

Board of Zoning Appeals

Application #'s CU/VA-20-20, VA-20-21

October 15, 2020

LEGAL NOTICE

Notice is hereby given that the Orange Township Board of Zoning Appeals will hold a public hearing on Thursday, October 15, 2020, beginning at 6:00 p.m. to consider the following application/s:

**Conditional Use / Variance Application #CU-VA-20-20 Michael Cochenour,**

Seeking a variance and conditional use from section 22.04 of the Orange Township Zoning Resolution to construct an entry monument sign that will not meet all criteria of the section. The subject property is located at 857 Hidden Springs Dr., Lewis Center, OH 43035 and having parcel number 318-312-03-003-004.

**Variance Application #VA-20-21 Kurt Knazek,**

Seeking an Area Variance from Rezoning Case #7607 Walker Wood section 10.07 e) to allow a garage to encroach in the building setback. The subject property is located at 7880 Norma Ct., Lewis Center, OH 43035 and having parcel number 318-424-10-009-000.

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

<https://us02web.zoom.us/j/82614590937?pwd=VHJqWjV5b2FUbUxxVGJhWFJCTGlmUT09>

During the hearing the public may submit questions and comments to the Board by sending messages to Zoning Officer, Jeff Beard via the Zoom meeting chat room.

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

Following this hearing the Board may meet for general purposes to consider such business as may properly come before it including, but not limited to, consideration and/or approval of minutes, scheduling future hearing dates for this or other applications, and like matters.

The person responsible for the publication of this notice is Jeff Beard, Orange Township Zoning Department.

*Rick Oster, Chairman  
Jeff Beard, Orange Township Zoning Department*

*Please publish one time, on or before Saturday, October 3, 2020 in The Delaware Gazette*

Mr. Oster called the hearing to order at 6:00 p.m.

Roll Call: Aaron Shipley, Punitha Sundar, Rick Oster, Jerry Miller, Kelvin Trefz

Township Officials Also Present: Jeff Beard, Zoning Enforcement Officer

Mr. Oster administered the oath to those speaking: anyone who intends to testify, please raise your right hand to be sworn. Do you solemnly swear that the testimony that you are about to give is the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth, and state I do. And when it's your turn to offer testimony, please

## Board of Zoning Appeals

52 state your full name, address and affirm that you've been sworn in. Anyone who intends to offer  
53 comments or testimony through the online chat room function also needs to be sworn in remotely. Before  
54 your initial comment, please type in your name, address and the words "I affirm" to indicate you  
55 solemnly swear that the testimony that you are offering is the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the  
56 truth.

57

58 **Conditional Use / Variance Application #CU-VA-20-20 Michael Cochenour,**

59 Seeking a variance and conditional use from section 22.04 of the Orange Township Zoning Resolution to  
60 construct an entry monument sign that will not meet all criteria of the section. The subject property is  
61 located at 857 Hidden Springs Dr., Lewis Center, OH 43035 and having parcel number 318-312-03-003-  
62 004.

63

64 Mr. Beard presented the Staff Report and presentation. The subject property is located on the  
65 west side of Green Meadows Drive just south of Goldfish Swim School. The sign will be  
66 located west of Green Meadows Drive. We'll look at the Variance first. Surrounding area to  
67 the north is Planned Commercial District; south, east and west is all zoned Multi-Family  
68 Planned Residential District. The site is under construction and close to being completed. The  
69 applicant has requested to allow construction of a monument sign that the column would  
70 classify as a monument sign then it will have a blade sign attached to it. The Variance is to  
71 allow the blade sign to be allowed since it does not have a base underneath that sign. There is  
72 an entry sign, a big rock that has been falling over, so that is why they want to update the sign  
73 to replace that sign.

74

75

75 **APPLICANT PRESENTATION/BOARD QUESTIONS & COMMENTS**

76

77 Thomas Kirchner, Director of Construction for Presidential Construction, dba T&R Properties, 3895  
78 Stonebridge Lane, Dublin, Ohio 43017, I affirm. The sign that was shown is a slate sign that has an  
79 etched Hidden Ridge Condominiums. It was built in 2004 and the three condo buildings were built in  
80 2004-05. When things went south, the owner decided not to proceed with any more condos and decided  
81 for the two existing pads we put in a different footprint of apartments. It's going to be managed from  
82 Dooley's Orchard across the street so with no clubhouse here, the rental office and property management  
83 team will manage these two 16 unit apartment buildings, 1 bedroom units from across the street. To create  
84 some consistency, we wanted to use a similar branding as would be updated on the Dooley's Orchard side  
85 to tie into these two apartment buildings. We will be in the same location where the previous sign had  
86 been installed. It's about 31' from the right-of-way at Hidden Springs Drive on Green Meadows. The  
87 column will be pretty much where the stone is then the blade sign will just hang to the left of that.

