

1 BEFORE THE ORANGE TOWNSHIP
2 BOARD OF ZONING APPEALS
3 - - -
4 :
5 In the Matter of: :
6 Public Hearing - :
7 Variance Applications, :
8 Conditional Use :
9 Application :
10 :
11 - - -
12 PROCEEDINGS
13 before Members of the Orange Township Board of
14 Zoning Members; Chairman Kelvin Trefz,
15 Vice-Chair Sue D. Ross, Stacey Neff, Joseph
16 Pax and Punitha Sundar, held at Orange
17 Township Hall, Moffett Room, 1680 East Orange
18 Road, Lewis Center, Ohio, called at 6:00 p.m.
19 on Thursday, June 20, 2024.
20
21 Also Present:
22 Eric Gayetsky,
23 Senior Zoning Officer
24 Andrew Koenig,
 Zoning Inspector.
 - - -

1 - - -

2 P R O C E E D I N G S

3 - - -

4 CHAIRMAN TREFZ: I'll call the
5 Orange Township Board of Zoning Appeals
6 meeting to order.

7 MR. GAYETSKY: I'll take roll
8 call.

9 Mr. Trefz.

10 CHAIRMAN TREFZ: Here.

11 MR. GAYETSKY: Ms. Ross.

12 MS. ROSS: Here.

13 MR. GAYETSKY: Ms. Neff.

14 MS. NEFF: Here.

15 MR. GAYETSKY: Ms. Sundar.

16 MS. SUNDAR: Yes.

17 MR. GAYETSKY: Mr. Pax.

18 MR. PAX: Here.

19 MR. GAYETSKY: Alright. We have a
20 quorum.

21 CHAIRMAN TREFZ: Okay. For all of
22 those who intend to testify, please raise your
23 right hand and be sworn.

24 Do solemnly swear that the

1 testimony that you shall give shall be the
2 truth, the whole truth and nothing but the
3 truth? If so, state "I do". And when it's
4 your turn to offer testimony, please state
5 your full name, your address and affirm that
6 you've been sworn in.

7 AUDIENCE: "I do."

8 CHAIRMAN TREFZ: Thank you.

9 MR. GAYETSKY: Alright. Good
10 evening, Members of the Board of Zoning
11 Appeals. I'm sure you're aware, we have a
12 full Agenda today. All of the items that you
13 have before you are New Business. We will
14 finish all of that with going through the
15 April Minutes, and that should be the order
16 today.

17 So, the first item of New Business
18 is for a residential variance request, and
19 that is at the address 5647 Mercier Street
20 under Variance Case VA-24-14. And I will go
21 right to the summary.

22 So the applicant is requesting an
23 area variance from Rezoning Case 13-0302/15
24 -0446 North Farms to allow for a paver patio

1 with a concrete base to encroach 8 feet and 1
2 inches into the 35-foot rear yard setback in
3 an area zoned Single Family Planned
4 Residential District. The property is
5 currently owned by Jyoti Prava Badajena.

6 For the surrounding area, we have
7 to the North side zoning district Single
8 Family Planned Residential; land use Single
9 Family Residence. Same for the South, Single
10 Family Planned Residential District Zoning;
11 land use, Single Family Residence. East is
12 also the same for both zoning and land use.
13 And then the West is same zoning district,
14 Single Family Planned Residential District,
15 and land use is both Single Family Residences
16 and Mercier Street.

17 Moving onto our aerial views, the
18 close-in view, the pics of the property. It
19 had been an open area in the backyard, the
20 intent is to add a patio to the rear of the
21 home, stretching across most of the back of
22 the home. Zoomed-out view in the midst of
23 North Farms neighborhood.

24 And now we're at the Staff Review

1 portion. Again, this is an area variance
2 request from Rezoning 13-0302/15-0446 North
3 Farms for a rear yard setback requirement of
4 35 feet. The proposed patio would encroach 8
5 feet 11 inches into the 35-foot rear yard
6 setback. And this is roughly a 25 percent
7 variance request from Rezoning Case
8 13-0302/15-0446 North Farms.

9 And Exhibit 1 has a nice contrast
10 to it so you can get a good idea of the
11 extents of the patio. Typically with paver
12 patios, you have no requirement for a permit
13 to be submitted, but this one is different in
14 that you have a base that is concrete, so it's
15 a solid base that the applicant is going to
16 have installed, which triggers the requirement
17 for the permit and also the variance in this
18 case. You can see the measurement that shows
19 the patio would be 26 feet and 1 inches from
20 the rear property line, and then approaches 8
21 feet 11 inches into the 35-foot rear yard
22 setback. The orange line represents that
23 35-foot rear yard setback. And this, to be
24 clear, this particular Exhibit was digitally

1 edited for the contrast and clarity.

2 The site photos, these give you an
3 idea here of the location of the proposed
4 patio in reference to the property line. So
5 the photo taken west and the preliminary work
6 on site does depict generally the approximate
7 size of that proposed patio. The large cone
8 represents where the property line is and the
9 small cone, if you can make it out in some
10 taller grass there, is the location of the
11 35-foot setback.

12 The second photo is the reverse of
13 that, so you get a better idea of the setback
14 line with the small cone facing east. The
15 preliminary work showing the approximate size
16 of proposed patio. And then the large cone in
17 the distance, the background is where the
18 property line is. Alright.

19 And then next up is the criteria
20 for consideration. That's it.

21 CHAIRMAN TREFZ: Is there anybody
22 who would like to speak?

23 MR. GAYETSKY: The applicant
24 states she doesn't really have any materials

1 or presentations or whatever. But if you have
2 any questions for her, by all means.

3 CHAIRMAN TREFZ: Sure. Thank you.
4 Board Members, questions?

5 MS. ROSS: No questions.

6 MR. PAX: The only question I
7 have, I guess, is there any correspondence
8 from any of the neighbors that -- none has
9 been received?

10 MR. GAYETSKY: None has been
11 received.

12 MR. PAX: They were notified?

13 MR. GAYETSKY: Yes.

14 MR. PAX: And that's customary.

15 MR. GAYETSKY: Yep.

16 MR. KOENIG: Yep.

17 MR. PAX: I mean, I'm looking at
18 the photographs and there's pretty good
19 separation from the proposed patio into the
20 rear property. The 20-foot drainage easement
21 helps on that. Also looking at their plot
22 plan there in the graphic, so adequate
23 separation, that's something that's positive
24 towards the project.

1 CHAIRMAN TREFZ: Any other
2 comments?

3 MS. SUNDAR: The HOA.

4 MR. GAYETSKY: The HOA, that would
5 be up to the applicant to work out. That's
6 not a requirement on this.

7 MS. SUNDAR: Okay. Just making
8 sure.

9 MS. ROSS: May I go ahead with a
10 Motion?

11 CHAIRMAN TREFZ: Certainly.

12 MS. ROSS: Based on the
13 considerations, I move to approve Case No.
14 VA-24-14 for the property located at 5647
15 Mercier Street, Lewis Center, Ohio, seeking an
16 area variance from Rezoning Case
17 13-0302/15-0446 North Farms to allow for a
18 patio with a concrete base to encroach 8 feet
19 and 11 inches into the 35-foot rear yard
20 setback in an area zoned Single Family
21 Residential District.

22 MS. SUNDAR: I second.

23 MR. GAYETSKY: Motion made by Ms.
24 Ross, seconded by Ms. Sundar. Those voting:

1 Mr. Trefz.

2 CHAIRMAN TREFZ: Yes.

3 MR. GAYETSKY: Mr. Pax.

4 MR. PAX: Yes.

5 MR. GAYETSKY: Ms. Ross.

6 MS. ROSS: Yes.

7 MR. GAYETSKY: Ms. Neff.

8 MS. NEFF: Yes.

9 MR. GAYETSKY: Ms. Sundar.

10 MS. SUNDAR: Yes.

11 MR. GAYETSKY: Motion carries.

12 The variance is approved.

13 CHAIRMAN TREFZ: Thank you.

14 MR. ABBARAJU: Can I ask a

15 question?

16 CHAIRMAN TREFZ: Yes.

17 MR. ABBARAJU: So I'm behind that

18 property.

19 CHAIRMAN TREFZ: You have to be up

20 here, state your name and that you've been

21 sworn in and your address.

22 MR. ABBARAJU: Yeah, my name is

23 Hymavathi Abbaraju. My address is 5628

24 Dorrington Street. My property is behind this

1 one. I also received a notification on this
2 hearing and I didn't understand what is impact
3 to my property. Is there any impact because
4 of this one? Or why do why did we receive
5 this hearing notification?

6 CHAIRMAN TREFZ: You're within 200
7 feet of the property.

8 MR. KOENIG: Within 200 feet of
9 the property. Adjacent property owners within
10 200 feet are notified whenever there's a
11 variance request. And again, the variance is
12 for the patio to encroach into the rear
13 setback of 35 feet, so that's why you were
14 notified.

15 MR. ABBARAJU: Is it going impact
16 us?

17 MR. GAYETSKY: Well, all the work
18 is going to be on this address. So the patio
19 is being added to the rear of this home and a
20 setback will be about 26 feet away from the
21 rear property line.

