

**MONTVILLE TOWNSHIP
ZONING COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES
OCTOBER 23, 2024**

PRESENT

Justin Carr, Vice Chairperson
Brad Novotny
Mary Pawlowski
John Vujevich
Dave Wetzel
Vince D'Angelo, Alternate

ALSO PRESENT

P. Jeffers, Planning and Zoning Director
B. Schwehm, Zoning Secretary
M. Davis K. Lancianese
T. Davis K. Nugent
R. Gentile M. Schmahl
T. Gerspacher J. Walsh
J. Krahe

HANDOUTS: Comments – Preliminary Development Plan Review – Retreat at Cobblestone

- AGENDA:**
1. Preliminary Development Plan Review #09-24-038/Retreat at Cobblestone/Community Business Mixed-Use Overlay District
 2. Preliminary Land Disturbance Plan Review #09-24-039/Retreat at Cobblestone/Community Business Mixed-Use Overlay District
 3. Zoning Updates

Commission Vice Chairperson Justin Carr called the Wednesday, October 23, 2024 meeting of the Montville Township Zoning Commission to order at 7:00 p.m. and served as chairperson for the meeting.

ROLL CALL: Commission Member Mary Pawlowski – “Here.”; Commission Member John Vujevich – “Here.”; Commission Member Brad Novotny – “Here.”; Commission Member Dave Wetzel – “Here.”; Commission Chairperson Justin Carr – “Here.”; Alternate Commission Member Vince D’Angelo – “Here.”

Commission Chairperson Carr asked if the meeting had been properly advertised and the necessary contiguous property owners notified.

Planning and Zoning Director Paul Jeffers confirmed the meeting had been properly advertised and the contiguous property owners had been notified.

Commission Chairperson Carr said the meeting was being taped for transcription purposes. Everyone in attendance was asked to sign in, and everyone was asked to state his or her name and address before speaking. The official minutes of the meeting would be the typed transcripts. He asked for cell phones to be turned off or silenced during the meeting.

None of the Commission members planned to abstain from discussing or voting on any of the agenda items.

home. Universal design plans were offered, which could accommodate wheelchairs and walkers as needs changed. She referred to their sister community in Fairlawn as a very active adult community with residents in their 40s, who had just seen children off to college, up to residents in their mid-90s.

Commission Member Vujevich thought a step was required between the home and the garage to keep gas fumes low.

Ms. Lancianese said that was correct; however, per code, the garage floor was sloped to direct gas fumes towards the large garage door.

Commission Member Novotny wondered how much the garage floor sloped.

Mr. John Walsh, GBC Design, 565 White Pond Drive, Akron, Ohio said the slope was pretty minimal – maybe a couple of inches over the whole garage.

Ms. Lancianese said they focused on a low-maintenance community where the homeowners' association (HOA) handled lawn maintenance, including landscaping, trash removal and snow removal, as well as repair and maintenance of the private streets. The developer would set up a board to run the HOA until the residents ultimately took over when the project was sold out. Ms. Lancianese said Montville Township would receive a copy of the HOA documents/declarations.

Ms. Lancianese said everything would be built slab-on-grade – no basements. All of the living was on the first floor; however, a bonus second level was offered for additional space. She realized it was a little mind-bending to not have a basement in Northeast Ohio; however, the floorplans offered 2.5-car garages and a lot of storage space. They also worked with homeowners to create storage options. Smart home security options were offered for safety and peace of mind.

Ms. Lancianese said the homes offered a unique courtyard space. The rear lines of all of the homes aligned, which allowed for a private courtyard that attached with fencing at the back of each home. A courtyard easement governed by the declarations allowed homeowners to enjoy the courtyard space all of the way over to their neighbor's home. The courtyard space was private and enclosed and was not maintained by the HOA. Many buyers chose to build with them because of the light-filled, open floorplans that faced towards the courtyards.

