

**MONTVILLE TOWNSHIP
BOARD OF ZONING APPEALS MEETING
JUNE 15, 2026**

PRESENT

Amanda Dillon, Chairperson
Allen Biehl, Vice Chairperson
Bill Montalto
Pat Ryan
J.C. Stouffer
Cheryl Heinly, Alternate

ALSO PRESENT

P. Jeffers, Planning and Zoning Director
B. Schwehm, Zoning Secretary
D. Kollar M. Rebick
J. Morgan T. Rebick
S. Morgan G. Terrell
J. Pompos E. Webb

HANDOUTS: None

- AGENDA:**
1. Public Hearing: Variance #05-26-012/5883 Emerald Lakes Drive – Morgan/Section 410.8 – Rear Yard Setback for Patio
 2. Public Hearing: Variance #05-26-013/3890 Paradise Road – Rebick/Section 410.8 & 210.2 #33 – Carport in Front Yard for Trailer Storage
 3. Zoning Updates

Board Chairperson Amanda Dillon called the Monday, June 15, 2026 meeting of the Montville Township Board of Zoning Appeals to order at 7:00 p.m.

ROLL CALL: Board Member Allen Biehl – Present; Board Member Pat Ryan – Present; Board Member J.C. Stouffer – Present; Board Member Bill Montalto – Present; Board Chairperson Amanda Dillon – Present; Alternate Board Member Cheryl Heinly – Present.

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

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

Board Chairperson Dillon 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. She asked for cell phones to be silenced during the proceedings.

Board Chairperson Dillon 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

Application No.: 05-26-012

Applicant/Owner: Jeff & Sandi Morgan
5883 Emerald Lakes Drive
Medina, OH 44256

Zoning District: Emerald Lakes Subdivision, Controlled Density Development R-2, Single-Family Suburban Residential District

Request: Section 410.8 C., Schedule 410.8: Yard Requirements for Sheds/Storage Buildings and Accessory Structures
A variance of 39 feet from the minimum 50-foot setback for an uncovered patio.

Board Chairperson Dillon opened the public hearing and read/referenced Variance Application #05-26-012, which included a drawing of the proposed patio; a photograph of the proposed sitting wall; a photograph of the beach area that would be replaced by the proposed patio; an aerial photograph of the subject property and surrounding area; and a property map showing the proposed patio and setback dimensions.

Board Chairperson Dillon read the comments from Planning and Zoning Director Jeffers dated June 4, 2026 regarding the subject variance request.

Ms. Sandi Morgan was sworn in by Board Chairperson Dillon.

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

Ms. Morgan thought her husband was pretty in-depth on the application. Their backyard was basically water. The beach was there when they bought the property twelve years ago. They wanted to put a patio where the beach was located. They were getting older and maintaining the beach was a lot of work. They wanted to streamline their lives and make it easier by not having to do all of the weeding that went along with maintaining the beach. The variance would allow them to make the patio as large as they wanted.

Board Member Ryan understood the 50-foot setback and that the property went into the lake. She thought Montville Township no longer allowed that.

Planning and Zoning Director Jeffers said Montville Township tried to avoid having properties go into a lake.

Board Member Ryan thought the subject situation was probably prior to that regulation.

Planning and Zoning Director Jeffers acknowledged that was correct.

Board Member Ryan asked why the applicant could not or did not want to put the patio adjacent to the deck.

Ms. Morgan had a couple of golden retrievers that needed a little backyard. If the patio was located near the deck, it would encroach into what little rear yard they had; and

secondly, they enjoyed sitting by the lake. It was very peaceful and very nice. They would like to continue sitting by the lake on the patio.

Board Member Montalto referred to Section 410.8 of the Montville Township Zoning Resolution. He thought the required side yard setback for the subject property was 10 feet.

Ms. Morgan said the side yard setback was 10 feet.

Planning and Zoning Director Jeffers confirmed the minimum side yard setback was 10 feet in the Emerald Lakes Subdivision.