22 MS. BADAJENA: Absolutely no
23 impact. You can see it.

24 CHAIRMAN TREFZ: Okay. Thank you.

1 To all of you, once the case is over that
2 you're curious about, you may leave. You
3 don't have to stay through the whole thing,
4 so.

5 MS. BADAJENA: Thank you.

6 MS. NEFF: Unless you want to.

7 CHAIRMAN TREFZ: You're welcome to
8 stay.

9 MR. PAX: It's pretty exciting.

10 MR. GAYETSKY: We're moving on to
11 the next variance.

12 CHAIRMAN TREFZ: Okay.

13 - - -

14 MR. GAYETSKY: The next item of
15 New Business, that would be for the property
16 located at 4911 Tralee Lane. The zip code is
17 43082, Westerville.

18 The summary for this application,
19 the applicant is requesting an area variance
20 from Rezoning Case 12-0223 Sanctuary and
21 Enclave at the Lakes to allow for an outdoor
22 kitchen area and fireplace to encroach 10 feet
23 and 10 inches into the 35-foot rear yard
24 setback in an area zoned Single Family Planned

1 Residential District. The site currently
2 contains wooden stairs and a small concrete
3 patio. The project plans to add a larger
4 paper patio, a fireplace and an outdoor
5 kitchen area. Only the fireplace and kitchen
6 area have concrete footers, so the rear
7 setback applies only to these two features.
8 The property is currently owned by Sara and
9 Matthew Geldhof.

10 The surrounding area to the North,
11 the zoning district, actually in all cases,
12 North, South, East and West, the zoning is
13 Single Family Planned Residential District.
14 The same case for the land use. And the only
15 exception, Tralee Lane is located to the South
16 of this property, as you will see in the
17 aerial views.

18 Focusing in on that aerial view,
19 this is a pie-shaped lot, wider in the front
20 and it tapers towards the rear with some you
21 could say unusual geometry. The deepest spot
22 is to the North. And you can see here it's at
23 the curve kind of where the Tralee Lane begins
24 curving to the other direction.

1 So, for the Staff Review portion,
2 there are some interesting setbacks here, but
3 we have measured them up for your convenience
4 so you can see precisely the distance that the
5 proposed features would encroach. So the
6 fireplace and outdoor kitchen area, they will
7 both encroach 10 feet and 10 inches into the
8 35-foot rear setback. This is a roughly 31
9 percent variance request from Rezoning Case
10 12-0223 Sanctuary and Enclave at the Lakes.

11 So the measured site plan is
12 Exhibit 1, and these measurements show the
13 deck area would be 24 feet and 2 inches.
14 Specifically, that's part of the fireplace,
15 and that would be 24 feet and 2 inches away
16 from the rear property line encroaching 8 feet
17 and 6 inches into that 35-foot rear yard
18 setback.

19 And then to clarify the other
20 feature, they are both the 24 foot and 2 inch
21 measurement away from the rear yard setback,
22 so it makes it a little bit easier for you to
23 understand. That portion of the outdoor
24 kitchen I think is what we're looking at is

1 the other 24 foot and 2 inch setback item. So
2 the most would be a 31 percent approximately
3 variance request.

4 MR. KOENIG: If I can just jump in
5 real quick, just to eliminate any confusion.
6 It wouldn't be a meeting without an error by
7 me. So I believe I updated this section here,
8 but not this one. So, this number is not
9 correct, and the 8 feet, 6 inches of
10 encroachment is not correct, but it is correct
11 up here. It's 10 foot and 10 inches is the
12 encroachment.

13 MR. GAYETSKY: So 24 feet and 2
14 inches is correct for the setback, and then 10
15 feet and 10 inches is correct for the
16 encroachment.

17 MR. KOENIG: And the percentage is
18 correct as well.

19 MS. SUNDAR: Okay. I was going to
20 ask that.

21 MS. NEFF: Me, too.

22 MR. GAYETSKY: So, moving on to
23 our site photos. In fact, these were provided
24 by the applicant for reference. Just to point

1 it out, the current setting includes those
2 wooden stairs. You can see that filter into a
3 smaller existing patio, and then on the, so
4 that's the left side, and the right side you
5 can see the new patio area that includes both
6 the outdoor kitchen, countertops and also that
7 fireplace to the right-most side.

8 The next page includes our site
9 photos and a large size for excellent details.

10 So, the photo is taken facing to the
11 southeast, and the large cone in the distance
12 represents the 35-foot setback and the smaller
13 cone and measuring wheel represent the edges
14 of the kitchen area and the fireplace. And
15 again, that lot line because of the geometry,
16 it kind of goes a little bit in the direction
17 of the house from left to right, so we did our
18 best to give you an idea of how far both of
19 those items will encroach. I think the second
20 photo helps out with that, as you can see it
21 on display now. The photo taken facing east,
22 and that large cone represents the 35-foot
23 setback, and the smaller cone, the measuring
24 wheel, represents the edges of the kitchen

1 area and the fireplace. So the red line was
2 digitally added to give you an approximation
3 of the rear property line for that reference.

4 I believe that's all I have. Yep.
5 The Board Analysis and factors for
6 consideration are on the next page. Any
7 questions from the Board? If not, you can
8 lead into the -- open it up to the applicant
9 for their presentation.

10 MR. HEMPEL: I'm Andrew Hampel.
11 I'm representing the Geldhofs. I'm the
12 contractor.

13 CHAIRMAN TREFZ: Okay.

14 MR. HEMPEL: Any questions for me
15 at all?

16 CHAIRMAN TREFZ: You've been sworn
17 in, right?

18 MR. HEMPEL: I have.

19 CHAIRMAN TREFZ: Okay.

20 MS. SUNDAR: He needs to state his
21 address.

22 CHAIRMAN TREFZ: Yeah, you need to
23 state your address, as well as your name.

24 MR. HEMPEL: Okay. My name is

1 Andrew Hempel. My personal address is 244
2 East Weisheimer Road, and that's Columbus,
3 43214.

4 CHAIRMAN TREFZ: Thank you. Does
5 anyone have any questions for him? Do you
6 have any comments you want to give us?

7 MR. HEMPEL: My main comment is,
8 they've just got a challenging lot, as you can
9 kind of see on there, so that's why we went to
10 the side with it.

11 CHAIRMAN TREFZ: It's nice.

12 MR. HEMPEL: It's an amazing
13 location.

14 MS. NEFF: Any comments from the
15 neighbors or anything on this?

16 MR. GAYETSKY: I did not receive
17 any correspondence.

18 MS. NEFF: Okay.

19 CHAIRMAN TREFZ: Okay.

20 MR. HEMPEL: We have a note from
21 the neighbor saying that they're excited to
22 see the project.

23 CHAIRMAN TREFZ: Any other
24 comments from the audience? Thank you.

1 MR. HEMPEL: Thank you.

2 CHAIRMAN TREFZ: Does anybody want
3 to make a Motion?

4 MS. NEFF: I'll make a Motion.
5 Based on the factors that we've heard, I move
6 to approve Case No. VA-24-20, for property
7 located at 4911 Tralee Lane, Westerville,
8 Ohio, seeking an area variance from Rezoning
9 Case No. 12-0223 Enclave and Sanctuary at the
10 Lakes, to allow for a deck to --

11 MR. GAYETSKY: And just to
12 clarify, I'm sorry, if you can state that that
13 is for an outdoor kitchen and fireplace, not a
14 deck.

15 MS. NEFF: Oh. To allow for an
16 outdoor kitchen and fireplace to encroach 10
17 feet and 10 inches into the 35-foot rear yard
18 setback in an area zoned Single Family
19 Residential District.

20 MR. PAX: I'll second.

21 MR. GAYETSKY: Motion made by Ms.
22 Neff, seconded by Ms. Ross. Those voting:

23 Mr. Trefz.

24 CHAIRMAN TREFZ: Yes.

1 MR. GAYETSKY: Mr. Pax.

2 MR. PAX: Yes.

3 MR. GAYETSKY: Ms. Ross.

4 MS. ROSS: Yes.

5 MR. GAYETSKY: Ms. Neff.

6 MS. NEFF: Yes.

7 MR. GAYETSKY: Ms. Sundar.

8 MS. SUNDAR: Yes.

9 MR. GAYETSKY: That Motion
10 carries.

11 MR. HEMPEL: Thank you.

12 Appreciate it.

13 MR. GAYETSKY: Okay. That was all
14 for the residential requests for the evening.

15 And our next application is for
16 the property located at 350 East Orange Road,
17 and that is the conditional use request for
18 that property to install a new monument style
19 sign. The subject property is currently a
20 place of worship located at 350 East Orange
21 Road. The applicants received approval of the
22 place of worship from the Board of Zoning
23 Appeals on May 18th, 2023. The applicant is
24 seeking a conditional use for Section 22.04(a)

1 of the Orange Township Zoning Resolution to
2 allow for the installation of a monument style
3 sign.

