

Zoning Commission

**Zoning Application #'s ZON-21-05 & ZON-21-06 &
Proposed Amendments to the Orange Township Zoning Resolution**

August 24, 2021

LEGAL NOTICE

Notice is hereby given that the Orange Township Zoning Commission will hold a public hearing on Tuesday, August 24, 2021 at 7:00 p.m. to consider the following applications:

Zoning Application #ZON-21-05, Evans Farm / BZ Evans, LLC The application is an amendment to the currently effective zoning development plan for +/- 131.0 acres within the Evans Farms Planned Commercial (PC) District, approved under applications #15-0104, #ZON-16-02, #ZON-18-05 and #ZON-20-02.

Zoning Application #ZON-21-06, Evans Farm Land Development Co. LLC. The application is an amendment to the currently effective zoning development plan for +/- 425.4 acres within the Evans Farms Single Family Planned Residential (SFPRD) District, approved under applications #15-0105, #ZON-17-07 and #ZON-19-03.

Proposed Amendments to the Orange Township Zoning Resolution The amendment(s) would modify or supplement ARTICLE XX – ROUTE 23 CORRIDOR OVERLAY DISTRICT (RCOD) of the Orange Township Zoning Resolution.

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

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

The application and plans are available for inspection from today's date through the date of the hearing at the Orange Township Zoning Office, 1680 East Orange Road, Lewis Center, Ohio 43035. Zoning Office hours are Monday through Friday, 8 a.m. to 4:30 p.m., except legal holidays.

Michele Boni, Development and Zoning Director is the person responsible for giving notice of the hearing by publication.

*Adam Pychewicz, Chairperson
Michele Boni, Orange Township Zoning*

Publish one time on or before Friday, August 13, 2021 in the Delaware Gazette.

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

Township Officials Present: Michele Boni, Development and Zoning Director

Mr. Pychewicz: We're here tonight to discuss two Rezoning Applications for Evans Farm, #ZON-21-05 and #ZON-21-06 as well as the amendment to the Orange Township Zoning Resolution. Some quick ground rules, when the Board is ready for any public comment or anybody to speak, there will be an opportunity for members to speak during the hearing. If you'd like to speak, state your name, address and limit your comments to 3 minutes.

Ms. Boni: I have a staff report for both applications. I know the application was submitted to you all in design form. The applicant and I discussed that thoroughly and talked to our legal counsel and we are

Zoning Commission

51 going to move forward with it as one but we are going to be treating it as 2 separate applications which I
52 think will work. I'm going to start with the commercial area. With the staff review we'll talk about the
53 development standards overall and we'll have the applicant touch on this. We did receive a narrative from
54 the applicant that I believe was sent out to the Board members in advance. This really summarizes all the
55 changes that were made. I think the biggest take away out of this when Evans Farm came to us in 2014-15
56 it was a 300 page binder of each application and Evans Farm and I have been working diligently on
57 simplifying it and reformatting the text in a way for not only easier enforcement but just to simplify this
58 development as I think the goal of this has always remained the same to create our town center and our
59 community identity with the mix of uses but if there's an easier way to format that and understand the
60 vision and again, I'll have the applicant touch on that. I did have some staff comments in my staff review
61 and I did pass that along to the Board members and the applicant. We can go into those in more detail if
62 the Board wishes to do so but at this point if the Chair is okay with it, we'll turn it over to the applicant.

APPLICANT PRESENTATION/COMMISSION QUESTIONS & COMMENTS

66 Tony Eyerman and Dan Griffin of Evans Farm Development Company, and with us is Kevin Kershner,
67 our engineer, 1550 Lewis Center Road, Suite B, Lewis Center, Ohio 43035. Last fall we came before you
68 and when we got to the Trustees, the Trustees' comment was approval but they also requested that we
69 amend our zoning text to make it far less cumbersome and using Michele's text because it was very well
70 said and comments to implement an easier and comprehensive format to assist in plan review and
71 enforcement and it's just far easier and concise format for the development as well as for the review and
72 enforcement. With that being said, the Trustees requested us to do this last November 16 at their approval
73 of another amendment we had come through. Around the first of the year Michele and I started working
74 on this and it's gotten to the point you see today. The vision for Evans Farm has not varied; it's the exact
75 same community we've always wanted it to be. It's the exact same community that we presented to you
76 back in 2015-16 and while the text may be tightening up a little bit, being amended slightly, and that's
77 what it is, an amendment, there really aren't any changes to the vision at all; the vision remains the same.
78 In fact, under this print is the first print we did once we got Berlin Township approval too, so we merged
79 the 2 in 2017 and the changes are minimal between the 2017 plan and the 20 plan and really the only
80 changes required by the County Engineer were the alignment of Street B out on Old State Road and a
81 couple other minor road changes governed by the County Engineer. There are easily 150 pages of text in
82 the original zoning between the Planned Commercial and Single Family Planned Residential. In addition
83 to that we had numerous tabs and exhibits. In there were photographs of other houses, retail, office
84 facilities and other new urbanism communities. This amendment or replacement doesn't have that
85 because we have all the photographs we need sitting out there now. We were told recently by the fellow
86 who is a new urbanist developer said you no longer need to call yourselves a new urban community
87 because you are one and if people don't see that, then they're never going to understand what one is. For
88 the sake of going through a process to just make sure that t's are crossed and i's are dotted and it starts to
89 open up discussion with us and comments and questions from you, I put together this 8 page narrative of
90 articles of what was approved in 2016 and how we transferred it to a mini section and we did not get into
91 minute details but if that's what you need, we can certainly go through this. Starting at the bottom of Page
92 1 of the narrative, Article 10, Single Family Planned Residential District, 10.01 and 10.02 there's really
93 no impact on the text, so we didn't address that. Section 10.3, 10.04 and 10.05 we submitted a
94 spreadsheet of the permitted uses and took about 25 pages and narrowed it down to 6. The content of
95 those 20 some pages was incorporated into those 6 pages. The 6 stapled pages are the permitted land uses
96 and the other page is lot restrictions with all the setbacks, lot coverage, building heights and condensed it
97 into a spreadsheet as well. We don't take credit for all the authorization. It was with Township staff,
98 specifically Michele, into trying to make something that wasn't easy more manageable and to get it
99 approved. There are 2 things in this 6 sheet spreadsheet that are new. One of them is in here, the other we
100 missed and will come back in with it at the next meeting. With the intent of bringing out another type of
101 housing that came out of discussions with the Township on the multi-family and also discussion on the

