

**MONTVILLE TOWNSHIP  
BOARD OF ZONING APPEALS MEETING  
APRIL 6, 2026**

**PRESENT**

Allen Biehl, Vice Chairperson  
Cheryl Heinley  
Bill Montalto  
Pat Ryan  
J.C. Stouffer

**ALSO PRESENT**

P. Jeffers, Planning and Zoning Director  
B. Schwehm, Zoning Secretary  
T. Devanney, Legal Counsel  
B. Booth                      C. King  
D. Calvin                      J. Marra  
M. DiCarlantonio              S. Meltzer  
M. Gallucci                      J. Pavluk Campitello

---

**HANDOUTS:** Email/Hillsong LLC

- AGENDA:**
1. Public Hearing: Variance #01-26-003 – Tabled 3/2/26 & 3/16/26 – Table to April 20, 2026/ Hillsong Subdivision/Section 550.1 B., Well Setbacks
  2. Public Hearing: Variance #03-26-009/Wallick Communities/The Ashford at Cobblestone/Wooster Pike – MUOD/Section 416.9, Maximum Height

Board Vice Chairperson Allen Biehl called the Monday, April 6, 2026 meeting of the Montville Township Board of Zoning Appeals to order at 7:00 p.m. and served as chairperson for the public meeting/hearing.

**ROLL CALL:** Board Member Cheryl Heinley – Present; Board Member J.C. Stouffer – Present; Board Member Bill Montalto – Present; Board Member Pat Ryan – Present; Board Chairperson Allen Biehl – Present.

Board Chairperson Biehl asked if the meeting had been properly advertised in the paper.

Planning and Zoning Director Paul Jeffers said the meeting had been properly advertised.

Board Chairperson Biehl asked if contiguous property owners had been properly notified.

Planning and Zoning Director Jeffers said contiguous property owners had been properly notified.

Board Chairperson Biehl said everyone in attendance should sign in if they had not already done so. Anyone who wished to speak would be sworn in before testifying. The meeting was taped for transcription purposes; therefore, it was important for everyone to state their name clearly before speaking. As a quasi-judicial body, the Board of Zoning Appeals based its decisions on evidence and not on opinions. The official documentation of the proceedings would be the typed transcripts. He asked for cell phones to be silenced during the proceedings.

Board Chairperson Biehl presented the items on the agenda.

None of the Board members would be abstaining from discussing or voting on any of the agenda items.

**1. PUBLIC HEARING: VARIANCE – TABLED 3/2/26 & 3/16/26  
TABLE TO APRIL 20, 2026 AT 7:00 PM**

- Application No.:** 01-26-003
- Applicant:** Anthony Valore  
Valore Builders  
23550 Center Ridge Road, #101  
Westlake, OH 44145
- Landowner:** Hillsong LLC  
23550 Center Ridge Road, #101  
Westlake, OH 44145
- Property:** Hillsong Subdivision, Phase 2  
Parcel #030-11B-10-037
- Zoning District:** R-3, Single-Family Urban Residential District
- Request:** Section 550.1 B., Minimum Distances for New Construction  
25-foot variance from the minimum 50-foot setback from a  
plugged well on proposed Sublots 96, 97, 114, 115, 118, 119,  
120, 121, 124 and 125

Board Chairperson Biehl introduced the agenda item and said the applicant asked for the agenda item to be tabled to April 20, 2026 per the email to Planning and Zoning Director Jeffers dated April 6, 2026.

MOTION: Board Member Montalto moved to table Variance Application 01-26-003 to the April 20, 2026 BZA meeting at 7:00 p.m.

SECOND: Board Member Stouffer

ROLL CALL: Board Member Ryan – Aye; Board Member Montalto – Aye;  
Board Member Stouffer – Aye; Board Member Heinly – Aye;  
Board Chairperson Biehl – Aye.