88

89 Mr. Oster: We don't allow this type of sign and why aren't you going with a monument sign that is within  
90 the Standard?

91

92 Mr. Kirchner: It was just trying to be consistent with the sign except it is larger for six 32 units. What we  
93 usually do at secondary entrances is a single pillar sign with a blade attached to it and that just stays  
94 consistent with the branding.

95

96 Mr. Oster: Are you saying there's another sign that looks like this one?

97

98 Mr. Kirchner: At the entrance to Dooley's Orchard there's similar columns with a sign that connects the  
99 two columns.

100

101 Mr. Oster: And that's what we allow is a base with two columns and a sign in between.

102

## Board of Zoning Appeals

103 Mr. Kirchner: But we were seeking the variance based on this just being two buildings. We were looking  
104 to just put a one pillar sign up.

105  
106 Mr. Trefz: The condos, do they have a monument sign somewhere other than the one that was in the  
107 picture?

108  
109 Mr. Kirchner: Yes, off of Highfield.

110  
111 Mr. Trefz: So essentially this will be the second monument sign on the same set of properties.

112  
113 Mr. Kirchner: Correct. The previous sign that said Hidden Spring Condominiums and these will be leased  
114 as apartments.

115  
116 Mr. Trefz: But not Hidden Springs but Dooley's Orchard apartments.

117  
118 Mr. Kirchner: Correct because the property will be owned and then eventually Hidden Springs LLC will  
119 be transferring all of these assets over to Dooley's Orchard LLC.

120  
121 Mr. Miller: Why not do a dual column as you have already at the other facility?

122  
123 Mr. Kirchner: Probably more from a scaling perspective is all I can think of. For just two buildings,  
124 putting a large monument up there...

125  
126 Mr. Oster: You've got a sizeable sign there and if you wanted to add columns to it, I think you'd be in the  
127 same range or the same size. We don't want to allow something that we don't like being used. We would  
128 rather have you do it per our Code and just redo what you've got.

129  
130 Mr. Kirchner: That stone has etched in Hidden Springs Condominiums, so I can't use that piece of slate.

131  
132 Mr. Oster: I'm not saying use that; I'm saying use that position and that place to do the larger sign like we  
133 allow.

134  
135 Mr. Kirchner: Two columns with a connecting sign in between them?

136  
137 Mr. Oster: You don't have to do the columns if you don't want to; you can do a base. As long as it  
138 conforms to our Code and the base has to be bigger than the sign itself that's sitting on it and then you've  
139 got to meet all the square footage of the sign, the colors, etc. We just don't allow these types of pole signs  
140 off of a column. We've seen them used temporarily but it was a temporary situation. In this situation, it  
141 would behoove you to put in whatever size monument sign that would meet the Code, whether you want  
142 the double column or just the base with the sign on top of it. I don't see any justification for breaking our  
143 rules for this sign.

144  
145 Mr. Miller: One issue we have is we have our Code and we allow one deviation, then here comes a  
146 second request, then a third and a fourth one, and you've got three others, you approved one, but didn't  
147 approve two now here comes a fourth one; it's a matter of consistency, and that's why there's the Zoning  
148 Regulations.

149  
150 Mr. Oster: That is the primary reason and that's what we hear all the time and we run into that all the time  
151 when something was under construction and they allowed a pole type sign with the pole off to the side  
152 temporarily. Some people see that and say they were allowed to have that for a certain amount of time and  
153 as soon as somebody does something that they can show, even if it's temporary, they want the same thing.

## Board of Zoning Appeals

154 So we try not to do that, and we try and steer you toward doing a monument sign, however nice or  
155 however cost effective, and just replace that stone because I believe that falls within the specs as far as  
156 right-of-way, etc., where that one is located.

157

158 Mr. Kirchner: Once I get a new design, and I think I'm leaning toward probably just putting a base below  
159 the sign and I'll go through your Zoning Requirements on the size of that sign and the colors, etc.