Zoning Commission

102 opportunity for us to work in some duplexes, on the single family lots. It's very much a new urbanism
103 thing and it's another opportunity for perhaps another entry level or even down size type housing that
104 would fit very much into the architectural standards of what we proposed and are enforcing. But it's
105 basically a single family scale unit that offers 2 units. Unless you drove down the street and counted
106 doors, you would not be able to tell that they were a duplex. So we're proposing that. The other thing that
107 is not in here and I caught it afterwards. Throughout the whole zoning process and even in the almost 5
108 years since we have talked about farm markets and outdoor community markets of sorts and festivals too.
109 Somehow that didn't occur to just leave that in here so while it's not in the text that you have it was
110 discovered long after July 14 when we submitted this. We can go through each one by one if you want.
111 On the first page I was reading through this with the intent of simplicity, it became clear to me that the
112 attached residential didn't make sense; there was a lot of gray area in there. So I changed the title, I didn't
113 really change the descriptions, but it was very clear that some multi-family as a line item has retail with
114 multi-family above which is a different use in my mind from multi-family first floor all the way up and
115 they fit different places. In the retail area we have only access to the multi-family above and its retail.
116 There are other places potentially by the railroad that we may have 2 or 3 store units where we have
117 multi-family on the first floor as well, but I wanted to make sure those were separated and they weren't
118 very clear in the approved text. So that was the change made there, the first 3 on the bottom of Page 1 and
119 the attached dwelling which is the townhome which is the first item on the second page. If there's any
120 question we can go back to the old way but I was trying to be more clear as requested by the Trustees.
121 The animal care, bed and breakfast use, conference center is pretty much as is in the permitted uses,
122 simply changed the format to make it simpler. Page 3, boutique, medical facilities, office, warehouse,
123 parking structure, parking surface lot; that whole page is just about identical to what was approved in
124 2016. There is a question from staff up at the top, the header of this, in the gray box where it says Lot
125 Type 1, Lot Type 2, Lot Type 3, Lot Type 4. It's nothing more than a reference and I can take that line
126 out and just say Single Family Residential and that's the 90'. That's all it is, a title; there's no significance
127 to it at all. It's up to you if you want it in there or not. Page 4, art sculpture, community center, all that's
128 pretty much as was approved as well. Page 5, outdoor dining and outdoor display of materials, I thought if
129 It's something the Zoning Commission and Trustees wanted, we could put in there the outdoor
130 community market as a separate line item again just to help the staff in its simplicity to try and interpret
131 what we meant by display of materials or anything like that. It's simple; it's a market. What I envision is
132 it could be the single family Lot Type 1 and 2 only in the public areas, so using the hot dog as an example
133 which is the area where the post office is, a nice treed area, we can have the outdoor festival in there if we
134 wanted to. We don't want it in private areas, in people's backyards, in the alleys or anything like that
135 which are all private. It would be public areas only and the Planned Commercial areas would be Types 3
136 and 4 and it would just be permitted in both of those and it would all be to time limitations as well so it
137 would be Permitted Use; Time Limited Uses. We can consider that there. Page 6, really no changes to
138 that. Section 10.06, the procedure section, because we are simplifying, because we are getting rid of a lot,
139 for example, the photographs of the houses at the other communities, those are all gone, the tabs are gone.
140 Somewhere in the text we had a reference to Azek and Trek materials and we've taken that out. The
141 quality that we're demanding and the quality that's out there now sets the standard. We now know enough
142 and our town architects know enough to know what's quality and what's not, and prior to the occupancy
143 permit being issued, the town architect will review for compliance to make sure and something we've
144 discovered as we've evolved, we didn't lack a hammer to get everyone to comply but it was work and this
145 just makes it easy and it provides the Township the assurance that the zoning permit that was submitted,
146 the quality of the architecture that was promised is being delivered.

147
148 Mr. Griffin: And that's probably the best thing we can do for the Township and Evans Farm and it lets us
149 be the enforcer prior to you guys.

150
151 Mr. Eyerman: Working through Section 10.06, there are parts of the procedure that are incorporated into
152 the text, the architectural, the lighting, the trails, and those are in the section entitled Site Amenities,

Zoning Commission

153 Landscape, Open Space and Walls, General Development Totes and lastly at the request of the Township
154 in October/November is the lot classifications. Back in the beginning it specified 40', 45', 50', 55' lots,
155 all the way through and with each of those we had a certain quantity of lots in each category and not
156 realizing what a clerical time that would be to keep track of. You have a 45' lot but you have a side yard
157 setback on a corner that becomes 51', so do you have a 45' lot or 50' lot. We made the commitment a
158 long time ago to have 946 single family lots and we were going to have 149.5 acres of open space. We
159 aren't requesting any change to those. The open space is going to remain the open space acreage, 946
160 single family lots are there, the duplex lots are in addition but we're not changing the open space. What
161 this would do in getting rid of, and I can't remember how many 40' and how many 45' lots there are, we
162 still have 946 lots and how those are divided among lot sizes, Michele and staff were asking for those to
163 be removed. The market is driving it. When we initiated this in 2015 I had no expectation at all that a 40
164 or 45' lot would store a \$700,000 house but they are. In talking to builders now a 40-45' lot probably
165 starts in the high 4's or low 5's; it just blows me away. And that was before the lumber issues and
166 skyrocketing of lumber came up. We still have demand for the larger lots in a variety of architectural
167 styles that we can't capture on a 40 or 45' lot but larger lots allow for a different style home and there are
168 still demands for the larger lots and probably in the last 6 months we've sold mostly larger lots.
169 So we don't see taking 946 lots and making them all 45's and 50's. That's one of our requests as well.
170 Section 10.07 is Development Standards. One thing we have found with COVID is it changed our market
171 drastically and all of our office demands disappeared because of people working from home. Our plan
172 was always to have multiple stories of retail area. I can't say it was all planned for 4 stories which was the
173 50' height maximum, but we were planning on part of that on Market Street which was really important
174 for our retail and commerce area to have offices and it's pretty apparent that the offices aren't going to
175 come back for a while. We talked to the Trustees, to various people in the community, some of the
176 Zoning Commission members, and the response we got back was we should consider bringing part of the
177 retail area in compliance with the 23 overlay which allows 3 units to the acre. Going through the different
178 criteria, you can increase your densities up to 10 and that's what we wrote down here, a maximum of 10
179 units. That doesn't change our retail uses on the first floor, it doesn't change how we plan anything along
180 there, it simply allows us more than 1 story of retail along Market Street through the rest of the
181 community because the office isn't going to support it for a long time. One other thing in the
182 Development Standards we are requesting an amendment to the alley width. Working with the Township,
183 the County Engineer, the alley width we are proposing is 15' rather than 20'. In the City of Delaware,
184 that's the standard alley width. 20' we have found is almost as costly as a public road and it really doesn't
185 provide you a public space versus a private space, so basically you're double loading on my house. You
186 have traffic and a lot of activity from both directions. 15' is plenty of space for 18' head in parking space
187 outside the garage to allow yourself to back out and travel back and forth. Talking to the Fire Department
188 about it, they don't see any issue with changing, so that's what we're requesting. Section 10.08 and 10.09,
189 Single Cluster Housing Golf Course Community. We had nothing in that so that's an N/A. Article 21 in
190 the Single Family Planned Residential. 21.01, Parking is in our new parking section. The primary
191 difference from what was approved in 2016 that was proposed tonight is we are extending the shared
192 parking east/west; before it was stopping at Piatt at Meadows at Lewis Center. Now we're extending it to
193 the railroad track simply because the uses are continued if we see them. There is, and staff found them, is
194 a typo. There should be 2 parking spaces in the garage and 2 in the driveway for single family. We only
195 had 2 in the garage but we're sticking with the 4; we're not changing anything there. Height
196 limitations/lot limitations spreadsheet. The height limitation 35 single family that was approved in 2016
197 and it's the same thing in this proposal and the 50' is the maximum in the zoning text was approved and
198 it's the same on this sheet. Structure Separation, 21.03, in our spreadsheet we had 0' of separation
199 between the commercial buildings and that was because we were planning on having attached buildings. I
200 think what we need to do is have a 0 for attached and have a separate number for the detached units and
201 we'll do that. These are coming out of staff's comments. 21.04, Sanitary Sewer Requirements, nothing
202 has changed. 21.05, Water Impoundments, about a month ago Dan was in here and we incorporated that
203 text into this.