Motion Approved: 5 – Ayes; 0 – Nays; 0 – Abstentions

**2. PUBLIC HEARING: VARIANCE**

- Application No.:** 03-26-009
- Applicant:** Wallick Communities  
by Daniel P. Calvin  
Critchfield Law Firm  
4996 Foote Road  
Medina, OH 44256
- Landowner:** Cobblestone Crossings, LLC

3200 W Market Street, Suite 104  
Akron, OH 44333

- Property:** The Ashford at Cobblestone  
6327 (Parcel #030-11A-15-016) Wooster Pike and  
6309 (Parcel #030-11A-15-022) Wooster Pike
- Zoning District:** Mixed-Use Overlay District
- Request:** Section 416.9, Maximum Height, Mixed-Use Overlay District Regs.  
No building or structure shall exceed two (2) stories or thirty-five (35) feet in height except as specifically authorized by the Township:
- 1) Applicant requests that it be permitted to construct a building that has a portion that is three (3) stories tall;
  - 2) Applicant requests that it be permitted to construct a building that has a portion that is 39.125 feet in height.

Board Chairperson Biehl opened the public hearing and read/referenced the application and the key points in the information submitted with the application, which included a project narrative with sketches of the proposed building; a community needs statement; an economic impact statement; justification of the variance; schematics showing the layout of the proposed site with and without the variances; graphics of what the building would look like if the variances were granted and if the variances were not granted; a map of the site; a site plan with topographical features; and architectural renderings.

Attorney Dan Calvin, Critchfield Law Firm, said the representatives from Wallick Communities would speak first and then he would speak. The engineer and architect were also available that evening to answer questions.

Mr. John Marra, Vice President, Development, Wallick Communities, 4189 Silsby Road, Cleveland, Ohio was sworn in by Board Chairperson Biehl.

Planning and Zoning Director Jeffers was sworn in by Board Chairperson Biehl.

Mr. Marra said Wallick was a vertically integrated developer, contractor, and property manager out of Columbus, Ohio. Wallick had over 200 properties under ownership and management throughout the Midwest and into the Carolinas. Eleven licensed senior living facilities were located in Ohio; one was located in Michigan. The proposed project, which was called the Ashford at Cobblestone, would be the thirteenth senior living community in their portfolio.

Over their many decades of experience in senior living development, construction, and property management, which dated back to the 1980s, Mr. Marra said they had learned that the building design and the flow of the building were critical to the long-term success of the projects. Building design and flow lended itself to operational efficiencies, and most importantly, the best resident experience.

Mr. Marra said the facilities were large, staff-intensive buildings. For example, the proposed project would support over 45 full-time jobs and over \$4 million dollars of annual payroll once it was operating, of which the JEDD (Joint Economic Development District) would be a beneficiary.

In order to operate effectively, Mr. Marra said an efficient design component was needed. The proposed building design was their third iteration of the design concept. The design started with the Ashford of Beaver Creek project near Dayton, Ohio. It was repeated for the second time with the Ashford of Berkshire in Berkshire Township in Sunbury, Ohio. The proposed project would be the third iteration of the subject design.

Mr. Marra said it was a proven concept for Wallick, and it was a building their operator and residents really enjoyed, which was why they were in front of the Board of Zoning Appeals (BZA) regarding the preservation of the subject design.

Mr. Marra said the direct impact on the quality of life of their residents was equally important. The proposed model addressed both the needs of the residents and the community. They came into communities where they saw a need.

When they did their independent research and performed third-party market research, Mr. Marra said they saw the 65+ population was set to grow over 20% by 2030 in the primary market area in which the subject project would be located. Medina County recently published a demographic study for the county that stated the 65+ and 75+ population was expected to grow by almost 40% by 2050 based on current population trends. The study specifically stated that the county needed to adjust housing types for seniors.

In Medina County, as well as throughout the communities in Ohio that they served, Mr. Marra said Wallick saw that residents liked to stay within their communities. Many assisted living and memory care residents did not want to go far from home and commonly stayed within their communities. They did not want to be far from their loved ones. In Medina County, it was very clear that senior housing was needed to retain the senior demographic of the townships and county.