Per the drawing, Board Member Montalto said the edge of the proposed patio would be 16 feet from the east side property line, which was within the requirement.

Since the patio would be right next to a lake, Board Member Stouffer asked if approval would be necessary from any other entities, such as ODNR (Ohio Department of Natural Resources). Did wetland or riparian setbacks apply? Could a patio be built right next to the lake?

If the structure had height and footers or a subsurface was required, Planning and Zoning Director Jeffers thought the applicant would have to go through the Medina County Building Department and/or the Medina County Soil and Water Conservation District. However, since it would be a structure at ground level, nothing would be needed besides the approvals from Montville Township and the HOA (homeowners' association).

Board Member Stouffer asked if pervious versus non-pervious was a concern.

Planning and Zoning Director Jeffers said 35% of the backyard could be covered with impervious surface. With the lake, he did not believe that would be an issue.

In looking at the zoning code, Board Member Biehl did not believe the proposed patio fell within the riparian setback requirements.

Planning and Zoning Director Jeffers said it did not.

Board Member Dillon referenced the photograph of the proposed sitting wall and asked about the materials being used for the proposed patio.

Ms. Morgan said the patio would all be done in stone. They had talked with the landscaper, and the patio would look pretty much like the picture on page 4 of the application. The patio and sitting wall would be made of the same stone. The sitting wall would not exceed the regulations for maintaining the sightlines to the lake.

Board Member Biehl asked if the patio would be stone on some sort of stone or gravel base.

Ms. Morgan said paver stones would be used for the patio.

Board Member Biehl said that in itself was a type of impervious application versus concrete.

Ms. Morgan said the patio would not be concrete.

Board Member Ryan referred to the photograph of the beach area. She asked how much of the beach area would become part of the patio.

Ms. Morgan said all of the beach area would become patio.

Board Member Ryan asked if the patio would go to the edge of the water.

Ms. Morgan said the patio would not go to the edge of the water. The patio would abut about a 2-foot section of river rock. She referred to page 4 of the application and the approximate location of the sprinkler head on the photograph.

Board Member Biehl asked how much the level of the lake fluctuated.

Ms. Morgan said the level of the lake did not fluctuate. Of the four lakes in the development, their lake was the highest; and it drained down to a lake in another part of the neighborhood. The lake had never gone up to the edge of their yard.

Since one pin was in the water, Board Member Ryan asked if the survey drawing was used to determine the location of the property lines.

Ms. Morgan said they went by a white post that was put in by the developer. The neighborhood used the posts because their back property lines were in the water.

Board Member Ryan thought it sounded like the post was in the ground on the property line, but the actual corner of the property was in the water. She thought the applicant could project from the front pin to the pin that was in the ground.

Ms. Morgan clarified that they did not see a pin; they just saw the white post that was put there by the developer.

Ms. Morgan said they measured with their next-door neighbor to make sure that really was the side property line, and it measured out exactly.

Board Chairperson Dillon referred to the aerial photograph on page 5 of the application and asked if the property lines on the aerial photograph were inaccurate.

Ms. Morgan said that overhead photograph was taken from the Medina County Auditor's website. The property lines were off and could not be moved. It looked like the property line went through their house. She said the property lines were incorrect on the aerial photograph.

Looking at the aerial photograph, Board Member Biehl referred to the easement to the lake. The property lines should be over that easement – the property lines needed to shift.

Ms. Morgan thought Board Member Biehl was exactly right.

Board Member Ryan said the county superimposed the property lines on the aerial photograph; and depending upon the curvature of the photograph, the property lines could be pretty accurate or they could be off.

Ms. Morgan understood and said that was all they had to go by for a photo.

Referring to the aerial photograph, Board Chairperson Dillon noted the lack of space between the beach and the side property line.

Ms. Morgan stated the photograph was incorrect.

Board Member Montalto asked how many feet of existing wash gravel they planned to maintain.

Ms. Morgan had not measured but estimated there was about 2 feet of river rock.

Board Member Montalto asked about erosion.