Zoning Commission

204
205 Ms. Boni: I would double check that; I didn't think it was the same.

206
207 Mr. Eyerman: Section 21.06, Landscape, Open Space, Fencing and Walls. This section incorporates at
208 least 3 sections of the approved text in the existing Landscape Plan and merges them together. We got rid
209 of the spreadsheet that had all the approved trees in it and I don't think the Township has any preference
210 on which ones we keep. I don't know if you guys want to know what kind of trees we have in there. If
211 you want us to reference the City of Westerville or Dublin's approved tree list, that's fine but we got rid
212 of the tab that had the acceptable trees. Similar to the landscaping, the open space we consolidated 4
213 different places and furnished them on this text as well. We got rid of open space by open space and how
214 it was going to be maintained. As I said before, we're committed to the 149.5 acres of open space and the
215 plan is generally how it's been developed to this point. It is going to remain generally developed that
216 matches the acreages and all the open space is going to be right there.

217
218 Ms. Boni: Are all the trails and sidewalks going to remain the same?

219
220 Mr. Eyerman: Yes. In our fencing and walls text we have a 3' and 4' fence section and what we failed to
221 do was reference that this 3' fencing is more for single family planned residential and the 4' is for the
222 planned commercial and the reason we have 4' fencing in planned commercial is so people have a little
223 privacy if they're out on the sidewalk, whether it's fencing or a planter, you have a little privacy in more
224 intimate seating areas in areas out in front on the sidewalk.

225
226 Ms. Boni: And will the 5' fence requirement remain the same with the swimming pools?

227
228 Mr. Eyerman: Yes. 21.07, repealed. 21.08, Flood Plain Regulations, nothing has changed on that. 21.09 is
229 the setback regulation and that's the spreadsheet. We were able to take several pages and consolidate it
230 down and probably be every bit as precise as the multiple pages. We will be a little more specific on the
231 planned commercial side. If there are any questions, I'll be happy to discuss them with you. 21.10,
232 Requirements for Non-Residential Uses Abutting Residential. We submitted nothing in 2016 and we were
233 able to keep that task tonight. 20.11, Installation of Satellite Dishes. Those were in the architectural
234 standards previously and they're in the architectural standards in the new proposed text as well. Lighting,
235 21.12, similar to what the landscaping and open space were. They're referenced in several sections in 21
236 as well as Section 10. We tried to consolidate them all into Site Amenities. The only thing that we
237 proposed is specific to the signage above and around the doors because our retailers are not allowed to
238 have backlit signs. We're asking for directional signs rather than just lighted signs and if there's a lighted
239 sign on the corner, it's fairly burnable at 15', one downlit sign is inadequate, so we might have to come
240 around to the sides and go sideways too, so we're asking for directional signage with cut offs. We
241 understand the long time desire for downlighting in the Township and we're still award of the dark skies
242 initiative and some of the things around the fronts of the retail areas we're going to have a hard time with
243 lighting signage if we keep getting directional signage going sideways and I don't think we have anything
244 that's proposed uplighting at all. So if you want to get rid of uplighting we can do that and just go
245 directional. 21.13 is Display of Property Address. We have nothing there. 21.14, Permitted Uses and
246 Permitted Land Uses. Michele and I worked hard to try and consolidate that down to make it as specific
247 as we could. That's the end of the Single Family Planned Residential.

248
249 Mr. Pychewicz: I think we can address any comments for the Single Family Planned Residential before
250 we move onto Commercial. The introduction of the duplex houses. I understand you already have a set of
251 architectural standards in place and a community architect that's reviewing all these. You mentioned a
252 specific look or style that you're going for those but I was wondering if there would be additional
253 language added that would help like when you said if you didn't look at them close enough it was hard to

Zoning Commission

254 see it's a duplex, however that's achieved, is that something that will be handled in the text or do you plan
255 on having the architect dictate how that's driven or the developer?

256

257 Mr. Eyerman: I think we could do a little bit of both. There has to be some control.

258

259 Ms. Trebellas: Dennis and I were a part of this zoning and there was a discussion on duplexes and part of
260 the problem with duplexes, and I think the language was not included, was the Township has an idea of
261 what a duplex is and doesn't like it because there weren't architectural standards. The garages were out
262 front, the doors were out front, it was clear they were duplexes. They looked run down. That is why there
263 was a large discussion on that. If there are architectural standards where the garage is in the back and
264 they look like a single family from the front and it blends in with the rest of the neighborhood so that if
265 you do have architectural standards, it would make people in the Township a lot more comfortable and
266 accepting of duplexes.

267

268 Mr. McNulty: You already mentioned the garages are in the back, correct?

269

270 Mr. Eyerman: Yes.

271

272 Mr. McNulty: And I'm familiar with the ones you describe and with architectural standards, I think that's
273 fine. What they're referring to are some of the more modern styles with garages in front; that is not a
274 good thing. But I think where you're headed with this design of the older style that's a good thing.