With respect to the design features of the building as a whole, Mr. Marra said there would be a one-story memory care wing and a three-story assisted living wing connected by a shared common space. The commercial kitchen, resident dining room, all on-site management offices and maintenance facilities, various areas of social gathering and enrichment, such as a salon and barber shop, arts and crafts room, multi-purpose room, and fitness and rehabilitation center, would be located in the common corridor of the facility.

Mr. Marra said the facility was intentionally designed to encourage interaction and engagement amongst residents and staff. The layout minimized travel distance for residents and staff, which improved response times of staff getting to residents when needed. Travel distance reduced the risk of falls and EMS (emergency medical services) runs and encouraged residents to leave their rooms and partake and engage within the community. Clear lines of sight allowed staff to see call lights when residents were in need in a certain situation.

Mr. Marra shared the background information to emphasize that the subject project and design would not be a one-off, site-specific design. It would be a proven concept for Wallick that worked for their operational team, and most importantly, enhanced the lives of its residents.

Mr. Marra introduced Mr. Michael DiCarlantonio, Wallick Communities; Ms. Suzanne Meltzer, RDL Architects; Mr. Brad Booth, GBC Design; and Attorney Dan Calvin who were available to answer questions.

Attorney Dan Calvin, Critchfield Law Firm, said a lot of materials were provided to the Board for reference purposes. Two variances were requested, and they were going to spend a lot of time on the first variance request, which was to allow Wallick to construct a three-story building on the property. The second variance request was to allow the height to exceed the 35 feet maximum and go up to 39.125 feet to have a pitched roof – not a flat roof.

Attorney Calvin referred to the flat-roof option that was three stories and met the 35-foot requirement. They thought a pitched roof would provide a better more cohesive look for the property and would meet Montville Township's Comprehensive Plan to avoid flat roofs.

Attorney Calvin said the variance request for three stories was for just one-third of the building – not the entire building. Just the assisted living wing would be three stories.

Attorney Calvin referred to the grading plan for the site. Based on the grading for the entire site and the landscape mound along State Route 3, the first floor of the proposed building would be almost entirely covered. From many different angles, the proposed building would actually look like a two-story building.

Attorney Calvin said they thought the true intent of the zoning code was to limit the height of the building – not the number of stories. He knew the code referenced stories, but the zoning code allowed a two-story building that was 35 feet. He thought it would look kind of funny, but it would be allowed.

As he was driving through the Medina Square that day, Attorney Calvin looked at the new Legacy Hotel. The first thing he noticed was the height – not the number of stories. He thought the zoning code was really going after the height restriction for the subject area. Attorney Calvin thought the number of stories was a façade piece that really did not factor into it.

In the packet of information that the Board received, Attorney Calvin said he highlighted multiple places in the Montville Township Comprehensive Plan where two-story and three-story development was encouraged, especially in the State Route 3 economic corridor.

As Mr. Marra addressed, Attorney Calvin said they thought a two-story build was impractical. A diagram in the packet addressed travel distance. If a two-story building was constructed, the maximum travel distance for residents and/or staff would be about 400 feet, as opposed to their design with 280 feet. A longer travel distance would increase fall risk and fatigue for elderly residents, and it would reduce staff sightlines and increase staff response times.

Attorney Calvin added that the Mixed-Use Overlay District was the only commercial district in Montville Township that limited the number of stories. If the subject building was built across the road on the west side of State Route 3, which was in the commercial business district, the building could be three stories and 35 feet.

Attorney Calvin knew zoning worried about how the neighborhood would look and how it would match neighboring developments; however, another developer could literally build the proposed building right across the street.

Attorney Calvin said the decision would not set a precedent for other commercial districts throughout Montville Township. The request was only as it related to the Mixed-Use Overlay District, which was primarily residential development, with the potential for maybe two or three future commercial buildings in the district. A lot of concern was about setting precedent; but the subject district was very small, and only a couple spots had not already been spoken for.