4 The surrounding area, to the North
5 presently is Planned Commercial Office
6 District, as well as Planned Industrial
7 District. I will note also to the North is
8 Orange Road, East Orange Road. And the land
9 use for these places is Olentangy Local School
10 District offices and the U.S. Post Office. On
11 the South, the zoning district is Multi-Family
12 Planned Residential District, and the land use
13 is Hidden Ravines Condo Residences. Towards
14 the East is Planned Commercial and Office
15 District zoning and the land use is the Toy
16 Box, which is currently undeveloped land. And
17 to the West, the zoning is Multi-Family
18 Planned Residential District and Planned
19 Commercial and Office District, with land uses
20 being Hidden Ravines Condo Residences and
21 Healthy Pets Veterinarian office.

22 Alright. The zoom-in view shows
23 what I had just described, wooded lot towards
24 the rear, direct access onto East Orange Road,

1 and then also wooded, as you look to the East
2 and the West of that site. The zoomed-out
3 view, 23 is the intersection at the left,
4 towards the left, obviously, West of here.

5 And I'll move into our Staff
6 Review for the conditional use. For, let's
7 see, I think you can get a sense of the
8 conditional use. There's a lot of text here
9 so I'm just going to, if everybody's okay,
10 jump to the sections that we provided some
11 comments to, so I'll begin on the next page.

12 Alright. So, this is the
13 determination that the proposed sign meets all
14 of the following requirements.

15 Section 3 a, The sign is a
16 monument style freestanding sign. The
17 applicant is proposing a monument style
18 freestanding sign as shown in Exhibit 1
19 following. Section b, The maximum height of
20 such sign does not exceed 8 feet above the
21 average grade of the site. And the sign is
22 located at a distance from any street,
23 right-of-way line, as required. According to
24 Exhibit 1, the proposed sign will be 7 feet 0

1 inches from grade to the top of the sign. The
2 sign is proposed to be approximately 22 feet
3 and 0 inches from the property line, adjoining
4 the right-of-way of East Orange Road. And
5 according to Section 22.04(a)(3)(e) the
6 minimum setback and area permitted is 15 feet
7 0 inches away from the right-of-way line, so
8 this sign meets the standard. C, The sign
9 does not have more than two sides or surfaces.
10 The sign as proposed will have two sides as
11 shown. D, The display area of any one side or
12 surface does not exceed one half of the total
13 display area permitted. The permitted area
14 for the sign in its location is 88 square
15 feet. The total sign area proposed is 60
16 square feet, so the sign meets the standard.
17 For e, the total area, display area of all
18 surfaces does not exceed 32 square feet, or
19 maximum 16 square feet per side or surface
20 when the sign is located 15 feet away from the
21 primary frontage street, right-of-way line.
22 For each additional one foot setback from the
23 right-of-way line and additional 8 square feet
24 of total display area, or maximum of 4 square

1 feet per side or surface, will be permitted up
2 to a maximum of 128 square feet of total
3 display area, or maximum of 64 square feet per
4 side or surface, as permitted. The proposed
5 two-sided sign will be 30 square feet per
6 side. The sign will be set back 22 feet from
7 the right-of-way along East Orange Road, so 44
8 square feet total is permitted, and the sign
9 meets the above standard. F, not more than
10 five colors are used for the purposes of this
11 section, black and white shall not be
12 considered colors. The proposed sign meets
13 this standard. G, no part of such sign will
14 be closer to any street right-of-way line than
15 15 feet, nor closer to any property line than
16 the applicable building setback line, if the
17 adjoining property is in a residential
18 district. The proposed sign will be set back
19 22 feet from the street right-of-way line and
20 that meets this standard. H, the function of
21 such sign -- and I think we -- I'll just go
22 through these since we're almost done. H, the
23 function of such sign is in keeping with the
24 uses in the surrounding area. I, such sign

1 will be in harmony with buildings on the site,
2 and will not detract from the appearances of
3 the general neighborhood in which it is
4 located or adversely affect property values in
5 such neighborhood. J, and such sign will not
6 constitute a traffic hazard or contribute to
7 traffic problems through confusion with
8 traffic control devices, interference with the
9 field of vision of motorists using streets or
10 driveways in the area, or by creating a visual
11 distraction for such motorists.

12 And again, just to underscore that
13 there is no variance being requested here, so
14 that's why you see it as strictly conditional
15 use. They are meeting all of the standards
16 for a sign location and size, as well as
17 height.

18 Alright. Exhibit 1 being the sign
19 details, and as noted, it's a 7 foot tall sign
20 from finished grade to the top of the sign.
21 And this brick structure is noted as being for
22 illustration. The applicant can go into a
23 little bit more detail about any finishes, but
24 we have noted it as a compliant solid base,

1 so. The sign location is on the next page. It
2 gives you a little better idea. I noted that
3 it's not precise, but it can give you an idea
4 of this measurement with the blue line is
5 representative of 22 feet total distance, so
6 you can see that's further in from the utility
7 pole, which is currently up there.

8 MS. ROSS: Eric, which blue line?
9 Okay. Sorry.

10 MR. GAYETSKY: And my color is
11 incorrect.

12 MR. KOENIG: No, it's correct.

13 MS. ROSS: Okay. I couldn't see
14 that on the smaller Exhibit.

15 MR. PAX: I was getting it
16 confused with the line I'm seeing parallel.
17 Again, the 22-foot dimension you're
18 referencing is the south end of that blue line
19 that we're looking at?

20 MR. GAYETSKY: That's correct.
21 That's the closest point of the sign will be
22 at the south tip of that line. So we go
23 closer than -- I mean, where the line begins
24 is where the sign is going to end.

1 MR. PAX: Thank you.

2 MR. KOENIG: And I think
3 technically, the standard is measured from the
4 right-of-way, which actually is in the middle
5 of the road in this circumstance. So it's
6 actually more than 22 feet from the
7 right-of-way line, but it's still redundant,
8 so.

9 MR. PAX: But of important,
10 because I'm trying -- my main concern is
11 vehicles exiting out of their driveway and
12 having a clear view shot of Orange Road
13 traffic that is heading eastbound, any
14 instruction for -- or especially the solid
15 base. So that's where I had sensitivity on
16 whether it was 22 from edge of curb or center
17 line of Orange Road and the building at least
18 for one car, if not two, that they can have
19 eyeshot down on Orange.

20 MR. GAYETSKY: So, defer just a
21 moment to the applicant for any further
22 clarification about your thought process
23 behind putting aside at that location.

24 MR. RASTOGI: Good evening. My

1 name is Amit Rastogi. I live at 1768 Little
2 Bear Loop. I've been sworn already. So the
3 sign is 22 feet from the road. And even if
4 you were back, two cars back to back, you
5 would be able to see both sides of the road
6 without a problem.

7 CHAIRMAN TREFZ: Okay. Appreciate
8 it.

9 MR. PAX: That's the key
10 distinction that I wanted to make. It's from
11 the curb line versus the center line.

12 MR. RASTOGI: There's lots of
13 visibility. It's a very large open area. If
14 you would drive down that path, you will
15 notice that there's lots of space between
16 whether cars goes far, a couple of cars behind
17 them and still be able to see both sides of
18 the road.

19 MR. PAX: Okay. Thank you.

20 CHAIRMAN TREFZ: Is the sign
21 lighted in any way?

22 MR. RASTOGI: No. It's not
23 illuminated from inside. There will be a
24 light outside that throws a light on it for

1 the evening hours.

2 CHAIRMAN TREFZ: Okay. Do we need
3 that -- we don't --

4 MR. GAYETSKY: It would --
5 generally speak, it's not internally
6 eliminated. It wouldn't be something that
7 zoning would enforce.

8 MR. KOENIG: It's allowed to be
9 illuminated.

10 MR. GAYETSKY: But by that type of
11 lighting, in particular, that's not something
12 that we look at.

13 CHAIRMAN TREFZ: Okay.

14 MR. RASTOGI: Other questions?
15 Thank you.

16 MS. ROSS: Is there anyone in the
17 audience who wants to speak?

18 CHAIRMAN TREFZ: Does anyone else
19 want to speak on this? Okay. Thank you.

20 MR. GAYETSKY: To be clear, I did
21 have only one phone call correspondence that
22 was the veterinarian office. They just were
23 inquiring generally what the case was about.
24 They had no statements about their opposition

1 or --

2 CHAIRMAN TREFZ: And that's the
3 one to the west, right?

4 MR. GAYETSKY: Yes. Correct.

5 CHAIRMAN TREFZ: Okay.

6 MS. ROSS: If there are no
7 comments from the Board, okay. Based on our
8 considerations, I move to approve Case No.
9 CU-24-15 for the property located at 350 East
10 Orange Road, Lewis Center, Ohio, seeking a
11 conditional use from Orange Township Zoning
12 Resolution Article 22.04(a) to allow for the
13 construction of a monument sign in an area
14 zoned Farm Residential (FR-1).

15 MS. SUNDAR: I second.

16 MR. GAYETSKY: Motion made by Ms.
17 Ross, seconded by Ms. Sundar. Those voting:

18 Mr. Trefz.

19 CHAIRMAN TREFZ: Yes.

20 MR. GAYETSKY: Mr. Pax.

21 MR. PAX: Yes.

22 MR. GAYETSKY: Ms. Ross.

23 MS. ROSS: Yes.

24 MR. GAYETSKY: Ms. Neff.

1 MS. NEFF: Yes.

2 MR. GAYETSKY: Ms. Sundar.

3 MS. SUNDAR: Yes.

4 MR. GAYETSKY: And that Motion

5 carries.