275

276 Ms. Boni: There are some lots that are not serviced by alleys though so the garages would be in front.

277

278 Mr. Eyerman: Even then the garages have to be behind the building.

279

280 Ms. Boni: Behind the front unit?

281

282 Mr. Eyerman: Yes, but we're not amending our architectural standards to accommodate a duplex or
283 anything like that. New Orleans is rich with all kinds of housing. Using 2 other communities, Stapleton
284 which is in Denver is monstrosly large and they have created duplexes on corners and if you look at the
285 Bob Webb model on the Parade lot, it's almost identical to that where you have the front door and porch
286 is one and a front door on the side and if you didn't know any better, you'd think it was part of the same
287 house. Or the Commons in Louisville. You take that formal approach where they took a house that the
288 frontage is very long and architecturally done very well where it's 2 units that doesn't look like 2 units
289 and there's value in having duplexes where rather than having to stay where you've spent the last 25 years
290 with your family, you just move a few doors down and that's one of the things we've seen in going
291 around to new urbanism communities. Folks move within the community but that's something that we've
292 been without in Delaware County for a long time.

293

294 Mr. McNulty: I heard you mention higher density and the 23 overlay project. Does the overlay project
295 touch this?

296

297 Ms. Boni: No.

298

299 Mr. Eyerman: It's on the southwest corner of The Cove.

300

301 Mr. McNulty: Is that higher density something that's going to occur?

302

303 Mr. Eyerman: What we're proposing because we don't have an end for the office use, we don't have
304 anything to go above the retail on Market Street and coming in Evans Farm Drive, Buildings 1 and 2 are

Zoning Commission

305 almost finished, Building 3 and Building 4 the plans are finished, and as soon as Buildings 1 and 2 are
306 finished, Buildings 3 and 4 are going to start and in between Buildings 3 and 5 is Market Street at that
307 intersection and Market Street is the center part of the retail area and without any office space, it's all
308 going to be 1 story retail. You go from 4 stories on one side to the apartment houses.

309
310 Mr. McNulty: You're anticipating apartments for that space?

311
312 Mr. Eyerman: Some sort of condo or apartments.

313
314 Mr. McNulty: I think all of already expected this when we saw this from the beginning, that we were
315 going to see you often enough for changes to be made and we all understood that. I really like what's
316 done here. In my opinion, this may become the model for a lot of what we're doing. Does this simplify
317 things for you going forward?

318
319 Mr. Eyerman: Tremendously.

320
321 Mr. McNulty: Because as those changes, and we've already heard something that you've already seen
322 because of the offices going away. We know that with COVID and that's going to be a long time if ever
323 coming back. What else do you see as you look at that you may need to modify, adjust as time moves on?

324
325 Mr. Griffin: I think this gives us flexibility to move with the changes. I love the idea of making sure we
326 get all of our segments because that's when we build the village and I'm pretty excited that hopefully one
327 day the Orange Township town hall will be there in the middle. Other than the flexibility, 12 years of
328 planning and he's done a great job; who would have seen COVID and in 2 years, we don't know what
329 will happen. The market might come back, there might be offices. I think it's just sticking with the vision
330 and the architecture and every time we figure something out, come in and I think that just really cleans
331 things up. For me, Tony as well as you guys, it cleans up the enforcement side.

332
333 Mr. Eyerman: From a single family perspective, we had Mike Watkins come in from the very beginning
334 writing architectural text and everything was going to be white and he was limiting it to 2 or 3
335 architectural styles for the homes, and I remember no being the first answer and hell no being the second
336 answer. We have a pretty extensive architectural range and if you go to Prospect Village north of Denver
337 in Long Run and it's a phenomenal new urbanism community. There's every architectural style you can
338 imagine that it puts us to shame. Some of the styles work very nicely, some don't but people still accept it
339 because of the scale of the architecture. Even though it might not be my favorite, it works and it's still
340 very oriented toward the resident, the pedestrian. Vehicular is on the backside, they have a lot of
341 driveways, but it still works. That one and Stapleton. Stapleton, you can't have that many Victorian
342 houses, so they have every architectural style known to man. It allows us a lot of flexibility without
343 limiting us like Mike was trying to limit us to 3 or 4 styles which to me would have been a very dull
344 place. Someone will come in and ask for "x" style of house and I get to see about every style of house that
345 comes in. My first reaction is I would never live in that house but someone else will and will call it home.
346 So it allows a lot of flexibility, adaptability. Hopefully this simplification, consolidation of the zoning text
347 makes it a little easier for all of us.

348
349 Mr. McNulty: I think moving the alleys from 20' to 15' so you don't have 2 rows, 2 way traffic; I see the
350 reality and practicality of that.

351
352 Mr. Griffin: It gives more room to get into the garage, leave your car outside the garage because a lot of
353 people push their houses so far back that when you pull your vehicle into the garage, how close to the
354 alley is it? I'd rather have the extra distance.

355

Zoning Commission

356 Mr. McNulty: Because if you keep the same width, you'll have 2 way traffic.
357

358 Mr. Griffin: Let me ask you guys, you've lived through the growth of Evans Farm, what do you think? Is
359 there anything you'd like to see? Are we missing anything?
360

361 Mr. Pychewicz: It's an awesome community.
362

363 Ms. Trebellas: I think you made the right call in not limiting the architectural styles and colors; it would
364 become very monotonous. That's one thing I do appreciate, that you have a variety of styles. It doesn't
365 matter as long as they fit on the lot and they meet the setbacks and height limitations. And same with the
366 paint colors. It's nice you can do a variety. You're not limited to the all white and what seems to be
367 popular gray. It's nice to see someone with a bright front door.
368

369 Mr. Eyerman: We had a complaint from a resident in Evans Farm and it's not attacking anyone in
370 particular but Hardy Plank and Smart Siding they now finish off the painting in the plant and they have
371 about 9 colors. They painted their house dark gray and 2 houses down is the exact same color and you
372 said no house would be the exact same house. That house is Renaissance and yours is Craftsman and we
373 can't control it if someone built the exact same house, we can't control the colors. We can't get into that
374 level of control. If you haven't been there in the last couple weeks, on Linden there's a bunch of spec
375 houses and it's looking really good. There's a community in Michigan called Cherry Hill where they have
376 one street that has houses of every color in the rainbow. I don't know that I'd want to live in a lilac house
377 but someone did and in the context of that street, it's pretty cool. I wouldn't want every street like that but
378 good for them. It's the diversity we're trying to get to so we don't have to keep coming back to you guys.
379