Ms. Lancianese said seven different floorplans would be offered that ranged from 1,400 square feet to 4,000 square feet. The direction of the driveways and courtyards was preplanned. For privacy, the outside wall of the home that abutted the neighbor's courtyard would have transom windows or no windows at all. Rear courtyards would be offered in a few areas to take advantage of the view, such as the view of a retention pond.

Ms. Lancianese played a short video walking through the Retreat at Rosemont on Cleveland-Massillon Road in Fairlawn, Ohio. She noted the Retreat at Cobblestone would look very similar.

- The Retreat at Cobblestone would offer sidewalks on both sides of the street.
- Zero-threshold showers would be offered.
- Landscaping would be included with the purchase of a home and maintained by the HOA.

- Several floorplans offered generous front porches.
- Mailboxes would be clustered.
- The clubhouse at the Retreat at Cobblestone would look similar to the clubhouse at the Retreat at Rosemont, which was about 1,800 square feet. The proposed clubhouse would offer a pool, pickleball courts, bocce and a fire pit. The clubhouse would have a workout room and a kitchen area for hosting events. The clubhouse was considered an extension of a resident's family room.
- Quality materials were used for low maintenance.

Ms. Lancianese introduced Mr. Matt Schmahl, Director of Development, Gables Management Group, 2744 Compass Point Drive, Uniontown, Ohio.

Ms. Lancianese said their tagline was that they created communities that enriched lives. New Leaf Homes started the HOA and hosted get-togethers; however, New Leaf Homes got kicked out pretty quickly as residents took over. It was a very active adult community who wanted to get together all of the time.

Of the 90 acres, Ms. Lancianese said 35 acres south of Cobblestone Park Drive would be for the 84 residential units and the clubhouse. They worked closely with Planning and Zoning Director Jeffers and listened to what the Zoning Commission said with the new zoning regulations.

Ms. Lancianese said de minimus lots were shown on the plan, which were slightly different than fee-simple lots. The de minimus lots mirrored the lots on Wisteria Lane to the east. Mounding would surround the site and would be located along State Route 3. A commercial lot was located on the corner, which was smaller than the required 2-acres. The lot would require filing a variance request with the Board of Zoning Appeals. Service-type businesses, such as a coffee shop, small bank branch, etc., were anticipated on that commercial property and would serve the residents of the community.

Ms. Lancianese said the size of the commercial lot south of Cobblestone Park Drive was sufficient to locate a building and the required parking spaces while maintaining setbacks from the residential development. Mounding would be located between the residential homes and the commercial lot.

Ms. Lancianese said there would be no direct access from State Route 3 to the commercial lot. Access to the commercial lot would be located off of the Retreat at Cobblestone development, which they were well aware of and thought was appropriate. Since the road was private, there would be an agreement between the HOA and the owner of the commercial lot to share the costs of maintaining the private road. A reserve would be built through the HOA over time. Every five years, a study would look at the assets privately held by the HOA, including roads, storm sewers, clubhouse, and pool, to determine replacement costs and build up a reserve for those items. The commercial user would be part of that agreement.

Ms. Lancianese said the objective was to make the community very walkable. Traffic patterns and sidewalks related to the commercial development to the north were big parts of the plan. She anticipated coming back at a later date to discuss a plan for the northern portion of the property.

Commission Chairperson Carr asked which lots would have rear courtyards.

Ms. Lancianese referred to the lots on the east side of the project by the retention basin, which would have fountains and mounding along the back. The internal lots would have side courtyards. She anticipated some rear courtyards along State Route 3. The goal was to heavily landscape the area along State Route 3 to protect the residents from the sights and sounds of State Route 3. She anticipated less than 30% of the homes would have rear courtyards – the majority would have side courtyards.

Mr. Schmahl said that was more than most communities. It was a bit of a unicorn, but people loved the rear courtyards, especially with a view. It was nice to have a variety.

Commission Member Pawlowski asked if any of the homes on the cul-de-sacs would have rear courtyards.

Ms. Lancianese said the cul-de-sac lots could fit the larger 4,000 square-foot homes with approximately 2,800 square feet on the main floor. Those plans were very graciously appointed and had a side courtyard.