Attorney Calvin said the maximum building height requirement of 35 feet could be met with a flat roof, but they thought the neighbors, residents, and Montville Township would like the building better if it had a pitched roof. Instead of a pitched roof on two-thirds of the building and a flat roof on the assisted living, they thought the pitched roof would have a more cohesive appearance and look great.

Attorney Calvin said a couple of places in the Montville Township Comprehensive Plan said to try to avoid flat roofs. If they could avoid a flat roof with 35 feet, they would; but that was why the variance was requested to go from 35 feet up to 39 feet.

Board Chairperson Biehl read the comments from Planning and Zoning Director Jeffers dated March 30, 2026 regarding the variance requests.

Board Member Ryan said Attorney Calvin said the zoning district across the street did not regulate the height. She said the maximum height was 35 feet.

Attorney Calvin said the zoning district across the street did not limit the number of stories. Across the street, the 35-foot building could be built – not the 39-foot building. There was not a two-story limit.

Board Member Ryan acknowledged that was correct.

Board Member Ryan asked who determined the 5-acre site. Was it already set? Or, was it what Wallick requested?

Attorney Calvin said Wallick did not control the size of the site that they put under contract. The developer, Cobblestone Crossings, bought the bigger piece and was doing the bigger development.

Board Member Ryan knew the stormwater detention pond was next door; it was mentioned in quite a few instances. She said that location could change and wondered if anyone had spoken to Medina County about that.

Mr. Brad Booth, GBC Design, 565 White Pond Drive, Akron, Ohio was sworn in by Board Chairperson Biehl.

Mr. Booth said they were working with Medina County and were actually days away from probably having approval on that pond. It was not only taking in the site for

Wallick group but was also taking in the apartments on the other side of the private street.

Mr. Booth said the size of the pond met the EPA (Environmental Protection Agency) standards for water quality while also meeting the county standards for stormwater management and storage. The pond was as small as they could make it.

Mr. Booth said the location for the pond was chosen because that was currently the low point on the site. The basin would discharge into a culvert that went under State Route 3. A lot more earthwork would be required to move the pond one direction or another. Moving it to the north would mean taking out a low area and forcing a low area in what used to be an upland area. He said Wallick was given the site that they were given because the pond was already in design.

Board Member Ryan thought the pond could vary a little bit or be shifted slightly.

Mr. Booth said, "if needed." There could be slight variations; and if needed, some changes could be made to the shape of it. However, between all of the surrounding wetland areas that they were not allowed to impact, Mr. Booth said they were kind of pinned into the place where the basin now was. There were a few more wetlands to the north, which would require working with the EPA.

In order to eliminate the variance requests, Board Member Ryan asked why not add a second story over the memory care unit, which would not increase the walking distances.

Ms. Suzanne Meltzer, RDL Architects, 2493 West 11<sup>th</sup> Street, Cleveland, Ohio was sworn in by Board Chairperson Biehl.

Ms. Meltzer had designed senior living facilities her entire career. Memory care was designed to an I-2 type of use in the building code, which allowed memory care to be very open. It was important because of the type of residents who may need to be able to exit the building in different ways.

If stacked, Ms. Meltzer said the assisted living would also have to be I-2, which would require metal construction. Memory care and assisted living units were different, which made it difficult to align the plumbing and would make the building more complex. Metal construction would affect the costs and affordability of the project.

Ms. Meltzer said the situation would be the same with trying to build over the common area of the building.

Board Member Stouffer asked about the maximum allowed travel distance per the OBC (Ohio Building Code) for the subject residential use and current configuration.

Ms. Meltzer said there was not a requirement; the travel distance could be as long as they wanted. However, several different studies were used as guides. One study referenced not going beyond 250 feet for travel distance. At 400 feet, the study found resident participation dropped off considerably, which tended to make residents less active and frailer.

Board Member Stouffer asked if the building would be sprinkled.

Ms. Meltzer said the building would be sprinkled.

Board Member Stouffer thought the pitched roof looked better than the flat roof, and he said there could be a lot of drainage issues with flat roofs.

