ZONING COMMISSION JOURNAL OF ACTIONS
FROM MEETING HELD JUNE 9, 2026
ORANGE TOWNSHIP - DELAWARE COUNTY

The electronic recordings of this meeting serve as the official meeting minutes.
A full and accurate account of this meeting's audio and video can be found at www.orangetwp.org

Dennis McNulty called the meeting to order.

ROLL CALL:
Dennis McNulty, Chair - Present
Karthik Avadhanula, Vice-Chair – Present
Les Pierce - Present
Pam Foster - Present
Punitha Sundar, – Present

ALSO PRESENT:
Robin Duffee, Development and Zoning Director
Eric Gayetsky, Senior Zoning Officer
Julie Donnan, Legal Council

NEW BUSINESS

Zoning Application #ZON-26-01, Real Property Design & Development, Requesting to rezone an 8.34 acre Farm Residential (FR-1) District property to Planned Unit Development (PUD) District for a new 17-lot single family neighborhood with onsite amenities. The subject property is currently owned by 6980 SOS LLC and is located at 6980 South Old State Rd., Lewis Center, OH 43035 with parcel number(s) 318-240-01-018-000 & 318-240-01-019-000.

Mr. Duffee presents the Staff Report:

- Staff Comments
  - The development text submitted by the applicant lists the permitted uses as "single-family residential homes and permissible accessory uses." Staff recommends expanding on the list of accessory and conditional uses to add clarity, and adding language that all other uses would be prohibited. Referring to the list of permitted/conditional/prohibited uses for the Neighborhood Zone may also be an acceptable way of listing the uses.
  - A CAD (common access drive) area is shown on lot 5. While this could provide future access to the parcel to the north, zoning staff is not aware of a concrete access plan at this time. Regional Planning staff also mentioned that this should be clarified in the application, and Township zoning staff concurs. One possible solution would be to separate the area from lot 5 and place a future access easement there, instead of identifying the area as a CAD.
  - On sheets 2 and 3, the lot dimensions for lot 5 is incorrect. It should read 16,703 s.f. instead of 7,478 s.f.
- Review from Other Agencies:
  - The Orange Township Fire Department A similar site layout was reviewed and approved by the Orange Township Fire Department. If the street layout has changed, it would need to be re-submitted.

- The Orange Township Operations Department recommends that no parking signs be installed around the cul-de-sac.
- Delaware County Regional Planning Commission voted to recommend **conditional approval** of the rezoning request at their May 28, 2026 meeting, subject to the following staff recommendation:
  - Provide additional details on the Development Plan and in the Development Text regarding the "CAD" area on lot 5.

John Wicks, Real Property Design Development, 15 N Liberty St. presents the plan.

- Acknowledges the previous application that was submitted under the previous zoning resolution was denied. States this application is being submitted under the current, new zoning resolution under Planned Unit Development. This proposed development has 17 lots. The lot depth is 120 feet and all but one lot are at least 78.5 feet wide with the remaining lot being 71 feet wide. States this plan complies with the comprehensive plan
- Answers Regional Planning recommendation that additional details are provided regarding the CAD on lot 5 by stating the reason for the CAD is to provide access to an undeveloped property.

Ms. Donnan

- Reminded the Zoning Commission that Regional Planning referenced the CAD and the desire for more information about the CAD and what is being proposed.
  - Mr. Wicks explains the CAD is to provide access to a three acre property to the north
- Ms. Donnan asks if there was any discussion about making the CAD area a reserve
  - Mr. Wicks replies it wouldn't be an open space reserve, it is to be used for driveways

Board Comments:

Mr. Avadhanula:

- Asks the lot depths being proposed.
  - Mr. Wicks replies there are two that are 120 feet deep, the rest are larger
- Asks Mr. Duffee if the zoning commission can approve this plan with a CAD on it
  - Mr. Duffee answers that the board has the ability to recommend approval; approval with modifications; or denial.
- Asks Ms. Donnan which has more flexibility for the future, a CAD or an access easement
  - Ms. Donnan replies a CAD is basically a driveway that can service up to five lots and is regulated by Delaware County. An access easement can be several different things including a paved or gravel road and pavers or grass that can be driven over
- Wonders how the 60 feet CAD Mr. Wicks has shown impacts the side setback of that lot
  - Mr. Wicks states that typically there are no setback restrictions for a CAD
- Requests clarification on the percentage of open space the stormwater is allowed to make up.
  - Mr. Duffee roughly calculates the totals of reserve A, reserve B and reserve C to be about 80,000 so the maximum allowed would be roughly 40,000 square feet.
  - Mr. Wicks states the stormwater is just under 25,000 square feet.
- Wonders about the storm water drainage and if the future expansion of S Old State Rd. will create a barrier for the drainage

- Mr. Duffee states he does not have an answer as both stormwater and traffic will be reviewed by Delaware County.
- Mr. Wicks replies that they had to design for both existing and future conditions. In the existing condition, stormwater drains into the roadside ditch. When the county brings in the improvements, they will pick up the storm pipes and take them into their system.