Mr. Schmahl said those plans had an option for a tandem three-car garage and could only be offered on a limited number of lots. The tandem area could be finished as a playroom or exercise room within the home. The space would be fully air conditioned.

Commission Chairperson Carr asked if the section of the private road that served the commercial lot would have to be built to different standards.

Planning and Zoning Director Jeffers said that section of the private road – at least up to the drive for the commercial lot – should be built to commercial grade.

Ms. Lancianese did not have a problem with that; it made sense.

Commission Member Pawlowski wondered why a commercial property would be located on the south side of Cobblestone Park Drive. She thought Cobblestone Park Drive provided a nice separation between residential and commercial. She thought the nearby commercial development may devalue the homes.

Ms. Lancianese said they had been looking at the subject property for a very long time; and for a long time, they thought the corner had to be commercial. However, during the process, things changed.

Ms. Lancianese said their residents wanted to have a use within walking distance. In Fairlawn at the Retreat at Rosemont, residents walked to Giant Eagle, Aldi, and to an optometrist across the street. She acknowledged the concern; however, based on the clientele, the residents liked a use within walking distance.

At the Retreat at Rosemont, Mr. Schmahl said some residents had their own shopping carts.

Commission Member Pawlowski visited the Retreat at Rosemont and thought it was lovely. She was very impressed with the layout; however, she was surprised to see the commercial area south of Cobblestone Park Drive on the proposed plan.

Ms. Lancianese said a longer term plan connected the architecture and uses to make an entirely walkable corridor with truly mixed uses.

Mr. Walsh said the commercial property at the corner helped buffer the residential from the traffic at a busy intersection.

Commission Member Novotny thought the commercial property at the corner was probably a hot commodity.

Commission Member Pawlowski liked the community center and was glad they decided to have a community center.

Ms. Lancianese said the community would be very similar to the one in Fairlawn. She liked the connectivity with Cobblestone Park, and everything that people came to Montville Township for would be right there.

When Commission Member Pawlowski visited the Retreat at Rosemont, residents were out walking, talking and visiting. After visiting the Retreat at Rosemont, she was excited about the Retreat at Cobblestone. She wondered when the Retreat at Rosemont would be done.

Ms. Lancianese said the Retreat at Rosemont had nine sites remaining. She thought the Retreat at Cobblestone was a good fit for the community.

Mr. Schmahl said each community event had a leader, and there was a new community liaison who knocked on a new resident's door and welcomed/introduced them to the community. He said New Leaf Homes helped set up activities and then the residents ran with it making new friendships and planning activities.

Commission Member Pawlowski asked about the HOA fees.

Ms. Lancianese said the HOA fees were under \$300.00/month and covered building the reserve, snow removal, trash collection, lawn care, maintenance and care of the clubhouse and pool – everything.

Mr. Schmahl said it also included driveways and walkways.

Commission Member Novotny asked if the setbacks took future improvements along State Route 3 into consideration.

Ms. Lancianese said they actually increased the buffer to ensure everybody had plenty of room.

Planning and Zoning Director Jeffers said the project followed the Comprehensive Plan and new zoning code.

Commission Chairperson Carr said Montville Township looked for 25% of the commercial to be developed at the same time as the Retreat at Cobblestone. He asked about the timeframe in that respect.

Ms. Lancianese said they had a similar timeframe. It was her understanding that Montville Township was looking for the commercial to start before the residential was completed. She anticipated the southern area of the project would take about four years; however, it would depend upon the market. About halfway through the project, they planned to start the commercial. She said they could speak more later about the northern area of the project.

A brief discussion ensued regarding the sidewalks. It was not typical for sidewalks to be located on both sides of a private street; however, a right-of-way was needed for the sanitary sewer system, and the Retreat at Cobblestone would have sidewalks on both sides of the

streets. The Retreat at Rosemont also had sidewalks on both sides of the private streets, public utilities, and an easement.