160

161 Mr. Oster: You can use both sides of that sign if you want to position it that way with the road so it could  
162 be seen for each direction of traffic and put it in there as far as the size, the colors that you can use, etc.

163

164 Mr. Kirchner: If I were to stay just outside of the right-of-way, are there any zoning requirements of how  
165 far I'd have to be past the right-of-way line?

166

167 Mr. Beard: You must be 15'.

168

169 Mr. Kirchner: 15' past the right-of-way to the center of the sign or the far right edge of the sign?

170

171 Mr. Beard: To the closest point to the sign.

172

173 Mr. Trefz: I would also recommend getting the lighting package, not only the style of fixture, the Kelvin  
174 temperature, and the wattage all figured out because that's always one of our concerns.

175

176 Mr. Kirchner: It's not lit; there's a street lamp directly across there.

177

178 Mr. Oster: That would probably be sufficient for you and you could just put in whatever size sign you  
179 want to put in there according to the Code.

180

181 Mr. Kirchner: Once I get this drafted up, do I submit it to Jeff for another BZA meeting or if the sign  
182 meets all criteria, is it something that can be approved by Jeff?

183

184 Mr. Beard: There's a couple things I want to clear up. Kelvin asked about the two signs on the property.  
185 There's not two signs; they're different parcels, so there's a sign to the left for the three and this is where  
186 the rock was, so there's not two signs on the property and it doesn't need a variance for that.

187

188 Mr. Trefz: Would you show us where the sign for the three of them are?

189

190 Mr. Beard: Over to the left by Highfield, and this is a picture of their entrance sign.

191

192 Mr. Oster: So it's still going to say Hidden Springs over there?

193

194 Mr. Beard: On that side, yes.

195

196 Mr. Oster: Are those builders a different developer is why it's going to be called something different or  
197 are they going to attach them to Dooley's Orchard that's across the street?

198

199 Mr. Kirchner: Legally they were built as apartments, not condos.

200

201 Mr. Oster: So they're going to be more like the buildings across the street in Dooley's Orchard.

202

203 Mr. Kirchner: Correct.

204

## Board of Zoning Appeals

205 Mr. Beard: And this is the sign that they're replacing.  
206

207 Mr. Oster: So we can approve a monument sign as long as it meets our Code and then he would be free to  
208 go ahead and do whatever he feels within the Code, correct?  
209

210 Mr. Beard: You'll have to act on the variance first. This is the sign that's across the street for Dooley's  
211 Orchard at this time.  
212

213 Mr. Oster: That's different than what we do today.  
214

215 Mr. Kirchner: And all I was trying to do was the one column with a blade just to tie in but I certainly  
216 understand.  
217

218 Mr. Oster: I don't think we do suspended. If it's got two columns it still has to be sitting on a base. This  
219 was done long enough ago or originally with zoning that they did something special, so I would do your  
220 monument based sign. In fact, you could stick a sign on that base that looks identical to that one.  
221

222 Mr. Kirchner: I think that's probably what we'll do, either that or just a stone base that's wider than the  
223 sign as you said. Does that current sign as far as color and size....  
224

225 Mr. Oster: I believe so just looking at the picture; doesn't that look like it's within our limits, Jeff? I know  
226 the colors are.  
227

228 Mr. Beard: Yes, and the square footage would be.  
229

230 Mr. Oster: And you can use both sides of the sign so you wouldn't actually have to do two of them  
231 because it looks like there's two of them here or at least there's an in between that I can't see, but you  
232 could do one of those and outfit it to be a sign on both sides.  
233

234 Mr. Kirchner: We'll probably not do it perpendicular to Green Meadows; we'll probably do it horizontal  
235 only for the reason that we don't want to draw people into that, we want this to look like the large  
236 entrance because that's where the leasing and property management offices are, that building directly  
237 behind that sign, so we don't want people going in there and not finding the leasing office. That's why we  
238 were trying to downplay that sign but give it some branding to the buildings but we didn't want it to  
239 overshadow where we want perspective tenants to go to sign up, but we'll do a similar sign. I might  
240 decrease the size a little bit but I think I'm going to follow that same arch and put a stone base below it.  
241

242 Mr. Oster: Or you could even put an additional text at the bottom that the office is across the street and  
243 then you could shrink the Dooley's Orchard if you want to. As long as you stay within the Code, you're  
244 good.  
245

246 Mr. Kirchner: So you'll approve it as long as the sign meets the Code?  
247

248 Mr. Oster: Yes, and Jeff will keep an eye on that and if there's any questions, follow up with Jeff. I would  
249 do that before you actually construct anything just to make sure you're within Code.  
250

### 251 **MOTION TO APPROVE CONDITIONAL USE APPLICATION #CU-20-20** 252

253 Mr. Oster made a motion to approve Conditional Use Application #CU-20-20, Michael Cochenour, with  
254 the condition that the sign meets all the standards of the Orange Township's Zoning Resolution for Sign  
255 Code; seconded by Mr. Trefz.