Board Member Stouffer said there was a truss bearing on the flat roof of 31' 4 3/4" and 32' 4 3/4" for the pitched roof. He asked for an explanation regarding the 12 inch difference between the buildings.

Ms. Meltzer said it was usually related to being able to run some of the duct work, etc. through the trusses, which could not be done with a flat roof.

Board Member Stouffer said the truss bearing was being raised 12 inches for the pitched roof. He asked if the duct work was in the attic space or below.

Ms. Meltzer did not have the section in front of her, but said it was typically related to how the truss came down and was supported.

Board Member Stouffer wondered if the 12-inch difference could be used to take less of a variance. However, he thought they had probably studied how things would be run.

Ms. Meltzer said not only had they studied it, but they did it in Michigan and would never do it again. It was a nightmare.

Board Member Stouffer referred to the exhibit showing the view from State Route 3. He said windows were shown below the green line.

Ms. Meltzer said the building would be exposed. The road would be much higher and then there would be a berm.

Board Member Stouffer wanted to make sure windows would not be looking into rocks or a retaining wall.

With the berm along State Route 3, Board Member Ryan asked if the building would still appear to be a three-story building when traveling on State Route 3. Would vehicles be above the berm?

Ms. Meltzer said, "Yes." It would be possible to look down and see the building, but the building would not be at the same level as vehicles traveling along State Route 3.

If traveling right next to the building, Attorney Calvin said it would be possible to look down and see the building. When driving east on State Route 162, the building would be below the road. When driving north on State Route 3, the building would be set down a little bit.

Board Member Ryan said it would be possible to see the building was three stories.

Attorney Calvin said it would when driving right past it.

Board Chairperson Biehl asked for clarification regarding the relationship between the building itself and the actual site, existing homes, and school.

Mr. Marra presented the overall concept plan for the project area.

Board Chairperson Biehl asked if the plans were presented to police and fire and if there were any concerns about two stories versus three stories.

Planning and Zoning Director Jeffers said the plans were presented to police and fire. Fire Marshal Mark Crumley attended the Zoning Commission meeting when the plan

review was tabled. Fire Marshal Crumley thought the commercial access drive should be a private drive, which the county was currently taking care of. Fire Marshal Crumley was fine with the building being sprinkled and thought the waterline should be looped, which would avoid losing water entirely if there was a problem.

With a three-story building, Planning and Zoning Director Jeffers said Safety Services Director Matt Neil was concerned about the ladder truck being parked on the north side of Medina. However, Fire Marshal Crumley did not express that same concern.

Planning and Zoning Director Jeffers said addresses were important when it came to calls for safety services, which would be addressed by changing the commercial access drive to a private drive.

Board Chairperson Biehl said the applicant noted that the Montville Township Comprehensive Plan addressed two and three-story buildings. He asked about the history behind that being in the Comprehensive Plan.

Planning and Zoning Director Jeffers would have to look back at that specific discussion; a lot of discussion took place when the Comprehensive Plan was updated. However, he thought three-story/four-story buildings were encouraged in the Highway Commercial District.

Attorney Devaney said the Comprehensive Plan was last updated prior to the regulations being adopted for the Mixed-Use Overlay District. It was still residential and commercial.

Board Member Montalto knew there would be associated costs for safety services with an increase in medical calls. He asked who worked to recover some of those costs. The notes referenced the facility partnering with Montville Township or Medina County to share costs. When would that take place? How could they ensure that took place?

Once the plans moved forward, Planning and Zoning Director Jeffers said Safety Services Director Neil would discuss arrangements for recouping costs for non-emergency calls/runs with the management of the facility. The township's budget took a big hit for non-emergency calls that could be taken care of in-house or by a private transport.

Mr. Michael DiCarlantonio, Vice President, Development, Wallick Communities, 11109 Kingfisher Place, Plan City, Ohio was sworn in by Board Chairperson Biehl.