6 CHAIRMAN TREFZ: Thank you.

7 - - -

8 MR. GAYETSKY: The next item of
9 business, this is for the property located at
10 601 Corduroy Road and the variance Case No.
11 VA-24-16. The applicant is Tracey Diehl -
12 Expedite the Diehl.

13 For the description of the
14 request, the subject property is located on
15 the north side of Corduroy Road. This is
16 within Creekside Industrial Park. The site is
17 currently under construction and will be a
18 Columbus Granite facility. The site is
19 currently zoned Planned Industrial District
20 under Rezoning Case 11-0055. Within the
21 development text, it states that all signage
22 will comply with Article 22 of the Orange
23 Township Zoning Resolution.

24 The applicant is requesting an

1 area variance from Section 22.03(c)(1) of the
2 Orange Township Zoning Resolution to allow for
3 two wall signs to be installed above the
4 permitted 15 foot and 0 inches in height. The
5 signs are proposed to be 26 feet and 8 inches
6 from grade to the top of the signs.

7 The surrounding area to the North,
8 the zoning district is Multi-Family Planned
9 Residential District. The land use there is
10 Orange Grand Multi-Family homes. To the South
11 is Planned Industrial District zoning, and
12 land use is Industrial Uses. To the East is
13 Planned Industrial District zoning, and the
14 land use is Menards, as well as undeveloped
15 land. And finally, to the West is Planned
16 Industrial District Zoning with other
17 industrial uses.

18 This area does not show the new
19 development that's underway, but I am aware
20 that the building is relatively complete so
21 they're still doing a lot of construction on
22 the site, but the building is up and complete
23 with the parking area surrounding it. The
24 signs are proposed to face to the -- I will

1 have to actually double check the second one.
2 One of them is to the South. If you can go on
3 to the next Exhibit. So this one, yep, this
4 is the south elevation that we're talking
5 about here for Section 22.03(c). It states
6 that all display signs shall be mounted on the
7 building, which houses the business
8 establishment advertised by such signs. Such
9 signs shall be located on or along the wall of
10 such building, which faces the street, parking
11 lot or service drive, and shall be located
12 more than 15 feet above finished grade or the
13 height of the ceiling the first floor
14 building, whichever is less.

15 The proposed two signs would be
16 installed at a height of 26 feet and 8
17 inches. These signs approach 11 feet and 8
18 inches into the 15-foot height requirement.
19 These are approximately 78 percent variance
20 requests.

21 And looking at the display, I
22 mean, these are both being proposed at the
23 same height so there's consistency here. You
24 can see how that renders in reference to the

1 rest of building and to the proportionality.
2 Okay. And then to clarify, the second sign,
3 Exhibit 2, is on the west elevation. So that
4 west elevation facing parking area,
5 essentially, however visible from Corduroy
6 Road. And then the site map on the following
7 page is a better way of explaining the sign
8 locations. Sign 1 and Sign 2 are both
9 labeled.

10 And that is it for the Staff
11 Review of the Exhibits. The rest is the Board
12 Analysis.

13 MS. DIEHL: Good evening.

14 CHAIRMAN TREFZ: Good evening.

15 MS. DIEHL: I'm Tracey Diehl. And
16 my address is 6487 Hilliard Drive, Canal
17 Winchester, Ohio. And I represent Columbus
18 Granite. And the sign company actually
19 brought this to my attention. So DaNite
20 Signs, which is a local sign company as well.

21 I'm happy to go through the
22 criteria with you for this. I do want to note
23 that what they're proposing is appropriate for
24 a building of this size and scale, and

1 appropriate for the way that the building is
2 designed. And the residential property is to
3 the north, and there will be no signs facing
4 the residential property, which is usually a
5 concern. The variance request will not have
6 an adverse effect on the public interest. The
7 sign that is designed is to be in place where
8 precedence has already been set. Other signs
9 of this height or above the 15 foot height
10 requirement have been approved previously
11 within the Township. And I think that each
12 building designed esthetically needs to be
13 taken into consideration.

14 The variance is necessary for them
15 to be able to place the sign that's not
16 obstructed an architectural feature and still
17 be visible and over their entrance. And the
18 overall intent and spirit of the rest of the
19 zoning resolution wouldn't be disturbed by
20 approving a variance like this, where other
21 businesses within the Township have also
22 needed variances of this type, so it's not
23 unheard of.

24 And the sign would be placed in an

1 area where it's legible to motorists, so those
2 that are traveling along this road would be
3 able to see the sign from a line of sight that
4 allows them to slow and prepare to turn.
5 Especially for deliveries, when you have --
6 when you're thinking of granite, you're
7 thinking of trucks with very large slabs of
8 material that they need to be delivering, and
9 they need that slowing time. They need to be
10 able to prepare for their turn into the
11 parking lot. So that visibility is extremely
12 important for the type of business that's
13 going to occupy this location.

14 I'm happy to answer any questions
15 that you might have.

16 CHAIRMAN TREFZ: On your slowdown.

17 MS. DIEHL: Yes.

18 CHAIRMAN TREFZ: If a truck is
19 coming north, you've got one, two, three lots,
20 you'll see the sign on the front. Then you'll
21 have to go to the next road, turn right, turn
22 right again and come back to it.

23 MS. DIEHL: Yeah.

24 CHAIRMAN TREFZ: Okay. Then you

1 have no driveway out on 23.

2 MS. DIEHL: Right.

3 CHAIRMAN TREFZ: Your driveway is
4 from the back road.

5 MS. DIEHL: Right.

6 CHAIRMAN TREFZ: The same thing
7 going south. So, I don't see how you can
8 queue the drivers until after they've seen
9 your building.

10 MS. DIEHL: I understand what
11 you're saying.

12 CHAIRMAN TREFZ: Okay.

13 MS. DIEHL: Yes. Parallel signs
14 aren't as visible. So the parallel sign that
15 faces the roadway where they're traveling,
16 that sign isn't as visible or legible to them.
17 They're going to be relying on the sign on the
18 west elevation when they're traveling and if
19 they're coming from the opposite direction.

20 CHAIRMAN TREFZ: Well, even, and I
21 don't know anybody that doesn't bring up the
22 Google map of where they're supposed to be
23 going.

24 MS. DIEHL: Absolutely.

1 CHAIRMAN TREFZ: Okay. I just
2 wanted to make sure that we've got that
3 covered. Other questions?

4 MS. ROSS: On Exhibit 1, the south
5 elevation, it shows what look to be windows.
6 Are those actually windows or are those
7 architectural features, such as framing?

8 MS. DIEHL: I believe that those
9 are to be windows, but I did not design the
10 building so I can only go off of the
11 illustration that's been provided.

12 CHAIRMAN TREFZ: You have a second
13 floor, correct?

14 MS. DIEHL: I don't know. I have
15 not seen the construction plans for the
16 interior of the building, so I can't speak to
17 that. Staff may have seen the Building Plans.

18 MR. GAYETSKY: As far as the floor
19 plans, this was looked at strictly under that
20 15 foot standard. Essentially, though, with
21 the approval of a variance, you're still
22 granting them an approval that gives them
23 relief in the face of either/or both of those
24 standards above the -- for the first floor.

1 CHAIRMAN TREFZ: Right. The first
2 floor is considerably lower than our 15 feet.

3 MR. GAYETSKY: Right. Yeah. And
4 what I'm saying --

5 CHAIRMAN TREFZ: So the variance
6 would be much bigger if we were going to go
7 with the first floor level.

8 MR. GAYETSKY: Yes and no. I
9 guess the quantification of it. I'm not sure
10 how you would quantify the percentages.

11 CHAIRMAN TREFZ: I'm a pretty good
12 math person. So if it's at 11 11, which is
13 normal start of the second floor, 12 feet
14 roughly, now the sign would have to be below
15 the top of that 12 feet. So now you're moving
16 it up to where you want it. You're almost 100
17 percent variance.

18 MS. NEFF: If they indeed have a
19 second floor, then wouldn't the requirement be
20 different? Wouldn't they be allowed to have
21 it higher?

22 CHAIRMAN TREFZ: No, less. It's
23 to the top of the first floor or 15 feet,
24 whichever is less.

1 MS. DIEHL: Yeah, I have no
2 knowledge of the construction of the interior
3 of the building, so I honestly cannot tell you
4 that.

5 CHAIRMAN TREFZ: Well, and this
6 should have been looked at before the design
7 of the building was done.

8 MS. NEFF: Did you look at
9 alternatives, given that -- so anything over
10 25 percent we consider a significant variance.
11 This is at 78 percent. Did you all look at
12 alternative sign options to be a little more
13 in requirements with the zoning?

14 MS. DIEHL: I can honestly tell
15 you that this was brought to me at the point
16 where I was told the variance is needed. It
17 was not brought to me in the planning phase.

18 MS. NEFF: Okay.

19 MS. DIEHL: So I do not know what
20 alternatives were considered prior to that.

21 MS. NEFF: Okay.

22 MS. DIEHL: And my conversations
23 have pretty much mostly been with Staff to
24 present the variance and submit the variance.