Ms. Foster:

- Asks the square footage of the proposed houses
  - Mr. Wicks replies the plan shows 1800 square feet but he foresees the residences being closer to 2200 square feet.

Mr. Pierce:

- Wonders if the house samples provided in the proposed development are the actual homes that will be built.
  - Mr. Wicks states those are the actual houses the builder is proposing

Mr. McNulty:

- States Regional Planning just said they wanted more information on the CAD; not sure what to do from here
  - Mr. Duffee agrees stating a potential future access easement that provides access is more general, and gives future options which could be beneficial because it would not be locked into a CAD or private or public street
  - Ms. Donnan adds an additional consideration is if a CAD, private street or public street were to be put in, how would that impact the setbacks of lots five and four

Public Comments:

Brian Hunt, 3300 Riverside Dr., Suite 125, Upper Arlington Ohio 43221 – representing Amanda Bliemeister

- States the zoning commission should recommend denial because: the proposal violates the comprehensive plan; misuses the PUD district; introduces unresolved traffic and safety hazards; the density exceeds the PUD standards; impacts to his clients property by the risk of trespass, and loss of privacy and enjoyment; the community has spoken

Brian Szuch, 2230 Jaxton Ct.

- Believes this is spot zoning; has concerns that if this is allowed, the remaining FR -1 parcels in the area will want to rezone with the same type of development further impacting traffic. Also has safety concerns about a single access in and out of the development

Manivannan Sathiyanarayanan, 2097 Chicory Ct.

- Concerned about this development creating new traffic patterns with left and right turns that will have no traffic signals or dedicated turn lanes in close proximity to a major intersection. Further concerned this new traffic pattern will interfere with the existing fire station as fire trucks are deployed. Feels the traffic study that was done is not accurate and believes a new traffic study should be required.

Matt Baxendell, 7371 Summerfield Dr

- States the traffic pattern created by this and another nearby planned development will be a safety hazard.

Peter DeGaia, 6976 S Old State Rd.

- States the new code says PUD zoning is established to provide flexibility for projects that promote the goals of the comprehensive plan but cannot be accomplished under base zoning district – there is a straight neighborhood zoning available. Goes on to say this development is in the middle of an FR-1 neighborhood and in addition to setting a precedent, it does not maintain the character of the FR-1

neighborhood. Mr. DeGaia says the application does not include a detailed site plan. He is also concerned about drainage issues and it will affect his septic system.

Tom Washer, 7040 S Old State Rd.

- Enjoys the farm residential neighborhood he lives in and would like see this property remain farm residential.

Kristina DiFranco, 7377 Trillium Dr.

- Agrees with previous comment that a new traffic study is needed. States the comprehensive plan discusses connectivity with the community but this development is a cul-de-sac on S Old State with no connectivity

Khozema Doctor, 2537 Coltsbridge Dr.

- Voices his concerns about traffic

RESOLUTION TO RECOMMEND DENIAL OF ZONING APPLICATION #ZON-26-01 OF REAL PROPERTY DESIGN AND DEVELOPMENT LLC

Motion by Mr. Pierce to recommend to the Board of Township Trustees (the "Board) the **DENIAL** of Zoning Application #ZON-26-01 of Real Property Design and Development LLC, the pages of which are each stamped received with ORANGE TWP. ZONING, requesting the rezoning of 8.34 +/- acres from Farm Residential ("FR-1") to Planned Unit Development District ("PUD"), including requested divergences, upon finding that it is not in the interest of the public convenience, comfort, prosperity, or general welfare, or sufficiently in accordance with the comprehensive plan.

Motion seconded by Ms. Sundar.
VOTE: McNulty – No, Avadhanula - No, Sundar - Yes, Foster – Yes, Pierce - Yes

MOTION TO APPROVE MARCH 10, 2026 MINUTES

Motion by McNulty
Second by Sundar

VOTE: McNulty – Yes, Avadhanula - Yes, Sundar - Yes, Foster – Abstain, Pierce - Abstain

Meeting adjourned