## Board of Zoning Appeals

256 Vote on Motion: Mr. Oster-yes, Mr. Miller-yes, Mr. Shipley-yes, Mr. Trefz-yes, Ms. Sundar-yes  
257

258 Mr. Beard: Now we just need to take action on the variance part.  
259

### **MOTION TO DENY VARIANCE APPLICATION #VA-20-20**

261  
262 Mr. Oster made a motion to deny Variance Application #VA-20-20, Michael Cochenour; seconded by  
263 Mr. Miller.

264  
265 Vote on Motion: Mr. Oster-yes, Mr. Miller-yes, Mr. Shipley-yes, Mr. Trefz-yes, Ms. Sundar-mic not on  
266  
267 Motion carried

268  
269 Hearing continued with Variance Application #VA-20-21  
270

271 Minutes prepared by Cindy Davis, Zoning Secretary  
272

273 On December 17, 2020, Mr. Miller made a motion to approve the October 15, 2020 meeting minutes of  
274 the Orange Township Board of Zoning Appeals for Conditional Use/Variance Application #CU-VA-20-  
275 20, Michael Cochenhour, with the following correction:

- 276  
277
  - Change “Kershner” to “Kirchner” throughout the entire document.

278  
279 Seconded by Ms. Sundar  
280

281 Vote on Motion: Mr. Oster-yes, Mr. Miller-yes, Mr. Shipley-yes, Mr. Trefz-yes, Ms. Sundar-yes  
282 Motion carried  
283

# Board of Zoning Appeals

1 **Application #VA-20-21**

**October 15, 2020**

2  
3  
4 **Variance Application #VA-20-21 Kurt Knazek,**

5 Seeking an Area Variance from Rezoning Case #7607 Walker Wood section 10.07 e) to allow a garage to  
6 encroach in the building setback. The subject property is located at 7880 Norma Ct., Lewis Center, OH  
7 43035 and having parcel number 318-424-10-009-000.

8  
9 Mr. Beard presented the Staff Report and presentation. The subject property is located on the  
10 west side of Norma Court at the intersection of Tucker Trail. The surrounding area, north,  
11 south, east and west are all Single Family Planned Residential District, all single family homes.  
12 The applicant is seeking for the garage addition to encroach the building setback from the  
13 right-of-way a distance of 6'-6-1/2" from Norma Court. The applicant has letters of support  
14 from the neighbors.

15  
16 Mr. Oster: It looks like instead of using the depth into his lot, he's shoving it out to the front  
17 which is causing the 6'-6-1/2" variance because it has an existing garage, correct?

18  
19 Mr. Shipley: The way it sounded the 2 car garage was being replaced with a 3 car garage and  
20 then they were adding an apartment above it, and adding it all at the same time.

21  
22 **APPLICANT PRESENTATION/BOARD QUESTIONS & COMMENTS**

23  
24 Kurt Knazek, 7880 Norma Court, Lewis Center, Ohio, the plan is to remove the existing garage and  
25 replace it with a 3 car garage and have a bonus room above that 3 car garage, approximately 700 square  
26 feet.

27  
28 Mr. Shipley: And because it's a 3 car garage that pushes it out in that direction?

29  
30 Mr. Knazek: Correct.

31  
32 Mr. Oster: It looks like you could shove it to the rear and alleviate that variance.

33  
34 Mr. Knazek: We went over this with our architect and this was the plan he suggested for a handful of  
35 reasons, one being the fact that architecturally it then kind of blends in with the rest of the homes. The  
36 other point being that by bringing it out a little bit further from a little side jut that goes inside the front of  
37 the house, it doesn't allow the water and ice to dam up against the side of the house and because the lot  
38 itself is cornered, if we were to go all the way to the back of the house, it would actually bring the garage  
39 closer to the front of 7896 Norma Court which is the house right adjacent to it.

