; nobody uses wood on exterior
749 because it's a maintenance issue. Generally you're going to use fibrous cement. It will look like wood, so
750 I was wondering if you had talked to developers about this and what they were using. Some developers
751 try to use vinyl and I try to talk them into not because that also has maintenance issues, and why stucco
752 and not EIFS which is used a lot. And where does the 80% number come from because I'm assuming
753 you're referring to all sides of the building's exterior faces.

754

755 Ms. Mattei: Yes.

756

757 Ms. Trebellas: Where some buildings like in the Short North, the side facing High Street might
758 predominantly be brick or stone with a little bit of EIFS or stucco but the back might only have the
759 ground floor be cast stone, brick or something like that and the upper floors might be EIFS or fiber
760 cement or something like that. I was wondering why that 80% and whether or not current practice had
761 commented on that.

Zoning Commission

762 Mr. Dove: I thought we've always stressed 75% and 4-sided architecture.

763

764 Ms. Trebellas: But we haven't necessarily stressed wood or whatever.

765

766 Mr. Dove: No, and the Schottenstein group did, and I don't think they like the fiber cement.

767

768 Ms. Trebellas: No, they didn't and they wanted vinyl. You have vinyl equal to fiber cement which is only
769 the case if you use a hardened and heavy vinyl as opposed to cheap vinyl which is what Schottenstein
770 wanted to do which will warp and if you have a hail storm or hit with a baseball, it's going to dent your
771 vinyl; I don't think that's what you want.

772

773 Mr. Pychewicz: I think the way to fix this is if we just keep those materials you listed, wood is fine if
774 someone wants to use it but we add fiber cement, whether we call that plank or board or just fiber cement
775 as material that is approved. We can't specifically say like Hardy Plank or something.

776

777 Ms. Trebellas: No, because that's proprietary.

778

779 Mr. Pychewicz: And I think if we add language to say 4-sided architecture would take care of both of
780 those.

781

782 Ms. Mattei: The 4-sided architecture is there; it's up at the beginning because it applies to all of the
783 buildings; it says buildings and also barriers shall be designed to be seen from 360 degrees and have the
784 same caliber of finish on all elevations.

785

786 Ms. Trebellas: Which is what we've adopted in the past. We've had to tweak over the years as to what 4-
787 sided architecture meant. I think you've done a good job of that by saying you need to have some sort of
788 feature on each wall; you can't just have a blank wall with one door, you need windows, gables, porticos
789 or whatever. I was wondering what the feedback was in terms of current building practices on your
790 predominant building materials.

791

792 Mr. Dove: I think some of these things are a little more open ended than our original Code, so now
793 someone can come in and say it's natural material, it's not on our list, but it's kind of like brick, so it's a
794 little more open but we're calling it natural materials.

795

796 Ms. Trebellas: Where you have accents, I call fiber cement. Dryvit is actually a proprietary name for
797 EIFS. There are other EIFS manufacturers and by no means am I going to say which is the best, so just
798 call it EIFS so we don't deal with the Hardy or other types.

799

800 Ms. Mattei: I want to make sure I heard correctly, but everybody agreed to add the fiber cement to the
801 predominant material list?

802

803 No one had a problem

804

805 Mr. Pychewicz: And Christine, I think you're right; we call it cementitious board or something.

806

807 Ms. Mattei: Down below I call it cementitious siding; do you want me to just stick with that term?

808

809 Messrs. Dove/Pychewicz: Yes

810

811 Ms. Trebellas: The only issue with cementitious siding is that is really siding, like lap siding as opposed
812 to board and batten or shingle or something else people commonly use, so fiber cement covers all types of

Zoning Commission

813 potential sheeting. If you want board and batten or shingle or vertical siding as opposed to horizontal
814 siding or whatever, cementitious siding implies just siding, not board and batten or shingles. We were
815 talking about the accent materials, you have vinyl and aluminum. There are now very popular forms of
816 vinyl trim or composite trim that's being used that you can put directly against concrete, so I don't know
817 if you want to include those or not.