380 Ms. Trebellas: You say you're going to stick with the 946 single family lots' we're just sort of moving
381 them around however the market tells us.
382

383 Mr. Eyerman: Yes and no. In new urbanism you go from the denser areas to the less dense areas, we're
384 pretty much holding to that but it's just that there's going to be a time where we're either going to have a
385 demand for small lots or large lots and we have to be able to respond to that.
386

387 Ms. Trebellas: 100 duplex lots; where do they fall into that? Are they part of the 946 lots that you're
388 setting aside 100 to be duplexes? Is it in addition to the 946 lots?
389

390 Mr. Eyerman: We're proposing them as additional.
391

392 Ms. Trebellas: So where are they coming from? If we're not changing green space and not changing units,
393 all of a sudden we have 100 extra lots.
394

395 Mr. Griffin: The duplex does allow us to be sensitive to values. As we see lumber going up and down,
396 you can't get laborers, you can't get supplies. We see the house someone could afford at \$400,000 now
397 you just can't. You're seeing \$500,000, \$525,000. So it has pushed us into this is a million dollar
398 subdivision and this isn't what we want to accomplish, so the lots would stay the same but you end up
399 getting additional units because of the duplex but we wouldn't have additional lots.
400

401 Mr. Eyerman: The demand for the 90 footers, 100 footers is not where we thought it would be and the
402 duplexes would be around the oval area where there's a little more density anyway. As you go to the east,
403 we'll start with 45's and 50's instead of 70' lots and we're keenly aware that we may not get to 1046 lots.
404 But we have seen on Maple Street where we have 100' lots, we still have lots available and we're pushing
405 Section 6 right now.
406

Zoning Commission

407 Mr. Pierce: So you're planning on adjusting based on the lot size. This may be for a single family home
408 but the rest of it in in itself could put a duplex on there.

409
410 Mr. Eyerman: We would cluster the duplexes together. It would make a nice transition in my mind
411 between single family and multi-family around the oval back to the single family.

412
413 Ms. Trebellas: So you're doing it so it's more dense to less dense and the duplexes would be part of that
414 transition from multi-family to large single family lots. From the street they may look larger than your
415 single family because you have to get in that extra unit.

416
417 Mr. Eyerman: Yes.

418
419 Mr. Pierce: You're asking for a decision on whether or not you're going to do "x" number of these,
420 correct?

421
422 Mr. Eyerman: Yes.

423
424 Ms. Boni: These amendments include the permitting of the use of the duplex and an additional 100 lots.

425
426 Ms. Trebellas: Then the duplexes would be topped at 100 lots so you have the potential of 100 two family
427 units or 200 extra units?

428
429 Mr. Eyerman: Correct.

430
431 Mr. Pierce: But where did the 100 lots come from again?

432
433 Ms. Trebellas: So it's my understanding that the extra wide 90' lots, if they're not going as single family
434 lots, some of those will become duplexes.

435
436 Mr. Eyerman: Yes and we have to have a little vision up front. What we don't want to do is end up with
437 duplexes on 100' lots on the street.

438
439 Ms. Trebellas: Or you don't want to end up with an extra 5, 10' here and there; that's not fully thought
440 out.

441
442 Ms. Boni: I think overall it gives the developer more flexibility.

443
444 Mr. Eyerman: We're probably 3 years out. We're studying the market and demands, we're talking with
445 the builders to try and figure out how we're going to do this, figuring out lot sizes and things like that. We
446 don't have a plan yet that shows a duplex on it; we were not going to assume we'd get approval but we're
447 hoping. If you do approve it, we go back to the drawing board and start over.

448
449 Mr. Pierce: You don't know if the duplex will be side by side or up and down, do you?

450
451 Mr. Eyerman: Not as of right now but it could be either.

452
453 Mr. Pierce: Do you know if you'll do 50/50 or 75 of that and 25 of that?

454
455 Mr. Eyerman: I'm guessing that they'll be side by side because they tend to be a little more handicap
456 friendly and when you have the upper and lower you kind of limit your market.

457

Zoning Commission

458 Ms. Trebellas: I think it's the other way around. If you have the top and bottom, your bottom can be
459 accessible, your top one would be not. If you have them side by side, your ground floor is accessible.
460 Also for corner lots, your front and side having 2 fronts on either street also. I think the only concern I
461 have is just to make sure there are architectural standards that go with the duplexes so Orange Township
462 is comfortable with duplexes and they're not mimicking what we have currently.
463

464 Mr. Eyerman: If this would help and it's not considered a submission, but our architectural standards that
465 we use to enforce se review everything on now. The reason it isn't submitted to the Township is because
466 the Township isn't in a position where they want to enforce these and if you want a copy personally, I'd
467 be happy to send you a file with them. We amended it, not because of any content but mostly because of
468 redundancy and there's nothing more fun to have to do it again if you guys want us to do it. Walking
469 down the street with architects, they're sitting there looking at these houses and it's just cool to walk
470 down the street with someone who knows what they're looking at.
471

472 Mr. Pierce: How often do you deviate from your standards?
473

474 Mr. Eyerman: Rarely. We deviated on one when a builder makes a mistake. It was an architectural
475 mistake that no one caught and the first floor is off by 1' and then the front porch is short 1' in depth so
476 we had to extend that out. It still meets all the Township's zoning text with setbacks and everything it just
477 didn't meet ours but we know it was an honest mistake and that's the last one we've had in a long time
478 and he made it look good.
479

480 Mr. Pychewicz: Do you want to go through commercial and just touch on the ones that have changed?
481 Some of these are similar.
482