40  
41 Mr. Oster: But still not need a variance.

42  
43 Mr. Knazek: Correct.

44  
45 Mr. Miller: You make reference in your application that the builder assured you that there would be  
46 enough space to add the addition. Who is your builder and do you have that in writing?

47  
48 Mr. Knazek: We do not have that in writing; it was Joshua Homes. When we approached them about  
49 buying the house, the house was in the stage where they had the foundation set, so we asked would they  
50 be able to put a third car garage on it at a later time, and they said where we were from the setbacks that it  
51 would be fine and not require any type of variance to be able to come to the front of the house.

## Board of Zoning Appeals

52 Mr. Oster: I bet what they were thinking was you could do that if you went to the rear of the house.

53

54 Mr. Knazek: I'm not 100% sure what they were thinking, but from the architectural standpoint we're  
55 trying to bring that to the front and if everything is laid out the way they explained it to us, we could have  
56 brought part of the back half of the garage forward but add a gable at the front of the house that would  
57 have been turned and then architecturally blend in with the rest of the homes in the subdivision and that  
58 cul-de-sac.

59

60 Mr. Miller: Looking at the photo we're looking at right now shows the front of the 2 car garage; you  
61 wanted to take that out. The third bay for your garage, you want to put it to the right instead of the left?

62

63 Mr. Knazek: That whole garage will be removed. We will take a portion that goes into the backyard and  
64 the remainder of it will end up into the front yard, kind of where the sidewalk goes up, basically up to the  
65 edge of the sidewalk.

66

67 Mr. Oster: To me it looks like you're going the wrong way. It would be better to go toward the rear of the  
68 house because it looks like you're planning on widening the driveway where if you went toward the rear,  
69 you could just widen the rear portion of the driveway to meet that third bay because even that driveway  
70 shown for the garage and bonus room drawing looks like it's going to be way up front also. It just looks  
71 like it would go better if it went toward the rear.

72

73 Mr. Trefz: From the diagrams and blueprints we have, it looks like the addition that goes to the right of  
74 the existing garage is 8' and the part going left of the garage that exits now may be 4'. Is that about right?

75

76 Mr. Knazek: Yes.

77

78 Mr. Trefz: What would happen if you would do 8' on the left side and 4' on the right side?

79

80 Mr. Oster: It would almost even it up with the house it appears to me.

81

82 Mr. Knazek: In order to swap those with the gable in the front, we potentially run into an area where the  
83 water will dam up against the side of the house and potentially create a freeze point where I'd have to put  
84 a ??? (43:43) in the roof there.

85

86 Mr. Trefz: The gable I'm looking at that's above the garage now, the new portion of it would also have a  
87 gable but that's not going to be on the level with the middle of your home?

88

89 Mr. Knazek: That gable you're looking at now gets completely turned toward the front of the house so it  
90 will point to the front entrance to Norma Court.

91

92 Mr. Oster: So you're changing the roof line of the garage also?

93

94 Mr. Knazek: Correct.

95

96 Mr. Trefz: So the roof line of the garage is not parallel with the roof line of the house?

97

98 Mr. Oster: It is now but he wants to change it.

99

100 Mr. Knazek: It will give it a similar look to the rest of the homes in the cul-de-sac, have the front part the  
101 way it is, and then have a gable and kind of turn to the front of it.

102



## Board of Zoning Appeals

103 Brent Racer, New Avenue Architects, 4740 Reed Road, Columbus, Ohio, and I have been sworn in. If we  
104 flipped the 8' and 4', we would still be over the setback line, less than what we are asking for. The reason  
105 we are doing it in this proportion is to match up and allow for the least amount of ice damming in the  
106 cricketed areas and allow for a larger area on the front side to help shed the water. If we needed to push it  
107 back to accommodate, we could do that, but pushing it all the way back to the back side and allowing the  
108 front to stay where it is, which is the only way to stay behind the setback, it would end up changing the  
109 architecture dramatically that allows the gable to be full on the left side of the screen.

110  
111 Mr. Miller: Do you have an ice issue now?

112  
113 Mr. Kershner: Yes.

114  
115 Mr. Miller: Putting a good membrane in there, would that not reduce the damming?

116  
117 Mr. Oster: I could see creating a damming issue by turning the roof this way. If you left it the same way  
118 as constructed now only make it a 3 car and still brought it out in the same fashion, I wouldn't think  
119 you'd have that issue.