818
819 Ms. Mattei: What's the Board's thought on that?
820

821 Mr. Pychewicz: I don't want to open the door for them to say this is a vinyl trim. If they want to use
822 something like that, then it should go through the review; not something that's in here and they just
823 say....
824

825 Ms. Trebellas: The problem with vinyl is you can have something like AZEK which I've used before on
826 projects where fiber cement was an issue but it opens a whole can of worms of the definition of what is
827 vinyl trim. So if you're uncomfortable with that, I understand.
828

829 Mr. Pychewicz: I think we just leave that out and whatever product they're using that's vinyl related, they
830 have to write that in as a divergence or something that has go into review.
831

832 Ms. Trebellas: When we came to townhomes or townhouses, you have exterior materials, cladding listed,
833 fiber cement, whatever term you use, be consistent with it. You have vinyl beaded siding or any material
834 equal as well. I don't know how to word it to make sure the vinyl siding is of the same quality as wood or
835 fiber cement siding so you don't have issues with the vinyl siding sagging or getting marked in a hail
836 storm, etc. This is the problem we had with Schottstein. We wanted them to use a higher quality vinyl
837 siding to prevent that type of damage which would impact neighboring property values. I don't know if
838 anyone has any ideas on or if you think material of equal quality will cover it or if we need to specify a
839 thickness or something like that.
840

841 Mr. Dove: I'd put the mil in.
842

843 Ms. Trebellas: Then I'd have to do the research to determine which mil is equal to fibrous cement because
844 there's a whole range of vinyl siding.
845

846 Ms. Mattei: When I worked in Dublin we did do a mil for the siding, and I'd have to go back and see
847 what it was, but I could look into that for you.
848

849 Ms. Trebellas: I just want to make sure it's of equal quality because I doubt that's something the Trustees
850 are familiar with, and that's one reason why I'm a little nervous of just giving it all over to the Trustees
851 without some of these adjustments or without some form of review because we have had developers try to
852 use a cheaper siding because they want to save money but it does impact the quality of the development.
853

854 Ms. Mattei: I'll look at that a little bit.
855

856 Ms. Trebellas: On landscaping, one issue is the screening areas shall consist of either landscaping or walls
857 accented with landscaping but that's very broad with service areas, production areas, storage areas and
858 trash containers and loading zones. We've had issues where they've had trash containers and storage
859 areas which really weren't screened. Our current Code requires trash containers or trash enclosures be
860 solid on three sides then the gate on the fourth side. I understand you can't put a fence around a loading
861 area, certain service areas or production areas; however, I think a storage area, depending on its size, but
862 definitely trash areas you should put a fence around and potentially landscaping as well. We had a big
863 issue with WalMart that had a storage area that had a fence around but was not an appropriate fence but

Zoning Commission

864 they have since remedied that. I don't want to be living in a multi-family complex and have the dumpster
865 for the office next to me or the dumpster for the restaurant below me in the mixed use area not screened.

866

867 Mr. Dove: It's usually three-sides with like material of the building and a gate.

868

869 Ms. Mattei: I think we can address that.

870

871 Ms. Trebellas: You've prohibited the use of mulch in a landscape island and I understand what you're
872 going for, you just don't want a landscape island that's dead with nothing on it but a bunch of mulch.

873

874 Ms. Mattei: That's also come up as a comment from the Fire Department; they don't want mulch for fire
875 purposes.

876

877 Ms. Trebellas: But, from a landscaping purpose, you need mulch in your beds to prevent weed growth.
878 How do you make sure that your bed island without the use of mulch doesn't become a weed bed?

879

880 Mr. Dove: Gravel.

881

882 Ms. Boni: Surprisingly mulch is a pretty common fire in the Township in commercial areas.

883

884 Ms. Trebellas: That's also why in some commercial areas you have a bed of gravel with weeds in it that's
885 not very attractive. How do we make sure those islands are attractive so when you're walking from your
886 car to wherever you're going you have shade and trees and not a bunch of weeds and trash in the area? I'll
887 leave it up to you as to how to address that. And I'm quite content with shared parking. I think the
888 Township should use more of it. In some of your minimum and maximum spaces in your chart, you're
889 still using terms like mini golf, batting cages and private country clubs, and I thought those had been
890 removed from the district.

891

892 Ms. Mattei: The country club is out; mini golf and batting cages, did we take those out?

893

894 Ms. Boni: We might have.

895

896 Ms. Mattei: I will double check that.

897

898 Ms. Trebellas: I didn't think we were going to have a stadium. If you want a stadium in the industrial area
899 by the railroad tracks, that's fine; I just don't think along 23.

900

901 Ms. Boni: Wonder if there was an outdoor concert area, I was thinking of Columbus Commons, used to
902 hold events. I know it's not a stadium.

903

904 Ms. Trebellas: Wouldn't they need to get a Permit from Zoning to do that, like a one time special event?

905

906 Ms. Boni: I was saying like if there was a park designed.

907

908 Ms. Trebellas: Like an event venue.

909

910 Ms. Boni: Yes, something that was consistently having things all the time. Having a permit for that every
911 time would be pretty wild. I have no idea if it would happen; my guess it would happen more in Evans
912 Farm than on 23. I can't imagine a stadium coming in. I think it was in there just in case.