Unlike many developments, Ms. Lancianese said homes were placed at the rear setback, which created interest along the street, avoided a barracks-like appearance, and allowed for the fence/private courtyards. Each home plan had four elevations. The same elevations and colors would not be placed beside one another. However, they did have complementary color schemes. Typically, the shingle colors matched; and the same masonry was used throughout the subdivision.

Commission Member Vujevich asked about the price range for the homes.

Based on choices, Ms. Lancianese said the homes would probably be in the mid-\$400,000 up to \$600,000 or \$700,000.

Mr. Schmahl said a ton of custom-feature options were offered. Some people went up a little in the design, and some people went up to the maximum. As with most builders, second or third tier upgrades were standard.

Attorney Trina Devanney, legal counsel for Montville Township, happened to live in a community that was marketed as a 55-plus community. In her community, there was a significant lack of parking. She wondered if there would be any guest parking areas.

Ms. Lancianese said guest parking would be located within the clubhouse area, and each of the homes would be set back 30 feet from the back of the curb, which allowed two cars to fit in every single driveway.

Since the roads were private, Commission Member Vujevich wondered if parking would be allowed on the road.

Ms. Lancianese said short-term parking would be allowed on the roads, but overnight parking would not be allowed on the roads.

Alternate Commission Member D'Angelo said HOAs could develop rules for that particular issue.

Mr. Schmahl said 15 feet was proposed between the houses. On average, the homes in the Retreat at Rosemont were 12 feet apart. The lots in the Retreat at Cobblestone would be wider and deeper, which meant even more breathability. Based on feedback from other communities where residents did not want to step in the wet grass or snow, the driveways would also be a little bit wider. Cars would easily fit in the driveway, which would help get the cars off of the street.

Commission Member Vujevich asked what was meant by de minimus lots.

Ms. Lancianese looked at a de minimus lot as a platted building envelope in which the house sat. The de minimus lots were separated from one other and met the required separation per the zoning code for the front, side and rear yard setbacks. The home could essentially be placed anywhere within that building envelope, which was owned by the homeowner.

Alternate Commission Member D'Angelo asked if the HOA owned any of the property on the lots.

Ms. Lancianese said the de minimus lot would be owned like a fee-simple lot. Everything outside the de minimus lots, except for the courtyard easements, would be common area that was owned and maintained by the HOA. Homeowners owned the exterior of their homes – it was not a condominium – and insured their entire home.

Mr. Walsh described a de minimus lot as a mini lot. The homeowners owned the land and the house.

Commission Member Pawlowski thought two or three cars could be parked in the garage, and two more cars could be parked in the driveway. She thought it could be a long walk from the guest parking at the clubhouse to the end of the streets.

Ms. Lancianese said most residents had their parties at the clubhouse.

Commission Member Pawlowski thought a casual gathering for someone with several children and grandchildren could have more cars than what would fit in the driveway.

Ms. Lancianese said cars could park on the street – just not overnight. Unlike a lot of private streets, the streets would be wider like public streets.

Mr. Walsh said the width of the streets would meet subdivision standards. He said a lot of private streets were 20/22 feet wide, which allowed people to get around a parked vehicle but not two-way traffic.

Commission Chairperson Carr referred to the comment about Buckeye Lane aligning with the entrance drive for the school/park. He wondered how that area of the project may be affected.

Ms. Lancianese said that was a new comment that they just received. She wanted to have a conversation regarding the intent. All of the traffic for the additional commercial land to the north of Cobblestone Park Drive would be serviced by a drive closer to State Route 3 that extended north off of Alder Lane. The multi-family project area would be on the east side of that drive. Ms. Lancianese did not anticipate any connections to the school/park driveway.

Based on traffic studies, Ms. Lancianese said residents would not be driving at peak hours because the residents were typically retired and were not going out at rush-hour times. She did not anticipate a lot of issues with traffic from the school. She understood school traffic was a real concern; however, she did not know if the issue would be as big as it appeared on paper. She asked for help in gaining a better understanding.