483 Mr. Eyerman: Article 14, Planned Commercial Office District, 14.01 and 14.02 nothing changed. 14.03,
484 14.04 and 14.05 are permitted uses and temporary uses we have the spreadsheet that we've already gone
485 over. The one thing that we mentioned, the outdoor community market, isn't in there but we'd like to add
486 it. It's up to you guys whether to approve it or not but we've been getting a lot of questions about as far as
487 an open air market. 14.06, Procedures. Like the single family we got rid of the tab, we got rid of the
488 references to Azek and Trek. One thing we added and this is working with Michele and her staff and it's a
489 mutual benefit to both sides, in order to issue a zoning permit, the Township Office will require an
490 approval letter from the town architect and that's at the very beginning before construction's made. At the
491 end of the process, the hammer is in order to get my occupancy permit as a builder/homeowner, they need
492 to have an architect letter that says we did what we said we were going to do and in my mind that's the
493 best hammer to force compliance with the plan submitted and promised to be built. That's probably the
494 biggest change in 14.06. 14.07, Development Standards, Lot Types 3 and 4 are simply titles to describe
495 the area around the oval and the Lewis Center retail area. Setbacks are pretty much the same. Signage is
496 an issue; we just got Jeff's comments right before I left home so I haven't had a chance to go through
497 them. Our target in regard to the signage, especially in the retail area, and that's where signage is really
498 critical, if you go through State Street in Westerville, that's what our target is. The City of Worthington
499 has a similar streetscape although in my mind it's not as ornamental and entertaining. Bridge Street is nice
500 too but it's not quite there. State Street they have wall mounted signs, monument signs, awning signs, A-
501 frame, window signs whether it's etched or gold leaf painted. Our approved signage package says we're
502 allowed 3 signs per unit. Size, it doesn't say anything like that, so we took those 3 out and as part of the
503 town architect we have the opportunity to look at that and say you need more or you need less. That's
504 what our signage is in a very simple nutshell. Tract coverage, standards are the same as previously
505 approved at 75%. The overall Planned Commercial District is at maximum impervious coverage. It's not
506 a per lot kind of thing. Our engineers keep track of the impervious coverage over the entire site and at the
507 end of it all they're going to say yes or no we meet it and if we get to the last phase and we exceed it, then
508 we can't do it so we're very much looking ahead on the single family markets and we're also doing the

Zoning Commission

509 same thing on the commercial. It's something we take very seriously and we also know the County
510 Engineer is not going to sign off on anything more than that too because we'll blow up our storm basins.
511 General Development Standards, Section 21.0, there's nothing. 21.01, Parking, we already talked about
512 shared parking between the railroad tracks and Meadows at Lewis Center and then in the oval we'll go
513 with standard parking requirements. Height limitations, we haven't changed anything, 50' maximum. We
514 did work with the Trustees before on Buildings 1 and 2 and the height is measured at the middle of the
515 slope to the flat roof. It may be an inch or two higher on the high end but it's an inch or two lower on the
516 down side, so it averages 50'. Sections 21.03, 21.04 there's no change. We'll work with the Township to
517 provide structure separation for non-attached units. 21.05, Water Impoundments, we don't plan on having
518 any pools in the front or side yards in the Planned Commercial area, so I don't think we'll have any worry
519 there. Landscaping is similar to single family; we've merged several sections into that. We didn't limit
520 ourselves on that with the architect's approval of the site plan. Section 21.07 is repealed. Flood Plain
521 Regulation, there's no change to that. Setback Regulations, Section 21.09, and that's back to that one
522 page spreadsheet that shows all the heights. Lot Coverage Requirements, there's really no change to that.
523 21.10, Requirements for Non-residential uses abutting Residential Districts. The only place that that
524 occurs is in the Meadows at Lewis Center and we have easily a 50' setback between their community and
525 where our retail starts. They actually have a buffer on our property. 21.11, Installation of Satellite Dishes.
526 It's in the architectural standards with the cable that's in there. I doubt we have any but we have controls
527 in there in case we do. Lighting, the only thing we really focused on in the Planned Commercial other
528 than safe pedestrian crossings and parking corridors is the lighting on the signage and we already talked
529 about that. 21.13, Display of Property Address, we didn't change anything in that; there really wasn't
530 anything in the beginning. 21.14, Permitted Uses, those are in the spreadsheet as well and I don't think we
531 changed anything as far as temporary uses go. I got the staff report and I'm not sure if it's a rezoning case
532 or an amendment case. We're only asking for an amendment; we're not rezoning. When the Trustees
533 asked us to do this, they asked us to do this, they asked us to come in with a PUD. Which would take a
534 full blown rezoning and I don't have the stomach for it so what we tried to do is as much as we could in
535 talking with staff, you guys and the Trustees was try to consolidate this as much as we could while still
536 keeping the integrity of the 2 applications and making it a single document as a mixed use document. As
537 long as we're clear on that and all of our legal friends are happy with it, we will work with you guys any
538 way you want it to be done. We elected not to do the PUD even though there was question whether
539 legally we could. We just decided not to, not even to consider it, so it's an amendment. The proposed text
540 we're doing is a replacement for the zoning text, getting rid of 150 pages of text plus there were
541 illustrations and getting it down to 30 or 40 pages, but those 30 or 40 pages are pretty rich text that we
542 have. The plan itself we haven't changed and other than the County Engineer making us change a
543 separation, and that is just very minor to meet the County Engineer's standards.

544

545 Mr. Pierce; The outdoor community market you say is going to be in the front spot; is that the only place
546 it's supposed to be?

547

548 Mr. Eyerman: It could happen anywhere in the commercial area, it could happen in the parking lots, we
549 could shut down Market Street or one of the other streets. It depends on what kind of use and the size. As
550 the community grows, and I'm talking about Orange Township not just Evans Farm, I can see shutting
551 down Market Street as we shut down for the parade. A couple of years ago we shut down Evans Farm
552 Drive but we have to be a little sensitive about how much we walk into our residents' front yards in the
553 single family area, so Central Park is attractive but it's attractive partly because it's wooded and it's
554 green, and if you come in with a market there, you're going to trash it. Last year we hosted a cars and
555 coffee and we have another one in September and all these cars are backed in on Evans Farm Drive and
556 they're really not in the front yard of the residents, they're kind of parked at a diagonal, but we can see
557 uses like that but they're going to be low impact uses as we grow. Heavy duty stuff will be on Market
558 Street and we still have the oval which is still planned for movie nights and concerts and things like that,

Zoning Commission

559 and that's on the drawing board now. We have places for that and we have places for less impactful things
560 too, so that's what our plans are.

561

562 Mr. Pierce; But I think it's something that should be included.

563

564 Mr. Eyerman: If the Zoning Commission likes it, we'll add it to our next submission. Once we gather all
565 the comments and staff has comments too that we haven't addressed yet, we'll resubmit in the next week
566 or so and get that back before you and that's something we'll include if you'd like.

567

568 Mr. Pychewicz: I think it's a great idea and I'd like to see what the boundaries would be, and I'm not just
569 saying physically. Not just if it's restricted to a certain area but more what the intent of it is, how often it
570 would occur if you have an idea of what that could be, time line as to when it would open and close, and
571 if there's any restrictions, obviously meeting the guidelines of the community.

572

573 Mr. Eyerman: Something like a farm market, Delaware has them, Westerville has them, and they use the
574 sidewalks because it's a twice a week kind of thing so you don't want to shut the main street down. If
575 you're going to have an art show or music festival or something where you're going to bring in a lot of
576 people during a certain time period and time period is critical because we have uses that are time
577 restricted, we could do something like that and say these are the areas we envision for the big events. For
578 something like a farm market that's twice a week we don't have to worry about; it's permitted on our
579 sidewalks and our sidewalks are wide enough to accommodate them but we don't have to worry about
580 shutting down the streets so it's less impactful.