1 My apologies.

2 MS. NEFF: It's okay. That seems
3 to happen a lot.

4 CHAIRMAN TREFZ: Yeah. I was
5 going to say, if they didn't give you the
6 information.

7 MS. DIEHL: Right. And not to --
8 Staff has been wonderful to work with so I
9 don't want to throw them under the bus, but I
10 don't think that they anticipated these
11 questions. Had these questions been presented
12 to me, I would have come prepared with answers
13 for you, and I apologize for that.

14 MS. ROSS: Well, I do think this
15 is a nicely designed building. And I believe
16 that if the sign was located where Code says
17 to put it, it would not be as attractive. I
18 believe that this --

19 MS. NEFF: Or visible.

20 MS. ROSS: I believe that this
21 makes sense to have the sign where you have
22 proposed it. It is significant. It's a very
23 significant variance, but I believe that we
24 are given the leeway to look at these types of

1 things and to say that really wouldn't look
2 right. It wouldn't be -- it would not be
3 helpful to anyone that turns in that street
4 and is looking for someplace to go look for
5 their marble. I can't imagine that you would
6 have designed a building this height unless
7 you needed that height. And I don't think you
8 would have said, well, we have to keep it at
9 15 feet so we won't build a second story. So,
10 I really believe that this is the appropriate
11 place in my limited design skills for a sign
12 of this type. And I intend to approve it.

13 CHAIRMAN TREFZ: Go ahead.

14 MR. PAX: One other point, I
15 guess, with the windows, so that's critical at
16 least in my -- with the other Board Members
17 bringing up that question, whether there is a
18 second floor, whether these are sham windows,
19 in essence, just spandrel glass. It's just
20 there for visual and has no floor up there at
21 all. It's just vacant space. That happens at
22 times for proportion. Because if those
23 windows weren't there, then there's a lot more
24 leeway for that signage to drop and be lower;

1 however, I also agree with the comments made
2 about the appropriateness of it, the scale,
3 the speed on Corduroy, the use of that road
4 with other warehouse facilities and buildings
5 of that scale. And the windows also are a
6 nice feature. They create scale and that
7 helps, so I indeed hope those are actual
8 active vision lights there in this space into
9 the second floor.

10 MS. DIEHL: I don't like to make
11 assumptions and I don't want to legally
12 testify that there's no second floor, but I
13 can tell you that on the alternate elevation
14 of the west elevation, I believe it is, there
15 shows a door for a truck. And I would think
16 that if there was a second story going all the
17 way across, that that trucking door wouldn't
18 be where it is, that truck bay, for tractor
19 trailer deliveries that door would not be
20 appropriate. So it is quite possible that
21 it's a one-story building and that the windows
22 are there for esthetics. Or that a portion of
23 the building may be two stories, but I
24 honestly cannot tell you. I can't testify

1 either way.

2 MR. KOENIG: I can add some
3 detail, at least that I found. So I pulled up
4 the permit that was approved back in 2023. I
5 believe that the windows, at least the ones
6 that we're looking at here, are real. It
7 says, exterior windows to be one inch TK
8 clear, low heat, insulated glass, tempered as
9 required. And then there's other details that
10 I don't know about windows. But I think those
11 are real windows. I'm still not sure about
12 the floors, but those windows are there and
13 real.

14 MR. PAX: Thank you.

15 CHAIRMAN TREFZ: Another question,
16 the roof shows sort of a flat roof. Is it a
17 flat roof? Is it mansard on the edges?

18 MS. DIEHL: It appears to be a
19 flat roof to me as well. I don't have any
20 foundations that depict anything else. It
21 appears to be a somewhat industrial-style
22 building that's trying to incorporate a static
23 appeal of it being more like an office
24 building, you know, a cross between industrial

1 and office. So yes, I would believe so. Most
2 of my illustrations show it as a flat roof.

3 CHAIRMAN TREFZ: I just don't know
4 where the AC equipment is. That's what made
5 me ask.

6 MS. DIEHL: I would hope that it
7 would be shielded by landscaping wherever it
8 is.

9 CHAIRMAN TREFZ: Yes.

10 MR. PAX: Or up on the roof.

11 MR. KOENIG: And that would all be
12 decided in the original zoning permit
13 approval, the screening and the AC unit.

14 CHAIRMAN TREFZ: A lot of times
15 you see it in the roof design, if they're
16 going to put it on top.

17 Any other questions? Thank you.

18 MS. DIEHL: Thank you.

19 MS. ROSS: Is there anyone from
20 the audience that would like to speak on this?

21 CHAIRMAN TREFZ: Okay.

22 MR. PAX: Based on these factors
23 discussed and reviewed, I move to approve Case
24 No. VA-24-16 for property located at 601

1 Corduroy Road, Lewis Center, Ohio, 43035,
2 seeking two area variances from the Orange
3 Township Zoning Resolution Section 22.03(c)(1)
4 for the two proposed wall signs to be
5 installed at a height of 26 feet 8 inches from
6 grade to the top of the signs in an area zoned
7 Planned Industrial District.

8 MS. ROSS: I'll second.

9 MR. GAYETSKY: Motion made by Mr.
10 Pax, seconded by Ms. Ross. Those voting:

11 Mr. Trefz.

12 CHAIRMAN TREFZ: No.

13 MR. GAYETSKY: Mr. Pax.

14 MR. PAX: Yes.

15 MR. GAYETSKY: Ms. Ross.

16 MS. ROSS: Yes.

17 MR. GAYETSKY: Ms. Neff.

18 MS. NEFF: Yes.

19 MR. GAYETSKY: And Ms. Sundar.

20 MS. SUNDAR: No.

21 MR. GAYETSKY: Alright. That's a
22 3 to 2 in favor so that Motion does carry. The
23 Motion is approved.

24 MS. DIEHL: Thank you.

1 CHAIRMAN TREFZ: Have a good one.

2 - - -

3 MR. GAYETSKY: Alright. We're at
4 number five in terms of our business tonight.
5 And we're at variance request VA-24-17. This
6 is for the property located at 8870 Columbus
7 Pike. Similar to the last case, these are
8 wall sign variance requests and they're also
9 for two wall signs.

10 So just to back up, the applicant
11 represents Meijer and they are proposing the
12 two new wall signs for the primary facade to
13 exceed the 15 feet 0 inches height above the
14 finished grade requirement. These signs are
15 identified in this report as the following:
16 Sign No. 1 is referred to as the "Home" sign,
17 so that's "Home" inscribed text. And then
18 Sign No. 2 is referring to the "Fresh" wall
19 sign. Signs No. 1 and 2 are proposed 23 feet
20 and 0 inches above finished grade, which
21 exceed the height requirement by 8 feet and 0
22 inches.

23 Just for some context, the
24 applicant had recently been approved for

1 several wall sign face changes. And these
2 being face changes are not subject to that 15
3 feet 0 inch requirement. I did want to list
4 those out. So the existing signage received
5 face changes for the "Meijer" primary wall
6 sign, which was approved on December 29th,
7 2023; for the "Pharmacy Drive-Up" wall sign,
8 which was approved the same date; and then for
9 the "Meijer monument sign up front located
10 next to the main drive aisle that was on the
11 same date.

12 The subject property is located at
13 8870 Columbus Pike, and has Parcel No.
14 318-324-02-003-007.

15 The surrounding area, to the North
16 the zoning districts, so we have a few
17 different zoning districts going on. The
18 zoning district to the North is the Route 23
19 Corridor Overlay District partially and then
20 also Planned Commercial Office District.
21 Those land uses are Cheswick Village and other
22 commercial uses respectively. To the South
23 the zoning district is Farm Residential
24 District, and the land use there is

1 Single-Family Residences, as well as Heather
2 Lane. To the East the zoning is Planned
3 Commercial Office District, and land uses
4 include Staples, part of the currently vacant
5 shopping center beside Staples, and then U.S.
6 23. And to the west, the zoning district is
7 Single-Family Planned Residential District,
8 and the land uses are Single-Family
9 Residences, as well as High Meadows Village
10 Subdivision. And those are within High
11 Meadows Village Subdivision.

12 So let me direct you to the
13 zoom -- in view 34 or so acre site with
14 varying land uses around it. It has been
15 there -- I believe 1991 was when the
16 development was approved. The next view, the
17 zoomed-out context shows High Meadows Village
18 single-family residences to the west and farm
19 residents to the South, and your other
20 commercial uses to the South and East.

21 For Staff Review, we have, like
22 the last request, the exceeding of the
23 requirement from Section 22.03, that wall
24 signs must be 15 feet -- no more than 15 feet

1 above finished grade. We know clearly that
2 this is a single-story building.

3 You can see through Exhibit 1,
4 that is Wall Sign No. 1 with the "Home"
5 letters and the applicant being -- I should
6 say the applicant is proposing Wall Sign No. 1
7 on the East elevation to be placed at the
8 height of 23 feet 0 inches. The variance
9 request of 8 feet 0 inches is being requested,
10 and this represents a roughly 53 percent
11 variance request from Orange Township Zoning
12 Resolution Section 22.