120  
121 Mr. Racer: To follow the architecture of the building and maintain the roof pitches, it would be out of  
122 scale because the third car garage is wider on the plan and it is deep, so that's why we're trying to keep  
123 the gable to a minimum rather than having the gable running the opposite direction so it doesn't conflict  
124 with the main house.

125  
126 Mr. Trefz: A1.2 shows the interior of the second floor of the existing home into the bonus room above  
127 the third car garage. So the entrance to the bonus room above the garage is from the second floor?

128  
129 Mr. Racer: Correct.

130  
131 Mr. Oster: I don't agree with the positioning of it. I think you're better off to put the roof back  
132 architecturally with the others and have them all line up, then use that flat end rather than building this.

133  
134 Mr. Trefz: And you've got a valley coming down toward the front and a valley in the back?

135  
136 Mr. Racer: Correct.

137  
138 Mr. Trefz: Your contention is that there will be more ice damming if you have to slide it to the backyard  
139 or to the left as you're looking at the front of the garage?

140  
141 Mr. Racer: The main reason for this is it's architecturally better. The ice damming if the gable were to  
142 face that direction would be greater if this gets clipped at this location, if it's pushed back and ends up  
143 being behind this plane.

144  
145 Mr. Oster: There could be a little room up front, just not that 8' because that's what's running it into the  
146 easement. If it just went up say 4'.

147  
148 Mr. Trefz: They're still going to be inside the easement.

149  
150 Mr. Kershner: We're only 1' away from the building setback currently.

151  
152 Mr. Miller: Is part of the reason you want to move the third section more to the front than the rear is to  
153 maintain more of the backyard area?

## Board of Zoning Appeals

154 Mr. Racer: Being a corner lot it has two fronts, so two faces of it pushes it back more and more to the  
155 back corner but they have small kids so that's one of the things we discussed and architecturally what we  
156 hope for is a full gable and maintain as much of the backyard as they can.

157  
158 Mr. Beard: You have talked about moving it to the southwest, but if they move it back too far, they're  
159 going to be in the rear yard setback which I believe is 35' for this property.

160  
161 Mr. Oster: I would have a better feeling doing that than the front.

162  
163 Mr. Beard: They can't move it back too far or they would need two variances, one on the building setback  
164 and the other, and we got to remember that we've got to look at the criteria for an Area Variance, the  
165 Duncan versus Middlefield, the criteria that's in the Staff Report and not just look at the other things.

166  
167 Mr. Shipley: It appears all of your neighbors have written letters to the effect that they have no problem  
168 with you doing this and you mention you've talked to the HOA and they told you if the Township were to  
169 approve it, the HOA would have no problem with it, but there's nothing in the package in writing from  
170 the HOA.

171  
172 Mr. Kershner: Correct. I sent the plans to the HOA and sent them follow up emails after emails, and I  
173 never heard anything back. I finally gave them a call and the guy who was familiar with everything told  
174 me, and I have it documented in there, that if Orange Township gives their blessing, they're fine with  
175 everything.

176  
177 Mr. Oster: I just don't know about this roof going the other way because the roof is going to go straight  
178 over almost from the peak of this one to the house.

179  
180 Mr. Kershner: Three of the four houses in the cul-de-sac are basically the same way.

181  
182 Mr. Oster: Probably because they're utilizing that upper floor room. I can't see the roof part that goes  
183 over and meets the house, I don't see any pictures that really shows that and it just looks strange.

184  
185 Ms. Sundar: Do you have any comments from any of your neighbors?

186  
187 Mr. Kershner: All of my neighbors are 100% in support of it. I went around and talked to everyone,  
188 showed plans and went over what we were doing, and they actually got a little excited because it does  
189 help the house fit in a little better with the rest of the homes.

190  
191 Justin Saponaro, 7879 Norma Court, and I affirm I've been sworn in. I am Kurt's neighbor directly to the  
192 east so I see this house every day. I fully support this request. I think it looks great, I'm really excited for  
193 this to come to fruition. It does match kind of the slope and architectural look of the houses in the cul-de-  
194 sac, so I think it would be nice and I support Kurt with this plan.

195  
196 Mr. Oster: Jeff, do you have any aerial photos of other houses that have that?