Commission Member Novotny thought it was related to the school traffic and stop signs and determining who stopped first and which direction everyone was turning. He thought it may also be related to large emergency vehicles.

Commission Chairperson Carr thought a standard intersection would avoid confusion related to which driver had the right-of-way.

Commission Member Pawlowski said the homes were being marketed to seniors. She thought a 4,000 square foot home would mean a family – most seniors did not go that big.

Ms. Lancianese said it may be surprising, but some people were downsizing to 4,000 square feet.

If there were families, Commission Member Pawlowski wondered if the Retreat at Cobblestone would be part of the school bus route.

Ms. Lancianese said, “No.” She anticipated working directly with the school system if there were school-aged children. With the proximity to the school, if the school bus stopped, she thought it would stop at the entryway. The buses would not go through the development.

Commission Member Pawlowski thought that meant school bus pick up would be at the clubhouse.

Ms. Lancianese agreed. She could not/would not guarantee anything, but school buses had never gone through any of their neighborhoods.

Attorney Devanney said students were picked up at the clubhouse in her neighborhood. While she was one of the youngest people in her section, Attorney Devanney said people were out at rush-hour because the retirement age was getting later and later. Her neighborhood was very busy. Typically, one person in the household was retired, and the other person was still working; and six months after retiring, the retired person returned to work because they did not like being home alone.

Ms. Lancianese had traffic study data based on the subject type of communities to share if that was the concern.

Ms. Lancianese said the declarations and bylaws did not allow play equipment or basketball hoops. The community would have a target audience; however, they would not discriminate. Anybody could come into the community. In all of the communities they had done, school buses had not been an issue.

Mr. Schmahl said a number of families had gone through the Retreat at Rosemont and very quickly decided it was not for them when they discovered there were no playgrounds, basketball hoops, etc.

Ms. Lancianese said a lot of grandchildren visited because of the pool.

Based on his personal experience, Alternate Commission Member D’Angelo said speeding could be an issue on private roads. It could be difficult to control speeding because the police had no jurisdiction. His community tried speed bumps, radar signs, etc. He wondered if something could be added to the bylaws to make the speed limit more enforceable.

Ms. Lancianese said the speed limit would be set at 15 mph. She thought Alternate Commission Member D’Angelo made a great comment that she would defer to their attorney. She said they could certainly look into it and see.

Mr. Schmahl said they were all in favor of that.

Ms. Lancianese said speeding was a big deal and was never okay, but pedestrian traffic on the sidewalks helped.

Alternate Commission Member D’Angelo said the sidewalks were a big plus.

Commission Chairperson Carr asked about the road for the future attached, rental units.

Ms. Lancianese said Alder Lane would continue north between the commercial area and attached rental single-family area, which would provide access to the commercial on the west side and the rentals on the east side. They anticipated there would not be any curb cuts to make a right-in/right-out on State Route 3.

Commission Chairperson Carr would like to see how much Buckeye Lane overlapped the school/park driveway and how close Buckeye Lane was to that driveway. Ideally, they would line up perfectly.

Having just received the comment, they had not had a chance to look at it; but Ms. Lancianese said they could study it.

Mr. Walsh said Buckeye Lane and the driveway could either line up or be more off set.

Commission Chairperson Carr thought it would be best to align the driveway with Buckeye Lane.

Mr. Walsh thought it was more about the turning conflicts, etc. – not about the through traffic.

Commission Chairperson Carr agreed that turning conflicts were a concern.

During baseball season, Commission Member Novotny said a lot of teams played on the baseball fields at Cobblestone.

Planning and Zoning Director Jeffers said the driveways for Discount Drug Mart and McDonald's were aligned, which made for a better traffic pattern.

During the Spooky Walk, Commission Member Novotny thought someone leaving the Retreat at Cobblestone would never get out.

Ms. Lancianese said they planned to do a sidewalk along Cobblestone Park Drive to their east property line. Their goal was to be pedestrian friendly. She referred to the comment asking to extend the sidewalk to Wisteria Lane; however, east of their property line was private property.