913

Zoning Commission

914 Ms. Mattei: It was originally when the school was in and I was thinking of football stadium, but the
915 school's not in this any longer.

916

917 Ms. Trebellas: Just be consistent if you remove them, then I'm worried there would be an opening that we
918 can put a stadium in or a mini golf because you said we have parking provisions.

919

920 Mr. Beard: With the mini golf and batting cages, we do have one on 23 right now and currently their
921 zoning doesn't allow a monument sign along 23; it's pretty restrictive on their signage for that place, so I
922 think keeping the parking restrictions in there would be okay if they want to pull down the cloud to cover
923 the zoning for their signage purposes if they choose to do so.

924

925 Ms. Trebellas: I have no problem if it's in the mixed use or industrial area behind 23, but along 23, I
926 think there's better uses for the land to give more value back to the community.

927

928 Ms. Mattei: I appreciate all the comments we received tonight. These are very constructive comments and
929 very helpful in making the document the best it can be. I will look at all of these and address the text
930 where necessary to accommodate the comments that were given tonight.

931

932 Mr. Pychewicz: Michele, was there anything on YouTube that we should mention?

933

934 Ms. Boni: No. We're still in the meeting, so if anyone has any comments, please submit them and we'll
935 be happy to address them. If you're not able to submit comments now, feel free to email our office; you
936 can find our contact information on our website, and we can communicate from there.

937

938 Ms. Trebellas: What are the next steps?

939

940 Ms. Boni: We just had our third Zoning Commission hearing. If the Commission wants to, we'd be happy
941 to take any more comments, preferably in writing. If there's anything you forgot during this meeting, feel
942 free to share them with me and I will pass them along to Holly to make those changes in the text, so I ask
943 for the Board's comments by Tuesday, August 11. We are also receiving a second review from Regional
944 Planning Commission. I just got some feedback from Scott Sanders at Regional Planning just before this
945 meeting, so we'll review those, staff is going to put a list of comments together and we'll continue
946 working with legal next week. Our goal is to have the last version of this text for the Board to review on
947 August 18 and that will include everybody's comments. If we don't make the map revisions now, we'll
948 make them as a stipulation. Our GIS Specialist resigned recently, so Regional Planning is working on the
949 maps with us, so we can make those changes with them. I will be sharing a report with you that I will
950 create and we'll have draft recommendations for the Board to approve. We're proposing to have the next
951 Zoning Commission meeting on August 25 and that will hopefully wrap it up.

952

953 Ms. Trebellas: So we're basically trying to fine tune this document and if there are issues that the Zoning
954 Commission might have, we present them as stipulations to the Trustees?

955

956 Ms. Boni: I think that's going to be the route we'll take.

957

MOTION TO RECESS ROUTE 23 OVERLAY CORRIDOR DISTRICT TEXT

959

960 Motion made by Ms. Trebellas to recess the Route 23 Overlay Corridor Text until Tuesday, August 25,
961 2020 at 7:00 p.m. via in virtual matters Zoom; seconded by Mr. Dove.

962

963 Vote on Motion: Mr. Pychewicz-yes, Ms. Trebellas-yes, Mr. Dove-yes

964 Motion carried

Zoning Commission

965 Meeting adjourned at 8:50 p.m.

966 Minutes prepared by Cindy Davis, Zoning Secretary

967

968 On September 15, 2020, Mr. Pychewicz made a motion to approve the August 4, 2020 meeting minutes
969 of the Orange Township Zoning Commission for the Route 23 Corridor Overlay District, with the
970 following corrections:

971

- 972 • Lines 262-263 should read: “...developed utilizing the proposed standards.....”
- 973 • Lines 387-388 should read: “...will we still have a zoning sign on the property?”
- 974 • Line 473: “/” at the end of the sentence should be “.”
- 975 • Line 492: “s” at the end of the sentence should be removed
- 976 • Line 574: “all” should read “fall”
- 977 • Line 606 should read: “...after it has been reviewed then kicked over to zoning....”
- 978 • Line 672 should read: “...and the final stage will still go to the Trustees....”
- 979 • Line 737 should read: “...have two rows of buildings”
- 980 • Line 767 should read: “.....vinyl equal to fiber cement.....”

981

982 Seconded by Ms. Trebellas

983

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

985 Motion carried

986

987