Besides the sand washing into the lake and having to bring it back, Ms. Morgan said they did not experience any erosion.

Board Chairperson Dillon opened the hearing to the public.

Mr. Jim Pompos, 5785 Emerald Lakes Drive, was sworn in by Board Chairperson Dillon.

Mr. Pompos introduced himself as the president of the HOA. He said line-of-sight was one of the biggest HOA bylaws. Since the patio would be at ground level, the patio should not pose an issue with the next-door neighbor. However, the dimensions of the sitting wall were not listed, and he thought it would be important to include the height of the sitting wall.

Ms. Morgan said that was taken into consideration. She thought the sitting wall would be 22 to 24 inches high. They read the HOA bylaws backwards and forwards. They did not want to violate the HOA bylaws and were aware the sightlines had to be maintained.

When measuring the distances with their neighbor to the east, Ms. Morgan walked him through the actual plans; and the neighbor commented that he was sorry that he misunderstood. The neighbor thought the patio would be closer to the side lot line. Ms. Morgan said the neighbor also commented that it would look really nice.

Board Chairperson Dillon said the above could not be considered as part of the Board's evaluation; testimony could only be taken from the individual.

Ms. Morgan understood.

Board Chairperson Dillon closed the public portion of the hearing, and the Board reviewed the Duncan Factors.

MOTION: Board Member Montalto moved to approve Variance Application #05-26-012 submitted by Jeff and Sandi Morgan at 5883 Emerald Lakes Drive in Medina, Ohio 44256 for a variance of 39 feet from the minimum 50-foot rear yard setback per Section 410.8 C., Schedule 410.8: Yard Requirements for Sheds/Storage Buildings and Accessory Structures, and the setback regulations for Emerald Lakes Subdivision, for an uncovered patio. The proposed patio shall meet all other requirements of the zoning code.

The property is located in Emerald Lakes Subdivision, a controlled density development in the R-2, Single-Family Suburban Residential District.

The Board amended the motion to include the following:

Seating wall shall not exceed a maximum of 24 inches in height, with which Ms. Morgan stated she agreed.

SECOND: Board Member Biehl

ROLL CALL:

Board Member Stouffer: Approved.

Board Member Biehl: Approved, as amended.

Board Member Montalto: Approved, as amended.

Board Member Ryan: Approved, as amended, and due to the lake encompassing so much of their rear yard.

Board Chairperson Dillon: Approved, considering the unique features of the property and the lake's placement in proportion to the neighborhood and the rear property.

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

2. PUBLIC HEARING: VARIANCE

Application No.: 05-26-013

Applicant/Owner: Marc Rebick
3890 Paradise Road
Medina, OH 44256

Zoning District: Rural Residential District

Request: Section 410.8, Accessory Use Regulations & Section 210.2, Definitions, #33, Carport

- 1) A variance to place a 24 feet by 35 feet carport in the front yard with the following minimum setbacks: 150 feet from the road, 45 feet from the west property line, and 70 feet from the east property line.
- 2) A variance to allow a travel trailer to be stored in a carport in the front yard.

Board Chairperson Dillon opened the public hearing and read/referenced Variance Application #05-26-013, which included an aerial photograph with dimensions showing the home, turnaround, and proposed carport.

Board Chairperson Dillon read the comments from Planning and Zoning Director Jeffers dated June 4, 2026 regarding the subject variance request.

Mr. Marc Rebick was sworn in by Board Chairperson Dillon.

Mr. Rebick presented photographs showing the view towards his property from the front yards of the neighboring properties at 3910, 3876, 3883 and 3893 Paradise Road.

Board Member Montalto thought a carport was a structure with open sides covered with a roof. He asked Mr. Rebick to describe the proposed carport.

Mr. Rebick presented a Photoshop design of a structure with sides that went all of the way down to the ground and was open in front and back and could be pulled into.

Board Member Stouffer asked about the height of the structure and the height of the nearby trees.

Mr. Rebick said the carport would be 12 feet in height, and the trees were 50 to 60 feet tall.