Attorney Devanney asked if the sidewalks would be standard width.

Ms. Lancianese said the sidewalks would be standard width, which had been sufficient.

Attorney Devanney wondered how many of the residents may have golf carts. In Fox Meadow, young teenagers had golf carts.

Planning and Zoning Director Jeffers said golf carts could be licensed and driven on the road.

Ms. Lancianese had not seen as many golf carts as she had seen in other communities.

With the exception of New Leaf Homes' golf cart, Mr. Schmahl said they did not have any.

Commission Chairperson Carr asked if there would be sidewalks on both sides of Cobblestone Park Drive.

At that time, Ms. Lancianese was only talking about the south side of Cobblestone Park Drive; however, she assumed Montville Township would have them do sidewalks on the north side. She said the answer to sidewalks on both sides was yes.

A brief discussion clarified that a sidewalk did not currently run along Cobblestone Park Drive in front of Arbor Lakes.

Alternate Commission Member D'Angelo referred to Buckeye Lane and the driveway to the school/park. He thought it looked like they could give up some of the space on the driveway side of the road for alignment without losing anything.

Ms. Lancianese said that was an interesting thought.

Planning and Zoning Director Jeffers referred to Section 416.10 A. 2., which required one guest parking space for every three units. The parking spaces were to be evenly dispersed throughout the project. Fifteen parking spaces were shown at the clubhouse. Additional guest parking spaces, or a variance, would be needed.

Ms. Lancianese thought some guest parking spaces could be added, but it may be a variance request because the driveways would be generous. At a minimum, two cars could park in the driveway; and if the home was set farther back, there would be more room than that to park in the driveway. She did not know if it could be called guest parking, but she thought there would be adequate parking on each individual lot.

Commission Member Novotny said Arbor Lakes had two or three parking spaces in each circle.

Ms. Lancianese said the circles would be landscaped, but parking spaces may potentially fit on the circles.

If the clubhouse had 15 parking spaces, Attorney Devanney said an additional 13 guest parking spaces would be needed.

Ms. Lancianese said they may be able to grow the number of parking spaces at the clubhouse a little bit, but she assumed a variance request may be necessary.

Commission Member Vujevich was impressed with the layout, as well as the presentation, which was why he did not ask many questions.

Commission Chairperson Carr opened the meeting to the public.

Mr. Tom Davis, 6625 Wooster Pike, asked if the zoning change only applied to the area in the picture.

Planning and Zoning Director Jeffers said an overlay district was created for the properties from Sharon Copley Road down through the green area on the Preliminary Plan/Master Plan for the Retreat at Cobblestone. All of the parcels were owned by the same person. The overlay district created a mixed-use situation that allowed both residential and commercial uses.

Planning and Zoning Director Jeffers said the depth of 1,000 feet for the commercial property was currently outside the realm of brick and mortar development. More rooftops were needed to attract commercial development. The entire area could be developed using the underlying commercial regulations rather than following the regulations for the new overlay district. However, the overlay district expanded the possibilities.

Mr. Davis asked about the properties south of the project area along State Route 3 to Poe Road.

In that area, Planning and Zoning Director Jeffers said the zoning remained Community Business. A residential use could remain on those properties; however, if a property was not used for residential for two years, then the use would go to commercial.

Mr. Kevin Nugent, 4787 Poe Road, wondered what would be used to separate the proposed project from the properties to the east. He asked if there would be an easement.

Ms. Lancianese thought the easement was 50 feet, which meant none of the homes would back up any closer than that. Quite a bit of mounding and landscaping would be done, which was the plan and required by the zoning code.

Commission Chairperson Carr said a mix of landscaping materials were required, including trees that remained green throughout the year.

With the way the courtyards sat, Mr. Schmahl said no windows would look directly to the back. Those courtyards would be to the side.