13 Alright. For Exhibit 2, the wall
14 sign "Fresh" east elevation. So, similar type
15 of a sign, similar lettering, states the fresh
16 that is the same height, same variance of 8
17 feet 0 inches, and represents a roughly 53
18 percent variance request from Orange Township
19 Zoning Resolution Section 22. The applicant
20 provided the below, as you can see, "Home" and
21 "Fresh" are the same, 23 feet 0 inches to the
22 top of the sign. You can see where they are
23 on that white linear front facade.

24 Finally, I believe, we have the

1 Site Plan, which shows essentially all of the
2 signs that are located on the Meijer site
3 currently. And it doesn't fully distinguish
4 it, but just to point out that the "Fresh" and
5 the "Home" are proposed signs. They have not
6 been installed, so they're requesting that
7 variance. They are the two exceptions.
8 They're the only signs proposed.

9 And that would be all I have for
10 Staff Review and the Exhibits. If you have
11 any questions, please let me know.

12 CHAIRMAN TREFZ: Is someone here
13 to speak for this one?

14 MS. VELLUCCI: My name is Cindy
15 Vellucci. My address is 1917 Henry Avenue
16 Southwest in Canton, and I was sworn in.

17 I'm asking -- we're asking for a
18 variance because we did a refresh of the
19 current signs that they have. The Meijer
20 channel letters that are on the building right
21 now are 25 feet above grade to the top of the
22 home. So in putting the new "Home" and
23 "Fresh" channel letters up there, we want to
24 make sure that it's esthetically the same, or

1 close to so that people can see it and it
2 looks good. And I think that Meijer is asking
3 to do this because they're putting up new
4 stores in Northeast Ohio and they all have the
5 "Home" and "Fresh" on their branding, and this
6 store didn't, so they like to keep everything
7 in line, so. Any questions?

8 CHAIRMAN TREFZ: And all the signs
9 are above the awning, right?

10 MS. VELLUCCI: Yes. We looked at
11 putting them a little bit lower on top of the
12 awning, or even attaching it to the awning,
13 but the top of the awning is 15 feet, so it's
14 still going to be above.

15 CHAIRMAN TREFZ: Yeah.

16 MS. NEFF: I have a question. Can
17 you help me understand the "Home" is 14 feet 6
18 inches wide, but "Fresh" is 13 feet 4 inches
19 wide, and it's five letters versus four. Are
20 they -- can you help me understand, I was just
21 wondering if those were flipped or something?

22 MS. ROSS: There's an N in there.
23 It takes up more space.

24 MS. NEFF: I mean, maybe that's

1 it. I was just wondering. I was just
2 curious.

3 MS. VELLUCCI: It's the M, you're
4 correct.

5 MS. NEFF: All right. Good call.

6 MS. ROSS: I was a typesetter in
7 my previous life. (Laughter.)

8 MS. NEFF: Okay. I was like, how
9 does that make sense? Okay, it's the M. That
10 is my only question.

11 CHAIRMAN TREFZ: I don't have any
12 other questions. Okay.

13 MS. SUNDAR: I can make a Motion.

14 CHAIRMAN TREFZ: Are you ready?

15 MS. NEFF: I'm good.

16 CHAIRMAN TREFZ: Okay.

17 MS. SUNDAR: Based on these
18 factors, I move to approve Case No. VA-24-17
19 for the property located to 8870 Columbus
20 Pike, Lewis Center, Ohio, 43035 seeking an
21 area variance from Orange Township Zoning
22 Resolution Section 22.03(c) to allow for the
23 wall sign identified in this report as Wall
24 Sign No. 1 to be at 8 feet 0 inches above the

1 allowed 15 feet in an area zoned Planned
2 Commercial and Office District.

3 MS. ROSS: I'll second.

4 MR. GAYETSKY: Motion made by Ms.
5 Sundar, second by Ms. Ross. Those voting:

6 Mr. Trefz.

7 CHAIRMAN TREFZ: Yes.

8 MR. GAYETSKY: Mr. Pax.

9 MR. PAX: Yes.

10 MR. GAYETSKY: Ms. Ross.

11 MS. ROSS: Yes.

12 MR. GAYETSKY: Ms. Neff.

13 MS. NEFF: Yes.

14 MR. GAYETSKY: Ms. Sundar.

15 MS. SUNDAR: Yes.

16 MR. GAYETSKY: And the Motion
17 carries. That's for Sign No. 1.

18 MS. SUNDAR: East elevation.

19 MR. GAYETSKY: On the East
20 elevation, correct.

21 CHAIRMAN TREFZ: So one more.

22 MS. SUNDAR: So can I do it?

23 CHAIRMAN TREFZ: Sure.

24 MS. SUNDAR: Based on these

1 factors, I move to approve Case No. VA-24-17
2 for the property located at 8870 Columbus
3 Pike, Lewis Center, Ohio 43035, seeking an
4 area variance from Orange Township Zoning
5 Resolution Section 22.03(c) to allow for the
6 wall sign identified in this report as Wall
7 Sign No. 2 to be 8 feet 0 inches above the
8 allow 15 feet in an area zoned Planned
9 Commercial and Office District.

10 MS. NEFF: Second.

11 MR. GAYETSKY: Motion made by Ms.
12 Sundar, seconded by Ms. Neff. Those voting:

13 Mr. Trefz.

14 CHAIRMAN TREFZ: Yes.

15 MR. GAYETSKY: Mr. Pax.

16 MR. PAX: Yes.

17 MR. GAYETSKY: Ms. Ross.

18 MS. ROSS: Yes.

19 MR. GAYETSKY: Ms. Neff.

20 MS. NEFF: Yes.

21 MR. GAYETSKY: Ms. Sundar.

22 MS. SUNDAR: Yes.

23 MR. GAYETSKY: Okay. Motion

24 carries.

1 MS. VELLUCCI: Thank you.

2 CHAIRMAN TREFZ: Cool. Thank you.

3 - - -

4 MR. GAYETSKY: Alright. Okay.

5 We're down to our last two, and they also
6 involve signage. It looks like we have the
7 applicant for both of them tonight.

8 So just by the way of this order,
9 the first one is for 8823 Owenfield Drive.
10 This is for a future cafe called Another
11 Broken Egg. They are proposing two new wall
12 signs for the primary facade, both of which
13 will exceed 15 feet 0 inch height requirement
14 above finished grade. These signs are
15 identified in this report as Sign No. 1
16 referring to north elevation sign, Sign No. 2
17 referring to the east elevation sign above the
18 primary entrance.

19 So Sign No. 1 is proposed 17 feet
20 and 8 inches above finished grade, which
21 exceeds the height requirement by 2 feet and 8
22 inches. Sign No. 2 is proposed at 19 feet 0
23 inches above finished grade, which exceeds
24 that height requirement by 4 feet 0 inches.

1 The existing building has been
2 vacant for several years, which was a previous
3 Panera Bread restaurant. Another Broken Egg
4 received permit approval for exterior
5 modifications on March 18th, 2024, which
6 included exterior updates including awning
7 repairs, new cladding and paint. The subject
8 property located 8823 Owenfield Drive, Powell,
9 zip code 43065 and having Parcel ID
10 318-324-11-005-000.

11 Surrounding area direction towards
12 the North, the zoning district is Planned
13 Commercial and Office District, and the land
14 use there is a vacant restaurant currently,
15 foreshadowing that we'll talk about. It's
16 proposed as a Del Taco restaurant. To the
17 South, the zoning is Planned Commercial and
18 Office District, and the land use is Meijer
19 and the Fifth Third Bank. To the East, the
20 zoning is also Planned Commercial and Office
21 District, land uses are Staples, vacant
22 shopping center U.S. 23. And to the West, the
23 zoning is Route 23 Corridor Overlay District,
24 that is specifically Cheswick Village.

1 Alright. These aerials, again
2 they're not brand new, but this does, because
3 this is an existing restaurant, this does give
4 you an idea of the setting, some tree area to
5 the south, but otherwise, fully developed with
6 Cheswick Village, as I mentioned, directly to
7 the west. And to the north of that, Del Taco,
8 proposed Del Taco restaurant. You can see
9 it's right adjacent to U.S. 23. This is an L
10 lot, so access is served by the service road
11 just to the west, which is Owenfield.

12 Okay. Now switch over to our
13 Exhibits. These give me an idea of the
14 rendering of the new sign. And the applicant,
15 so just like our previous variances, the
16 applicant is proposing the Wall Sign No. 1
17 north elevation be placed at 17 feet and 8
18 inches. This would be a variance of 2 feet
19 and 8 inches, and it represents roughly 18
20 percent variance request from Orange Township
21 Zoning Resolution Section 22. Okay. Exhibit
22 2, the Wall Sign No. 2, technically this would
23 be east elevation, and it would be placed --
24 the Wall Sign No. 2 is to be placed at a

1 height of 19 feet and 0 inches. A variance
2 request of 4 feet and 0 inches is being
3 requested. This represents a roughly 26.67
4 percent variance request from Orange Township
5 Zoning Resolution Section 22. And so you've
6 already seen the aerials, but this is from the
7 applicant indicating where those two signs Are
8 both proposed. That would be all I have.