Board Member Biehl said Mr. Rebick mentioned in his application that the travel trailer would not fit in the Quonset hut. He asked how Mr. Rebick currently used the Quonset hut, and he wondered if Mr. Rebick considered replacing it with a single, larger structure.

Mr. Rebick had a small workshop and general things in the Quonset hut, and he worked on a 1966 Mustang. The Quonset hut only had an 8-foot door, and the travel trailer was 11+ feet.

Board Member Ryan asked where the travel trailer was currently stored.

Mr. Rebick said the travel trailer was just outside.

Board Member Ryan asked how long Mr. Rebick had the travel trailer.

Mr. Rebick said since 2016.

Board Member Ryan asked about how far the carport would be from the house.

Mr. Rebick said it would be approximately 55 feet.

Board Member Ryan assumed Mr. Rebick was on septic and well.

Mr. Rebick said the septic was behind the house, and the well was directly in front of the house.

Board Member Biehl asked if Mr. Rebick intended to store the trailer travel in the carport throughout the year.

Mr. Rebick planned to store the trailer in the carport all year, and it would be designed to withstand snow, etc.

Board Member Ryan referred to the aerial photograph and asked if the travel trailer was parked in front of the Quonset hut.

Mr. Rebick said that was correct.

Board Member Ryan thought Mr. Rebick had only one accessory building – the Quonset hut.

Mr. Rebick confirmed that was correct.

Planning and Zoning Director Jeffers said the carport was not classified as an accessory building. By definition, the carport was a miscellaneous structure.

If the walls went all of the way down to the ground, Board Chairperson Dillon asked if the carport would still be considered a miscellaneous structure.

With the open ends, Planning and Zoning Director Jeffers said the carport was classified as a miscellaneous structure. If the structure had four walls, it would be considered an accessory building. A structure with three-walls would still be considered a miscellaneous structure.

If the carport was covered with plastic in the winter, Board Member Ryan wondered if the structure would be considered as being enclosed.

Planning and Zoning Director Jeffers said that type of situation would be addressed as necessary or as prompted by complaints.

Board Chairperson Dillon opened the hearing to the public.

Ms. Erin Webb, 3893 Paradise Road, was sworn in by Board Chairperson Dillon.

Ms. Webb lived directly across the road from Mr. Rebick. If the carport was built, she would probably never see it due to the way the driveway was and the distance off of the road. It was covered in trees; and when Mr. Rebick's trees fell down, she texted him. In the wintertime, she barely saw their house. If it helped, she was onboard.

Board Member Biehl asked if Mr. Rebick intended to remove any of the trees, which would make the carport more visible.

Mr. Rebick did not intend to remove any trees; however, at times, the trees fell down by themselves.

Ms. Webb said there were a lot of trees.

Mr. Don Kollar, 3910 Paradise Road, was sworn in by Board Chairperson Dillon.

Mr. Kollar said his lot was next to Mr. Rebick's property. He may see Mr. Rebick's house in the wintertime, but it was a hard look. Until the Emerald Ash borer came around, he could not see anything. He had no objections; he would not see the carport.

Board Member Ryan asked the neighbors if they would see the carport when the trees lost their leaves.

Ms. Webb said she barely saw their house in the wintertime.

Mr. Rebick said Mr. Kollar would be looking through the carport if he saw it.

Commission Chairperson Dillon closed the public portion of the hearing.

1. Section 410.8 C., Schedule 410.8: Carport in Front Yard

The Board reviewed the Duncan Factors for the subject variance request.

MOTION: Board Member Stouffer moved to approve Variance Application #05-26-013 submitted by Marc Rebick at 3890 Paradise Road in Medina, Ohio 44256 for a variance from Section 410.8 C., Schedule 410.8: Yard Requirements for Sheds/Storage Buildings and Accessory Structures, to place a 24 feet by 35 feet carport in the front yard that is 150 feet from the road, 45 feet from the west property line, and 70 feet

from the east property line. The property is located in the Rural Residential District.