197  
198 Mr. Saponaro: You can use my house directly across the street on Norma Court across from Kurt's. It's  
199 the same kind of concept where the house faces one way and the garage with the gable faces the other  
200 way.

201  
202 Mr. Trefz: You're featured in one of the pages where they're giving the distance from the centerline or  
203 something.

204

## Board of Zoning Appeals

205 Mr. Saponaro: This is 7879; this is my residence you're looking at. It's the same kind of architectural  
206 concept that Mr. Knazek is looking to do.

207  
208 Mr. Oster: That looks different; that's not a two story.

209  
210 Mr. Trefz: And it's also flipped.

211  
212 Mr. Shipley: I think the question was is there a precedent to having a gable facing one way and the house  
213 facing the other.

214  
215 Mr. Kershner: Would it be possible to go to 7896, the house right next door to me? That's basically what  
216 it's going to look like and the house next to it is very similar to it.

217  
218 Mr. Oster: But his roof was going the other way where this looks like architecturally it's still got the A  
219 also on this side rather than a dormer off the roof.

220  
221 Mr. Trefz: I wonder if we're trying to design a house and what we're really supposed to be doing is  
222 looking if we want it in the setback or not.

223  
224 Mr. Oster: I agree but I also tend to wrap my head around the look as to what they're proposing to do and  
225 with the roof diagrams, I just couldn't get there. On paper, it just doesn't look right.

226  
227 Mr. Trefz: I want to speak to the setback. The homeowner gave us five different versions from Google,  
228 GIS data, and they are 28.1', 28.4', 26.2' 24.1' and 25.8', that is their setback, and they all must be within  
229 the 30' but I don't see how that's possible, so they must have smaller setbacks. Jeff, can you verify that  
230 the setbacks are different for those homes?

231  
232 Mr. Beard: Based on Tucker Trail and Norma Court, they would be the same as this applicant's setback.

233  
234 Mr. Trefz: The smallest one is 24' and what's being proposed is a setback of 23'-5-1/2"; there's still a  
235 foot difference there at least.

236  
237 Mr. Oster: My sheets on the site data, all four of them are identical and it's just one shot of the existing. I  
238 didn't know if that didn't get split up right in the packets or what. I was using SP1.1 in the packet and it  
239 coincided with that 23'-5-1/2" to the corner of the new addition out front.

240  
241 Mr. Trefz: In my mind, Number 2, it's substantial.

242  
243 Mr. Shipley: I don't disagree with that; that's one of the criteria.

244  
245 Mr. Oster: The property will always yield reasonable return without being altered as it was built  
246 originally.

247  
248 Mr. Shipley: If this isn't granted, what's the plan to solve the issues that you have?

249  
250 Mr. Kershner: We don't currently have one.

251  
252 Mr. Shipley: Number 6, could the problem be solved in some other manner, I just wondered if you had a  
253 backup plan at all.

254

## Board of Zoning Appeals

255 Steve Knazek, I have been sworn in. I live at 7896 Norma Court, which is just to the left, and I strongly  
256 agree with his architectural design on this. His house right now with the way it looks on the front doesn't  
257 fit in, but this will add a lot of architectural detail and also dam ice in that gable. That gray house on the  
258 street, across the street, behind it and next to it, they all have gables on the front, and what he's doing is  
259 going to allow with the bonus room, is to add the dormers which will add a lot nicer driveway pull up  
260 from my house, the architecture in my opinion, and I've built homes for 20. This looks amazing compared  
261 to if you would slide it back, put the gable on the garage and have nothing but ??? (1:12)

262  
263 Mr. Beard: I wanted to share the view from the front as he was suggesting;

264  
265 Mr. Oster: Go down the street by his driveway because it shows he's going to widen his driveway right  
266 there to go into the front.

267  
268 Mr. Trefz: Not at the street; just at the garage.

269  
270 Mr. Oster: According to the drawing, that wing starts pretty far back, a lot closer to the sidewalk, but that  
271 might be misleading. It's already got a walk that goes in there and the walk looks like it comes in at a  
272 different angle than what the drawing I'm looking at shows.

273  
274 Mr. Racer: That is the proposed sidewalk, not the existing.

275  
276 Mr. Oster: That's what I'm talking about; it looks like it's going to widen out a lot closer to the sidewalk  
277 but yet it's not going to be much further toward the sidewalk.

278  
279 Mr. Kershner: From the existing sidewalk to where the driveway will expand into the 3 car will be about  
280 8-10' so it will be just past that tree.