9 MR. PETRO: Brad Petro, 4330 North
10 Bend Road, Ashtabula, and I've been sworn in.
11 So, as you can see, depicted in the drawings,
12 this is the former Panera Bread Cafe. There
13 will be some exterior renovations. The
14 awnings will be kept. The lighting will be
15 kept. This is the natural placement of where
16 the signs were, where we're proposing the
17 signs. There's nowhere else really in the
18 building to put them, so. Do you have any
19 questions?

20 MR. PAX: Are the signs
21 illuminated, I mean, backlit illuminated, I
22 should say?

23 MR. PETRO: The rooster is front
24 lit and backlit, and the Broken Egg Cafe is

1 haloed in.

2 MS. SUNDAR: I'm sorry. What is
3 the rooster?

4 CHAIRMAN TREFZ: The rooster.

5 MS. SUNDAR: I'm sorry, I didn't
6 get it. Yeah, is that illuminated?

7 MR. PETRO: Yeah, the round logo
8 will light out the front and then also halo
9 against the building. The other letters halo
10 against the building.

11 CHAIRMAN TREFZ: I assume that's
12 the same on the north side?

13 MR. PETRO: Yes. The other side
14 is the exact same layout. It's just a smaller
15 -- that's a smaller size.

16 MS. SUNDAR: The letters are the
17 same size on both elevations, correct?

18 MR. PETRO: No, the north
19 elevation is smaller.

20 MS. SUNDAR: Oh, yeah, it's 18.
21 Okay.

22 MS. NEFF: No questions.

23 CHAIRMAN TREFZ: Thank you. Any
24 discussion? Does someone want to make a

1 Motion?

2 MR. GAYETSKY: I did not receive
3 any correspondence.

4 CHAIRMAN TREFZ: Okay. I wouldn't
5 think you would.

6 MS. ROSS: There's no one else out
7 in the audience?

8 CHAIRMAN TREFZ: Well, but where
9 it's at, it's all commercial.

10 MS. ROSS: Are you ready for a
11 Motion?

12 CHAIRMAN TREFZ: Yep.

13 MS. ROSS: Based on our
14 considering factors, I move to approve Case
15 No. VA-24-18, for the property located at 8823
16 Owenfield Drive, Powell, Ohio 43065, seeking
17 an area variance from Orange Township
18 Resolution Section 22.03(c) to allow for the
19 wall sign identified in this report as Wall
20 Sign No. 1 to be 2 foot 8 inches above the
21 allowed 15 feet in an area zoned Planned
22 Commercial and Office (PC) District.

23 MS. SUNDAR: Second.

24 MR. GAYETSKY: Motion made by Ms.

1 Ross, seconded by Ms. Sundar. Those voting:
2 Mr. Trefz.
3 CHAIRMAN TREFZ: Yes.
4 MR. GAYETSKY: Mr. Pax.
5 MR. PAX: Yes.
6 MR. GAYETSKY: Ms. Ross.
7 MS. ROSS: Yes.
8 MR. GAYETSKY: Ms. Neff.
9 MS. NEFF: Yes.
10 MR. GAYETSKY: Ms. Sundar.
11 MS. SUNDAR: Yes.
12 MR. GAYETSKY: That Motion does
13 carry. That's for Sign No. 1.
14 MS. NEFF: I'll do Sign No. 2.
15 CHAIRMAN TREFZ: Okay.
16 MS. NEFF: Based on the factors
17 we've discussed, I move to approve Case No.
18 VA-24-18, for the property located at 8823
19 Owenfield Drive, Powell, Ohio 43065 seeking an
20 area variance from Orange Township Zoning
21 Resolution Section 22.03(c) to allow for the
22 wall sign identified in this report as Wall
23 Sign No. 2 to be 4 feet 0 inches above the
24 allowed 15 feet in an area zoned Planned

1 Commercial and Office District.

2 MS. ROSS: I'll second.

3 MR. GAYETSKY: Motion made by Ms.

4 Neff, seconded by Ms. Ross. Those voting:

5 Mr. Trefz.

6 CHAIRMAN TREFZ: Yes.

7 MR. GAYETSKY: Mr. Pax.

8 MR. PAX: Yes.

9 MR. GAYETSKY: Ms. Ross.

10 MS. ROSS: Yes.

11 MR. GAYETSKY: Ms. Neff.

12 MS. NEFF: Yes.

13 MR. GAYETSKY: Ms. Sundar.

14 MS. SUNDAR: Yes.

15 MR. GAYETSKY: Motion carries.

16 - - -

17 MR. GAYETSKY: I think it's safe

18 to move on to our final item of business in

19 terms of the applications.

20 CHAIRMAN TREFZ: Yes.

21 MR. GAYETSKY: You're welcome to

22 have a seat or you're welcome to stretch your

23 legs out.

24 MR. PETRO: We have to sit for a

1 ride home.

2 MR. GAYETSKY: This application
3 corresponds to the parcel, as we alluded to,
4 immediately to the north of the previous,
5 which is at 8787 Owenfield Drive.

6 So, the applicant is representing
7 Del Taco. They are proposing two new wall
8 signs for the primary facade and secondary to
9 exceed the 15 foot 0 inch height above
10 finished grade requirement. These signs are
11 identified in this report as Sign No. 1,
12 referring to the south side elevation sign,
13 and Sign No. 2, referring to the east
14 elevation sign. Signs No. 1 and 2 are
15 proposed 20 feet and 3 inches above finished
16 grade, both of which exceed the height
17 requirement by 5 feet and 3 inches.

18 So the existing building has been
19 vacant, and this was previously a White Castle
20 restaurant. Del Taco submitted a zoning
21 permit application for exterior modifications
22 on March 18, 2024, which includes exterior
23 updates and awning repairs, as well as new
24 paint.

1 The subject property is located at
2 8787 Owenfield Drive, Powell, Ohio, and has
3 Parcel No. 318-324-11-004-000. The
4 surrounding area is very similar to the last
5 property, essentially. The only different
6 being that it's just to the North, so the
7 adjacent use to the North is Pizza Cottage.
8 That zoning to the North is Planned Commercial
9 and Office District, by the way. To the South
10 is Planned Commercial and Office. I mentioned
11 before, but Meijer, Fifth Third Bank and then
12 the proposed Another Broken Egg Cafe. To the
13 east, the zoning is Planned Commercial and
14 Office, land use is Staples, vacant commercial
15 and U.S. 23. To the west is Planned
16 Commercial and Office District with Steak N'
17 Shake and Cheswick Village, and that Route 23
18 Corridor District zoning.

19 Okay. This should look somewhat
20 familiar, just as we mentioned. They are
21 adjacent to each other with a drive aisle cut
22 through essentially to that right in and right
23 out of 23 for access. The zoomed-out view,
24 you saw this already.

1 Let's jump right into the
2 Exhibits. Alright. Exhibit No. 1 is Wall
3 Sign No. 1. The drawing here is clearcut in
4 terms of showing you the 20 foot and 3 inch
5 grade to top of the sign measurement there.
6 The applicant is proposing Wall Sign No. 1
7 east elevation at that 23 feet and 0 inches
8 height, means that a variance of 5 feet and 3
9 inches is being requested. So this represents
10 a roughly 35 percent variance request from
11 Orange Township Zoning Resolution Section 22.

12 And on the other side we have
13 essentially I think they're both the same
14 size, same height off grade, 20 feet and 3
15 inches, so a variance of 5 feet and 3 inches
16 is also being requested, the same 35 percent
17 variance request. And for your reference, the
18 locations of the proposed wall signs on the
19 Site Plan. And that is all I have

20 CHAIRMAN TREFZ: One question.
21 The two signs look like they come into a
22 corner. Do they actually meet?

23 MR. PETRO: No, they're two
24 separate elevations.

1 MR. GAYETSKY: They're centered
2 with both of those areas.

3 MR. PETRO: Yeah. That's an
4 architectural element and I know that they
5 worked with Staff on the materials and stuff,
6 based on what their corporate standard is, so
7 that was changed up a little bit. Those signs
8 are centered on those buildings.

9 CHAIRMAN TREFZ: Okay.

10 MR. PAX: I think the striped,
11 vertically striped elements come to a corner,
12 right?

13 MR. PETRO: Yes.

14 CHAIRMAN TREFZ: Well, the two
15 signs, they actually abut to each other,
16 right? There's no gap here?

17 MR. PETRO: No. That slat wall
18 system, whatever you want to call it, connects
19 into 90 degree.

20 CHAIRMAN TREFZ: Yeah.

21 MR. PETRO: Yes.

22 CHAIRMAN TREFZ: That's all I was
23 asking.

24 MS. NEFF: That's what you were

1 saying. Okay.

2 MR. PETRO: Yeah.

3 MS. SUNDAR: Okay.

4 MR. PETRO: Those abut up to each
5 other and there's no gap between them.

6 CHAIRMAN TREFZ: Yeah.

7 MS. SUNDAR: The stripes, what
8 color is that?

9 MR. PETRO: Typically, they're
10 like a dark bronze, black color, but I don't
11 know -- I wasn't involved with the changes or
12 whatever was requested. I know they've
13 requested some different materials.