As Mr. Marra mentioned, Mr. DiCarlantonio said the proposed project would be Wallick's twelfth assisted living facility in Ohio. For many different reasons, being in a CRA (Community Reinvestment Area) obviously helped. One reason was that it helped lower the costs for residents to live there – fewer expenses lowered the monthly rent. Mr. DiCarlantonio said ultimately, their goal was to be below market.

Mr. DiCarlantonio said the Ashford at Sturbridge in Hilliard, Ohio was in a CRA and was completed in 2017. He had an excerpt from a document from that project that talked about cost sharing because Wallick recognized if there was a CRA abatement, or something along those lines, public services would not receive what they would have received if the property had not been abated. He was happy to share the information and thought it would be a good starting point for discussions. Mr. DiCarlantonio said it was

something that Wallick was willing to enter into immediately if the project was approved.

As with all of their assisted living facilities, Mr. DiCarlantonio said part of their pre-development purchases would be a van and a bus, which would be owned by the project. The van and bus would be used to take residents to appointments, the grocery store, shopping, etc. Emergency services would not be called to take a resident to an appointment, which he knew had been the case in some instances; however, that would not be the case with the Ashford at Cobblestone.

Attorney Devanney said Montville Township had the legal ability to decide to charge for services after a certain number of services. It had been discussed simply because of nursing home situations and *frequent flyers* within Montville Township. Discussions were taking place with Medina Hospital, the contracting service, Medina Township, and the City of Medina. The request was for new nursing facilities to do their own transport unless it was truly an emergency. An ambulance would not be called for a blood draw. If that happened, Montville Township would have to go to the taxpayers to pay more.

Board Member Montalto said there was an expense issue. It would be one thing if expenses were recouped; but it would mean more resources, such as police officers, firefighters, etc.

Board Chairperson Biehl opened the hearing to the public.

Ms. Julie Pavluk Campitelli, 6420 Wooster Pike Road, was sworn in by Board Chairperson Biehl.

Ms. Pavluk Campitelli did not have any questions but was concerned about the traffic pattern and the speed on State Route 3. She hoped the future roundabout would slow down traffic.

Board Chairperson Biehl thought the roundabout had better slow down traffic, or there would be other reasons for an ambulance.

Ms. Pavluk Campitelli was in attendance to gain information about what would be going near their property.

Board Member Ryan had looked at the websites for other Wallick properties in Ohio and said at least one of them appeared to be two stories, but the pictures may not have shown the whole building. She asked if Wallick had any other two-story buildings.

Mr. DiCarlantonio said original projects from the 1980s would have been two stories. Those were very long communities. If those facilities were rebuilt, they would not look anything like those looked.

Mr. DiCarlantonio said those communities were hazardous for the residents because of how far they had to travel. There were a lot of turns, and it was a very inefficient design from a staffing perspective. In the proposed type of facility, the nurses' stations could be centrally located on each of the floors for a clear line of vision down each hallway.

Mr. DiCarlantonio said there was another project in Traverse City, Michigan, which was a newly constructed two-story facility. However, it was a much larger building and had a large element of independent living. Staffing ratios were far different, and the needs

were far different. The proposed plan was what they knew worked best in Ohio, and it was based a lot on demographics of the area and the needs.

Mr. DiCarlantonio said Traverse City was a little different with a very high need for independent living in an area that could age in place. They did not need the same amount of assisted living units and memory care units at that facility as were needed in Ohio to operate efficiently.

Board Member Ryan asked what made Ohio different.

Mr. DiCarlantonio said it was what residents could afford. Traverse City had a much higher income and net wealth. Residents were paying more for independent living in Traverse City than for assisted living in Ohio.

Mr. DiCarlantonio said eighty-two units of assisted living were proposed because staffing for nursing was in the forties. Some nursing staff was based on twenties. To be as efficient as possible, the facility needed to be in the forties for assisted living and sixteens for memory care. It was all about the staffing and keeping the most affordable rental rate for residents.

Attorney Devanney asked if Mr. DiCarlantonio was describing Wallick's business model.