281  
282 Mr. Oster: If you look at that 23'-5-1/2" line, that looks like it's going to be pretty close to the sidewalk.

283  
284 MR. Kershner: Our line starts inside the sidewalk and the proposed corner of the addition would be 34'-6-  
285 1/2" from the curb line.

286  
287 Mr. Miller: Is that from the left or right side because you have one that shows 31' on the right side.

288  
289 Mr. Kershner: No, that's to the property line, not to the curb.

290  
291 Mr. Oster: This drawing is showing existing sidewalk.

292  
293 Mr. Kershner: Correct.

294  
295 Mr. Miller: But it's also showing 23.5 to the property line.

296  
297 Mr. Oster: To the sidewalk, not to the curb.

298  
299 Mr. Kershner: Not to the sidewalk but there's about a foot between the property line and the sidewalk.

300  
301 Mr. Oster: We're not counting any of the sidewalk or front; that's what you were counting to get to 34'.

302  
303 Mr. Kershner: Correct.

304  
305 Mr. Oster: You were counting all the front that we don't normally count.

## Board of Zoning Appeals

306 Mr. Kershner: I agree and that's the 34' direction that's not shown; I'm just trying to give everyone an  
307 understanding of the depth there.

308

309 Mr. Trefz: If you were standing at the curb on the roadside, it's 34' to the new addition?

310

311 Mr. Kershner: Correct.

312

313 Mr. Racer: Going back to the comments on the other buildings, this being further than the 24', I think 2'  
314 or so, that is a dimension we can figure out. We could slide this back slightly to get to that 23' so it would  
315 not be greater than anything that is currently there in the neighborhood if that helps.

316

317 Ms. Sundar: It looks like it's a little complicated but I understand the neighbors are saying they are  
318 comfortable with it but the roof looks like it's going to be 1:19 to me.

319

320 Mr. Racer: I'm struggling to find the issue with that. We've done a number of houses with similar  
321 conditions many, many times in places from Dublin to New Albany to Bexley to Westerville, City of  
322 Columbus and so on. If it helps to provide some photos to make sure everybody understands it, we would  
323 be happy to do that.

324

325 Ms. Sundar: That would be a little help.

326

327 Mr. Oster: I would say that would help if they were in Orange Township because that's what we're  
328 looking at, but there are some odd looking roof lines.

329

### **MOTION TO APPROVE VARIANCE REQUEST #VA-20-21**

330

331 Mr. Trefz made a motion to approve Variance Request #VA-20-21, Kurt Knazek; seconded by Mr.  
332 Miller.

333

334 Vote on Motion: Mr. Oster-yes, Mr. Miller-yes, Mr. Shipley-yes, Mr. Trefz-yes, Ms. Sundar-yes  
335 Motion carried

336

337

338

### **Approval of Meeting Minutes:**

339

340 Mr. Oster made a motion to approve the meeting minutes of the Orange Township Board of Zoning  
341 Appeals dated August 20, 2020 for Conditional Use Application #CU-20-14, Craig A. Henderson and  
342 Cynthia Hall Henderson, and Caleb C. Bale and Bailey L. Bale with the following corrections:

343

344 • Correct the spelling of the Legal Counsel from Hravcak to Hrabcak throughout the document

345

346 • Line 85: remove the extra apostrophe

347

348 • Line 111: correct the font used for Craig Henderson's name

349

350 • Line 172: add the word "well" to the end of the sentence

351

352

353 Seconded by Mr. Shipley

354

355 Vote on Motion: Mr. Oster-yes, Mr. Miller-yes, Mr. Shipley-yes, Mr. Trefz-abstain, Ms. Sundar-yes

356

357

358

359

360

361

362

Minutes prepared by Cindy Davis, Zoning Secretary

## Board of Zoning Appeals

356 On December 17, 2020, Mr. Miller made a motion to approve the October 15, 2020 meeting minutes of  
357 the Orange Township Board of Zoning Appeals for Variance Application #VA-20-21, Kurt Knazek, with  
358 the following correction:

359

360 • Line 106: “crooked” should read “cricketed”

361

362 Seconded by Ms. Sundar

363

364 Vote on Motion: Mr. Oster-yes, Mr. Miller-yes, Mr. Shipley-yes, Mr. Trefz-yes, Ms. Sundar-yes

365 Motion carried

366