14 MR. GAYETSKY: And I think that's
15 a HardieBacker that they went with, if I kept
16 up with their revisions with that type of
17 siding product.

18 MR. PETRO: It's typically, if you
19 they're familiar with like a Taco Bell how
20 they have the slat walls, it's like a
21 Duranodic metal, but they changed the material
22 for this.

23 MS. SUNDAR: The east elevation
24 and the north looks slightly different. The

1 East has a grid.

2 MS. NEFF: Oh, yeah, they look
3 like, yeah, little blocks versus slats.

4 MS. SUNDAR: Yeah.

5 MS. NEFF: But they're both the
6 same?

7 MR. PETRO: They're identical.

8 MS. NEFF: They are the same?

9 MR. PETRO: Yes.

10 MS. SUNDAR: They're identical?

11 MR. PETRO: Yes.

12 CHAIRMAN TREFZ: I think that's
13 just a function of how it was printed out.

14 MS. NEFF: The print.

15 MS. SUNDAR: Okay.

16 CHAIRMAN TREFZ: You're talking
17 about this section, right?

18 MS. SUNDAR: Right.

19 CHAIRMAN TREFZ: Yeah.

20 MS. NEFF: Where the signs are
21 located, are those where the main signs were
22 located on the White Castle as well; do you
23 know?

24 MR. PETRO: I tried to go back. I

1 think I saw one photo where White Castle had
2 signs on both of those.

3 CHAIRMAN TREFZ: Look at Exhibit
4 3, it shows you where the -- keep turning,
5 there you go.

6 MS. NEFF: Okay. So they're on
7 the like --

8 CHAIRMAN TREFZ: So they're on the
9 east and the south.

10 MR. PAX: That makes sense.

11 MR. PETRO: They'll be facing the
12 main road and the corner of the cut-thru, the
13 right in and right out, I guess.

14 MS. NEFF: Okay.

15 MS. SUNDAR: The colors on the, I
16 believe it's yellow or red, are those
17 illuminated, or what material is that?

18 MR. PETRO: Yeah. These are all
19 face illuminated, so there's a sunburst, which
20 is yellow and orange.

21 MS. SUNDAR: Okay.

22 MR. PETRO: The letters are white,
23 and then the green pasture, hill, whatever you
24 want to call it. Those are all face lit.

1 CHAIRMAN TREFZ: Okay. Any
2 questions?

3 MS. ROSS: Are you ready for a
4 Motion?

5 CHAIRMAN TREFZ: Yes.

6 MS. ROSS: Based on the
7 considering factors, I move to approve Case
8 No. VA-24-19, for the property located at 8787
9 Owenfield Drive, Powell, Ohio 43065, seeking
10 an area variance from Orange Township Zoning
11 Resolution 22.03(c) to allow for the wall sign
12 identified in this report as Wall Sign No. 1
13 to be 5 feet and 3 inches above the allowed 15
14 feet in an area zoned Planned Commercial and
15 Office (PC) District.

16 MS. NEFF: Second.

17 MR. GAYETSKY: Motion made by Ms.
18 Ross, seconded by Ms. Neff. Those voting:

19 Mr. Trefz.

20 CHAIRMAN TREFZ: Yes.

21 MR. GAYETSKY: Mr. Pax.

22 MR. PAX: Yes.

23 MR. GAYETSKY: Ms. Ross.

24 MS. ROSS: Yes.

1 MR. GAYETSKY: Ms. Neff.

2 MS. NEFF: Yes.

3 MR. GAYETSKY: Ms. Sundar.

4 MS. SUNDAR: Yes.

5 MR. GAYETSKY: Motion passes,
6 variance is approved.

7 MS. ROSS: Based on the
8 considering factors, I move to approve the
9 Case No. VA-24-19 for the property located
10 8787 Owenfield Drive, Powell, Ohio 43065,
11 seeking an area variance from Orange Township
12 Zoning Resolution 22.03(c) to allow for the
13 wall sign identified in this report as Wall
14 Sign No. 2 to be 5 feet and 0 inches above the
15 allowed 15 feet in an area zoned Planned
16 Commercial and Office (PC) District.

17 CHAIRMAN TREFZ: I'll second.

18 MR. GAYETSKY: I may have you
19 reread that. And that's again on me as not
20 indicating exactly correct, Wall Sign No. 2
21 should be also 5 feet and 3 inches, as opposed
22 to 5 feet 0.

23 MS. ROSS: Oh, I'm sorry.

24 MR. GAYETSKY: No, that was my

1 typo.

2 MS. ROSS: I just saw it in the
3 text rather than the numbers.

4 MR. GAYETSKY: Correct. Sorry
5 about that.

6 MS. ROSS: I'm glad to reread
7 that.

8 Based on the considering factors,
9 I move to approve Case No. VA-24-19, for the
10 property located 8787 Owenfield Drive, Powell,
11 Ohio 43065 seeking an area variance from
12 Orange Township Zoning Resolution Section
13 22.03(c) to allow for the wall sign identified
14 in this report as Wall Sign No. 2 to be 5 foot
15 and 3 inches above the allowed 15 feet in the
16 area zoned Planned Commercial and Office (PC)
17 District.

18 CHAIRMAN TREFZ: Second.

19 MR. GAYETSKY: Motion made by Ms.
20 Ross, seconded by Mr. Trefz. Those voting:

21 I'll start with Mr. Pax.

22 MR. PAX: Yes.

23 MR. GAYETSKY: Mr. Trefz.

24 CHAIRMAN TREFZ: Yes.

1 MR. GAYETSKY: Ms. Ross.

2 MS. ROSS: Yes.

3 MR. GAYETSKY: Ms. Neff.

4 MS. NEFF: Yes.

5 MR. GAYETSKY: And Ms. Sundar.

6 MS. SUNDAR: Yes.

7 MR. GAYETSKY: That Motion carries
8 as well. Thank you.

9 MR. PETRO: Thank you.

10 CHAIRMAN TREFZ: Thank you very
11 much.

12 - - -

13 MR. GAYETSKY: Alright. I think
14 we're to a place where the only item we have
15 left is the minutes for April. You had
16 received all of those a little time ago, maybe
17 two weeks ago. I know a couple of you were
18 gracious enough to get some comments on those.
19 I think that the comments that you gave were
20 useful and we made changes as we were able to,
21 so those have been incorporated as of today.
22 I didn't know if any of you felt comfortable
23 with making a Motion to approve those minutes
24 but as they are before us, and May will be

1 upcoming next month.

2 MS. NEFF: I'll make a motion. Is
3 everyone okay with that?

4 CHAIRMAN TREFZ: Uh-huh.

5 MS. NEFF: Okay. I make a Motion
6 to approve the minutes from April 18th, 2024
7 for Cases VA-24-09, VA-CU-24-10 and VA-24-11.

8 CHAIRMAN TREFZ: I'll second.

9 MR. GAYETSKY: Motion made by Ms.
10 Neff, seconded by Mr. Trefz. Those voting:

11 Mr. Pax.

12 MR. PAX: Yes.

13 MR. GAYETSKY: Mr. Trefz.

14 CHAIRMAN TREFZ: Yes.

15 MR. GAYETSKY: Ms. Ross.

16 MS. ROSS: Yes.

17 MR. GAYETSKY: Ms. Neff.

18 MS. NEFF: Yes.

19 MR. GAYETSKY: And Ms. Sundar.

20 MS. SUNDAR: Yes.

21 MR. GAYETSKY: Okay. Thank you

22 all.

23 With that, I think this is the
24 last item in the order of things, so if anyone

1 has any comments or questions for the good of
2 the group.

3 MS. ROSS: I would like to thank
4 Andrew for his hard work and dedication to
5 this Board and to the Township, and I wish you
6 many blessings and good luck in your new life
7 and in your schooling and everything that goes
8 with it. I hope you find a home soon.

9 MR. KOENIG: Thank you very much.
10 I learned a lot. It's been great to work with
11 you guys, so appreciate it.

12 MS. NEFF: We're going to miss
13 you.

14 MR. PAX: Good luck to you.

15 MR. GAYETSKY: Well, he's here for
16 another week, So if you need him. (Laughter.)

17 MS. ROSS: If there's nothing else
18 before the Board, I move to adjourn.

19 MR. PAX: I'll second.

20 MR. GAYETSKY: All in favor say
21 aye.

22 MEMBERS: "Aye."

23 MR. GAYETSKY: Adjourned.

24 (Thereupon, the proceedings

1 adjourned at 7:21 p.m.)

2

3

- - -

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1 CERTIFICATE

2 The undersigned do hereby certify that
3 the foregoing proceedings were digitally
4 recorded, and transcribed via audible
5 playback, and that the foregoing transcript of
6 such proceedings is a full, true and correct
7 transcript of the proceedings as so recorded.

8 IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set
9 my hand and affixed my seal of office on this
10 2nd day of July 2024.


11

12

13

14

15



16

17 Sandra D. Kin,
18 Registered Professional Reporter,
19 Certified Digital Reporter,
20 Certified Digital Transcriber.
21 Notary Public - State of Ohio.

22

23 My Commission expires May 14, 2027.

24

-

-

-