Mr. DiCarlantonio said it was widely accepted – it was not just theirs, but it was what Wallick followed.

Board Member Ryan asked about the size of the other project sites with the proposed type of building plan.

Mr. DiCarlantonio said Beavercreek was 5.25 acres.

Mr. Marra said Berkshire was 6.4 acres, but a large retention pond was needed at that location.

Mr. DiCarlantonio said the Berkshire retention pond had to be shared with the county for the road. It was much larger to fit the capacity of their building and the road.

Board Member Ryan asked if the retention pond was on the building site.

Mr. DiCarlantonio said that was correct.

Mr. DiCarlantonio said Sturbridge was 4 acres. The size of the subject site was about where they liked to build the proposed type of facility.

Board Member Ryan asked if the other facilities had approximately the same number of units.

Mr. DiCarlantonio said, "Yes." Berkshire and Beavercreek were the same exact building and unit count.

Board Member Ryan asked if those buildings were one-story and three stories.

Mr. DiCarlantonio said that was correct.

Attorney Devanney asked if those facilities had the same zoning. Were there the same restrictions?

Mr. DiCarlantonio said Berkshire and Beaver Creek were in PUDs (Planned Unit Developments).

Attorney Devanney asked about the height restriction for those buildings.

Mr. DiCarlantonio and Ms. Meltzer thought it was around 45 feet.

Mr. DiCarlantonio said variances were not necessary. Both were approved uses. The PUDs were established, and Wallick became an end-user.

Attorney Devanney referenced the Beaver Creek property and asked about the ceiling height in the residents' rooms.

Mr. DiCarlantonio thought 10 feet on the first floor and 9 feet on the second and third floors. He confirmed the proposed project would have similar ceiling heights.

Beyond the basics of food, lodging, and housekeeping, Board Member Ryan asked what other services would be provided before skilled care was a consideration.

Mr. DiCarlantonio said Wallick had an all-inclusive model. Care and meals were included in the rent. There would be a full-time activities staff, salon and barber shop with licensed beautician/barber in the building four or five days a week; and off-site planned activities. Residents were not required to pay more for any of the activities.

Board Member Ryan asked about services such as help with showering or medication management.

In assisted living, Mr. DiCarlantonio said each resident was evaluated on a level one through four. The four levels were part of the all-inclusive package. A more intensive Level 5 was offered with an upcharge. Help with showering would likely come in around Level 4. Lower levels may not need assistance with showing or things along those lines.

Mr. DiCarlantonio said each unit would have a fully accessible shower with a pullcord, which would be taken into consideration. If a resident was deemed a fall hazard or was teetering between a Level 3 and Level 4, they typically had staff with them. A shower room would be available with a tub that filled up for someone in a wheelchair.

Mr. DiCarlantonio said their communities would have PCAs (personal care assistants), LPNs (licensed practical nurses), and a Director of Care – a full nursing staff.

Planning and Zoning Director Jeffers asked if the pullcords would go the nurses' station or 911.

Mr. DiCarlantonio said the pullcords would go the nurses' station. He acknowledged it was a buffer.

Board Chairperson Biehl said that was good to know.

Attorney Devanney apologized and excused herself from the public hearing/meeting at 7:58 p.m. but would be available by telephone if needed. She recommended the Board thoroughly review the Duncan Factors for the variance requests.

Board Chairperson Biehl asked if the Board would be considering one variance or two variances. There were two pages of Duncan Factors and one motion.

Attorney Devanney said variances were requested for height and the number of stories.

Planning and Zoning Director Jeffers said the second variance was dependent on the first variance being approved.

Board Member Ryan referred to Section 416.1 D., of the *Purpose* statement, which read, *To enable an extensive review of design characteristics to ensure projects are properly integrated into the surroundings and are compatible with adjacent development.*

Board Member Ryan said development across the street or within the subject district could only be a maximum of 35 feet in height. To say it was depriving what other property owners were allowed was debatable.