Board Member Biehl asked if the Board thought the motion should be amended to include the forest green color mentioned in the application. If the application was approved, the variance would go with the land. Mr. Rebick could move and a future owner could put something bright orange where the carport would be. He wondered if the Board should memorialize in the motion what was in the application.

Board Member Ryan wondered if the height should be restricted to 12 feet as stated.

If the height was limited to 12 feet, Planning and Zoning Director Jeffers wondered if it would create an illegal situation since the allowed maximum height was 20 feet.

The Board agreed it would not be appropriate to limit the height to less than what the zoning code allowed.

Board Member Biehl thought the color of the carport should be part of the motion since Mr. Rebick would install the carport, but the variance would go with the land. A future homeowner could tear down the carport and put up a building that was a bright, ugly, disgusting color. By including the color in the motion, the Board would ensure future owners had to keep it the same color and would memorialize what Mr. Rebick said.

Board Member Ryan wondered if the Board should require the building to be open-ended – not totally enclosed.

Board Chairperson Dillon said that was required as part of the definition for a carport. Enclosing the carport would take it out of compliance because it would no longer qualify as a carport.

Based on the above discussion, the motion was amended to include:

The carport cannot exceed the accessory structure height of 20 feet, and the color shall be emerald green as stated in the application.

Mr. Rebick said that was the name listed on the website for the color.

SECOND: Board Member Montalto

ROLL CALL:

Board Member Ryan: Approved, as amended due to the fact that it was not visible by the neighbors on either side as stated at the meeting.

Board Member Montalto: Approved.

Board Member Stouffer: Approved.

Board Member Biehl: Approved, as amended.

Board Chairperson Dillon: Approved, due to the property configuration and tree coverage, and given the amendments with the limitations on height and the color to maintain a continued presence that blended in with the surrounding forestry.

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

2. Section 210.2, Definitions, #33 for Carport and Sections 410.8 C. 9. & F.: Travel Trailer Storage in Carport

The Board reviewed the Duncan Factors for the subject variance request.

MOTION: Board Member Biehl moved to approve Variance Application #05-26-013 submitted by Marc Rebick at 3890 Paradise Road in Medina, Ohio 44256 for a variance from Section 210.2, Definitions, #33 for Carport and Sections 410.8 C. 9. & F., to allow a travel trailer to be stored in the carport in the front yard. The property is located in the Rural Residential District.

SECOND: Board Member Ryan

Board Member Ryan wanted to confirm the variance would not allow travel trailers to be stored in the front yard on any other property and only applied to the subject property.

Planning and Zoning Director Jeffers said the variance would only apply to the subject property. Montville Township did not allow trailers to be stored in the front yard. Trailers could be stored in the side or rear yard on a pad.

ROLL CALL:

Board Member Montalto: Approved

Board Member Ryan: Approved, due to the property being wooded.

Board Member Biehl: Approved.

Board Member Stouffer: Approved.

Board Chairperson Dillon: Approved, with the approval of the carport, it was appropriate.

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

3. ZONING UPDATE

VA Medical Center

The project had been fully approved and construction would soon begin.

The Crossings at Cobblestone

The final development plans would be reviewed at the June 24, 2026 Zoning Commission meeting.

Hawks Ridge

Several applications were recently submitted for new homes in Hawks Ridge.

Life Support Team

A brief discussion ensued regarding the number and impact of ambulance runs with respect to Champion Creek and the future assisted living and memory care facility.

MUOD (Mixed-Use Overlay District) Commercial Development

Plans had not been submitted for any new development in the commercial area of the MUOD.

ADJOURNMENT:

MOTION: Board Member Ryan moved to adjourn the June 15, 2026 Board of Zoning Appeals meeting.

SECOND: Board Member Biehl

A collective oral vote was taken.

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

The June 15, 2026 meeting of the Montville Township Board of Zoning Appeals was adjourned at 8:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,



Bonnie Schwehm
Zoning Secretary

Signature



Chairperson

Date

8-17-26