581

582 Mr. Pychewicz: That's good to know. I know the signage comments came in kind of late; was there any
583 red flag comments?

584

585 Ms. Boni: No.

586

587 Mr. Pychewicz: I went through them very brief and I would say if it's more of a clarification thing or
588 question, I know you guys can answer them. If there is something in here that you would say that's not
589 what we're trying to do, if there's a way to communicate that back before the next meeting just so we're
590 not going into the next meeting and it's all brand new. Obviously we're all going to review it.

591

592 Ms. Boni: I apologize, that's on me. I asked Jeff to review it, he's our Township signage guru, and I think
593 his intent of these comments is to assure that they are not excessive or blinding.

594

595 Mr. Pychewicz: Speaking of signage, the lighting part you discussed possibly doing a side light or
596 something. With the residential aspect to this project and everything being kind of close to each other, but
597 if there was a way in the case of a blade sign or something with side lighting on it, if there was a way to
598 shield that. It's illuminating the sign, doing what it's intended for, but not going through.

599

600 Mr. Eyerman: The information I got from lighting reps they have lenses that are able to cut off the non-
601 useful light off the side and that's our intention.

602

603 Mr. Pychewicz: Is the landscaping the same that was done on the single family and it was all taken out
604 and you kind of manage that as far as what kind of species and everything?

605

606 Mr. Eyerman: In regard to the species of the street trees, we took that out. In regard to the design of the
607 individual lots and the selection of street trees, we kept that in our side and that's in the architectural
608 standards and it's approved by the town architect.

609

Zoning Commission

610 Mr. Pychewicz: In the case where someone comes in with a less desirable species of trees and the process
611 would be it goes through that architectural review and that's where it would be taken out?

612

613 Mr. Eyerman: That's my job

614

615 Mr. McNulty: You already have the lighting in your architectural standards.

616

617 Mr. Eyerman: Yes, and one thing we do not have in our architectural standards is directional signage.
618 Being from Columbus I could point to a sign in German Village that had a blade sign that ran just about
619 the height of the 3 story building. It wasn't very wide but it said Reeves in big letters down the side. One
620 downlighting on the top isn't going to work so you've got to have lighting on the side. It wasn't backlit, it
621 was just a wooden sign and you have to be able to light the sign. According to our zoning text we're only
622 permitted downlighting so we're just calling it directional signage with cut offs so we're not streaming
623 light down the street or in people's eyes. The last thing, we do not want the orange glare from Glenn
624 Parkway because we're not out for that. We're illuminating corners at intersections, if it's a good size
625 block we'll go mid-block and that's exactly how we designed the Parade walk and signage is going to be
626 every bit of common sense as that.

627

628 Mr. McNulty: Someone is going to have to maintain your architectural standards after this is completed.
629 There's got to be someone there.

630

631 Mr. Eyerman: I'm not the town architect.

632

633 Mr. McNulty: I know you guys enough, I know you've got a lot of those things written, I heard State
634 Street in Westerville. Great idea. Is what you're proposing still meet our Code or are any divergences
635 needed from what's in here versus our Code?

636

637 Mr. Eyerman: The directional signs don't meet your Code because you require everything downlighting.

638

639 Ms. Boni: And Evans didn't really meet our Code in 2016 either.

640

641 Mr. Eyerman: There's lots of divergences.

642

643 Mr. McNulty: And that will have to be for type of lighting for this sign.

644

645 Mr. Eyerman: Yes. And anything that I could think of that didn't quite meet the Code listed in here as
646 something we are proposing; I didn't list them as divergences but we can do that.

647

648 Mr. McNulty: I personally like it. I've always thought some of our Code was too restrictive in some
649 cases, signage especially.

650

651 Mr. Eyerman: And if you look at the built product around the community it's pretty nice and it's hard to
652 legislate nice. If you sit there and say every house has to have a peak and every house has to have 2
653 windows on the front, it just doesn't compute and Orange Township text for the most part across the
654 community has done a pretty good job and you guys did a good job interpreting that text, and it's hard.

655

656 Mr. McNulty: After your time, Tony, there's going to be someone maintaining these architectural
657 standards. Because I know your community is still going to be there in 50 years.

658

659 Mr. Eyerman: Yes.

660

Zoning Commission

661 Mr. Pierce: Do you have anyone who verifies things are built to your standards?
662

663 Mr. Eyerman: The town architect and the HOA is involved in this already. There is a continuity to go
664 forward.
665

666 Mr. McNulty: That's the point I was trying to make. The continuity of this for the decades to follow as it
667 continues to grow.
668

669 Mr. Eyerman: The applicant pays the town architect but because we pay him, but because we hired him,
670 you'd think he'd say yes to everything we say yes to but it doesn't work that way and we don't want it
671 that way. And we encourage our architects to design houses just to stay sharp because it can become very
672 dull. We have 2 town architects and both of them are very good at residential quality design. Our previous
673 town architect designed a couple of houses and now he has so many houses under construction that we
674 brought in another architect and these 2 swap back and forth ab and they review each other's stuff.
675 So we have 1 town architect with a reliever and we're kind of looking for a bull pen architect but it's
676 something that's critical, it's the essence of the community, the architecture of the single family. If we
677 screw up on that, the whole community falls apart. So the quality of the people we have for architects is
678 every bit of essential and we have to make sure that we have the opportunity that if one of those guys
679 leave or goes out of town, we need to find a steady one. We can't talk enough about the town architects
680 and the work they do. Those 2 and another fellow with us were the authors of the updated version and
681 those are the guys you walk down the street with and they get it, they interpret for us.
682

683 Mr. McNulty: I think that book that you have is a huge plus for your development. I know it's rock solid.
684

685 Mr. Eyerman: I can share a digital copy with you if you want.
686

687 Ms. Boni: It will probably take a week or so to get the comments from everybody and Tony I don't know
688 what your turnaround time is.
689

690 Mr. Pychewicz: If you get comments in a week.
691

692 Ms. Boni: We don't have anything next month, so the 14th and 28th would be the possibilities.
693

694 Mr. Eyerman: With Labor Day being in 2 weeks; if you did it the week after that.
695

696 Mr. Pychewicz: The 14th?
697

698 Mr. Eyerman: Something like that; how would that work?
699

700 That works with everyone.
701

702 **MOTION TO CONTINUE THE HEARING FOR APPLICATION #ZON-21-05 AND #ZON-21-06**

703
704 Ms. Trebellas made a motion to continue the hearing for Zoning Application #'s ZON-21-05 and ZON-
705 21-06, for Evans Farm/BZ Evans, LLC and Evans Farm Development Company, LLC until Tuesday,
706 September 14, 2021 at 7:00 p.m. at the Orange Township Hall; seconded by Mr. McNulty.
707