Attorney Calvin said to think about the other things that were going east of State Route 3. He referred to the Retreat at Cobblestone, which was age-targeted housing; the age-targeted apartments that would be developed; and a VA Clinic. It would be kind of an aging in place continuum for a part of Medina County that needed resources for senior living. The proposed facility would be part of that and would be cohesive with the neighborhood. While not in the Mixed-Use Overlay District, a three-story building could be built right across State Route 3; however, it could not be over 35 feet.

Board Chairperson Biehl closed the public portion of the hearing, and the Board reviewed the Duncan Factors for both of the variance requests starting with the variance request for three stories.

MOTION: Board Member Montalto moved to approve Variance Application #03-26-009 submitted for Wallick Communities by Daniel P. Calvin, Critchfield Law Firm, at 4996 Foote Road in Medina, Ohio 44256 for The Ashford at Cobblestone, 6327, Parcel #030-11A-15-016, and 6309, Parcel #030-11A-15-022, Wooster Pike in Montville Township, Medina County, Ohio.

The following variances are approved from Section 416.9, Maximum Height, Mixed-Use Overlay District Regulations, which states no building or structure shall exceed two stories or thirty-five feet in height except as specifically authorized by the Township. 1) The applicant's request is approved to be permitted to construct a building that has a portion that is three (3) stories tall per the elevations and plans for a building with a gabled roof that were submitted with the variance application; and 2) The applicant's request is approved to be permitted to construct a building that has a portion that is 39.125 feet in height per the elevations and plans for a building with a gabled roof that were submitted with the variance application.

The approved variances will allow the construction of a gabled, three-story building with a portion of the building being a maximum of 39.125 feet in height per the plans submitted with the variance application.

The property is owned by Cobblestone Crossings, LLC at 3200 West Market Street, Suite 104 in Akron, Ohio 44333 and is located in the Mixed-Use Overlay District.

SECOND: Board Member Stouffer

ROLL CALL:

Board Member Montalto: Approved, taking the following into consideration: the economic impact to the area; services for residents in the community and beyond; and the operational and safety model of the footprint.

Board Member Ryan: Approved, echoing the reasons given by Board Member Montalto. She still had concerns that the zoning code said 35 feet. Even though it was not a great variance, such as 10 feet over, she did have safety service concerns, but the request was not extreme.

Board Member Heinly: Approved. Board Members Montalto and Ryan echoed exactly what she was thinking. The sharing of costs for the safety services was big for her – that helped a lot.

Board Member Stouffer: Approved. He agreed with the reasoning and concerns of his fellow Board members. He appreciated the applicant doing the study with the flat roof versus the pitched roof. The pitched roof looked a lot better given the context of the rest of the buildings. He appreciated the due diligence in the renderings and everything else that was submitted and the thorough presentation.

Board Chairperson Biehl: Approved, for a lot of the same reasons. He thought the discrepancy needed to be looked at between the Comprehensive Plan and the Zoning Resolution and what appeared to be a conflict.

Especially with the height, he thought the pitched roof would look nice and would fit in with the community and was what most residents were looking for. He was not suggesting the building was Victorian; but knowing the Victorian history of Medina, the pitched roof approached it more than a flat roof. He thought a flat roof could be a distraction for residents that drove by; and in his opinion, a flat roof was more institutional.

Motion Approved: 5 – Ayes; 0 – Nays; 0 – Abstentions

Planning and Zoning Director Jeffers said the development plan would be reviewed by the Zoning Commission on Wednesday, April 8, 2026.

**ADJOURNMENT:**

MOTION: Board Member Heinly moved to adjourn the April 6, 2026 Board of Zoning Appeals meeting.

SECOND: Board Member Stouffer

A collective oral vote was taken.

Motion Approved: 5 – Ayes; 0 – Nays; 0 – Abstentions.

The April 6, 2026 meeting of the Montville Township Board of Zoning Appeals was adjourned at 8:13 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Bonnie Schwehm  
Zoning Secretary

Signature \_\_\_\_\_  
Chairperson

Date \_\_\_\_\_