708 Vote on Motion: Mr. Pychewicz-yes, Mr. McNulty-yes, Ms. Trebellas-yes, Mr. Pierce-yes
709 Motion carried

710 **OTHER BUSINESS**

711

Zoning Commission

712 Mr. Pychewicz; We have the amendment to the Orange Township Zoning Resolution, for the RCOD text
713 amendment.

714

715 Ms. Boni: Holly Mattei, our planning consultant, helped us write this and I have a brief summary of the
716 changes proposed. These charges are pretty straight forward overall. It's prohibiting the use of gas
717 stations in all the sub-areas and we defined gas stations in addition to defining truck service centers and
718 defining auto oriented uses.

719

720 Mr. Pychewicz: This is gas stations and not the commercial sub-area, correct?

721

722 Ms. Boni: This would prohibit gas stations in all sub-areas.

723

724 Ms. Trebellas; All parts of 23

725

726 Ms. Boni: In the overlay.

727

728 Ms. Trebellas: So I'm a developer and I want to put in a gas station can I still do it.

729

730 Mr. Griggs: You'd have to rezone.

731

732 Ms. Boni: The other question that was raised was the initial text on the gas station, we didn't know if the
733 Commission and Trustees were interested in doing the same thing to all of our auto oriented uses.

734

735 Mr. McNulty: I'm not interested in prohibiting those I think their use is along 23 and anything else would
736 be dropped into other areas where they shouldn't be.

737

738 Ms. Boni: Would that include a car wash too?

739

740 Mr. Griggs: There's a bunch and that's a policy decision and that was brought up and talking to Michele
741 there's somewhat a sense of urgency with this particular text so I think it would be beneficial to look at
742 those other issues right now and then go back to the items that you looked at.

743

744 Mr. McNulty; You'd have to write exceptions because there's oil change places, car washes; I don't like
745 it. I don't like the blanket use of we don't want anything auto use in the 23 overlay. I think that's an over
746 reach.

747

748 Mr. Griggs: That's not what this particular text as written does but again, given the time sensitive nature
749 of the we don't....

750

751 Mr. McNulty: I don't want to grandfather in just because you're a car wash.

752

753 Mr. Griggs: There's always the ability to rezone if necessary to an existing PD or Standard Zoning
754 District.

755

756 Mr. McNulty: If you were another community and didn't have a road like 23, if we were a Powell that
757 had a 2 lane road running through, I could see this but with the nature of 23 and the size of it and the
758 community it's in.

759

760 Mr. Pierce: Why is it so critical?

761

762 Ms. Boni: Some of the recent overlay applications have cause controversy with the community.

Zoning Commission

763 Mr. Griggs: With uses it's a policy decision and I think this request before you is a policy decision
764 requested by the Trustees.

765
766 Ms. Trebellas: I'm not sure how I feel about this; I think I need to think about it a little more. But I do
767 know that we had one applicant that was a gas station, car wash, convenience store. It was very difficult
768 for them to meet the overlay regulations just by their building type, that their building type did not work
769 with the overlay restrictions and I don't know if it saved them any time or not because of that but that's
770 one reason I want to think about it more. It doesn't seem like this building type is suited for the overlay
771 guidelines in the first place.

772
773 Ms. Boni: I don't know that that was the intent when we were looking at it for those type of uses but they
774 are able to go in the overlay district.

775
776 Ms. Trebellas: They're allowed to but it's very difficult just because the standards of the overlay don't
777 necessarily meet that building type, like a car wash in terms of the façade and the street and stuff. Oil
778 change or anything like that requires lots of lanes.

779
780 Ms. Boni: Also we wouldn't be making a recommendation tonight.

781
782 Mr. Pychewicz: Just a brief summary on this, I think the intent behind this and the whole overlay
783 resolution not to put it all in one box but it was almost creating this corridor that we don't have a sea of
784 parking and a bunch of cars lined up, not that that's every gas station, so I think that was the intent of this,
785 creating a street scape, walkability and this sense of activity and having people walking around and
786 having it visible from the street.

787
788 Ma. Trebellas: Maybe there's a better land use than a car lot or a parking lot.

789
790 Mr. Pychewicz: Exactly, so I think it's worth the discussion and tonight we're just voting to initiate the
791 conversation.

792
793 Ms. Trebellas: I have no problem initiating the conversation but my mind hasn't come to a conclusion yet
794 or a course of action.

795
796 Ms. Boni: Also, we are trying to rewrite our Zoning Resolution so hopefully that will be this fall and we
797 can dive deeper into each chapter and tweak this overlay district.

798
799 Mr. Pierce; Have you chosen anyone yet?

800
801 Ms. Boni: We're real close; we're working on a contract. Do you want to do it September 14?, the same
802 day as Evans Farm?

803
804 Mr. Pychewicz: Yes, we can do that.

805
806 Mr. McNulty: I can see the purpose of the conversation among the Zoning members and voting for it, but
807 what is the purpose to be gained if you open it up to the public?

808
809 Mr. Griggs: We have to.

810
811 Mr. McNulty: I'm not opposed to public but would that be required for this?

812
813 Ms. Boni: Any changes to the Zoning Resolution it is required.

Zoning Commission

814 Mr. Griggs: Any amendment to the Zoning Resolution requires that the public be given the opportunity to
815 comment.

816

817 Ms. Boni: We published a notice for this and it was open.

818

819 Mr. Griggs: The way the Ohio Revised Code is set up, they treat text amendments the same as rezoning
820 10 parcels or less in terms of the public process.

821

MOTION TO INITIATE THE AMENDMENT TO THE ZONING RESOLUTION

822

824 Mr. Pychewicz made a motion to initiate the amendment to the Orange Township Zoning Resolution and
825 to set the public date of Tuesday, September 14, 2021 for the 2021 RCOD Text Amendment #1, Article
826 XX. Seconded by Mr. McNulty.

827

828 Vote on Motion: Mr. Pychewicz-yes, Mr. McNulty-yes, Ms. Trebellas-yes, Mr. Pierce-yes

829 Motion carried

830

831 Meeting adjourned at 9:00 p.m.

832 Minutes prepared by Cindy Davis, Zoning Secretary

833

834

835