Mr. Troy Gerspacher, 5734 Trystin Tree Drive, applauded the Zoning Commission and everyone for working together. He had been working on the subject site for six or seven years. He thought it was great that the Zoning Commission was open and creative in putting something together that would work.

Mr. Gerspacher said housing worked with commercial in a very synergetic way. More housing attracted uses that people wanted and businesses that would be vibrant.

Mr. Gerspacher appreciated Planning and Zoning Director Jeffers and the creativity. He thought being creative with density, etc. would attract high-quality development that everybody would like. He thought Montville Township had done a great job, and he wished all boards worked like the Zoning Commission.

Since no one else had any comments or questions, Commission Chairperson Carr closed the public portion of the meeting and read comments for the proposed project as follows:

- Montville Township Zoning Commission, Alan Piatak, Chairperson
- Medina County Engineer's Office, Erik Malinoski
- Ohio Department of Transportation, Jared Feller, P.E.
- Medina County Sanitary Engineer, Ben Romine, P.E.

Ms. Lancianese said they were working directly with Mr. Romine on a variance for public sewer and water. The sanitary study was in process.

- Medina County Health Department, Niaomi Lee
- Medina County Soil and Water, Jim Smith, District Technician
- Medina County Planning Services, Denise Testa
- Montville Police/Safety Services, Chief Matthew Neil
- Montville Township Service Department, Chris Kosman, Director
- Montville Township Planning and Zoning, Planning and Zoning Director Paul Jeffers

Planning and Zoning Director Jeffers referenced comment *G*. and said it did not comply because the information had not been submitted.

Commission Member Novotny thought there had been talk about a roundabout at State Route 3 and Cobblestone Park Drive. He wondered if that should be taken into consideration with the corner property.

In talking with Mr. Feller, Planning and Zoning Director Jeffers said it was something ODOT would like to do, but they had not yet found funding for a study.

Ms. Lancianese said they had taken a look at the roundabout for possible future consideration.

Mr. Kelby Crum, Wooster Pike, asked if 25% of the project had to be commercial and if the commercial parcel on the corner represented 25% of the project.

Planning and Zoning Director Jeffers said 40% of the whole project had to be commercial, and 25% of the commercial area had to be developed before the Retreat at Cobblestone was finished.

Commission Member Pawlowski asked when New Leaf Homes planned to begin.

On the residential side, Ms. Lancianese said they would love to break ground in the early part of 2025. As soon as approvals were in place, the engineering would be started to work with Medina County. Ideally, she hoped to be in the ground and have streets on the ground in midsummer, but she knew nothing ever went as planned.

On the commercial side, Ms. Lancianese said interest had already been expressed. They were looking to be thoughtful and comprehensive about the way in which the commercial was developed. They did not want it to be piecemealed. They were looking for something that serviced the community. She thought they would be looking at the commercial in the next couple of years, which was really pretty quick in the life of the project.

Planning and Zoning Director Jeffers thought they could probably say it was not going to be a nursing home.

Commission Member Pawlowski assumed they would not do that.

Ms. Lancianese said they were not going to do that.

Commission Member Vujevich asked if there were any wetlands in the area.

Ms. Lancianese said there were not any wetlands on the 35 acres.

Commission Member Vujevich asked where the riparian way was located.

Ms. Lancianese said they believed it was a culvert that went under State Route 3.

Mr. Walsh did not believe there was a riparian way.

Ms. Lancianese thought the culvert needed to be taken into consideration with mounding and drainage approvals.

Commission Member Vujevich asked if the mounding would be over 3 feet in height.

Ms. Lancianese said the mounding would certainly meet the minimum requirement per the zoning code, but she thought there would be a lot of dirt to lose on the site. She thought there would be good-sized mounds over 3 feet in height.

MOTION: Commission Member Novotny moved to approve the Preliminary Development Plan Review per Application #09-24-038 submitted by GBC Design, Inc., Brad R. Booth, P.E., 565 White Pond Drive, Akron, Ohio 44320 for the Retreat at Cobblestone, Parcel #030-11A-19-008 and 030-11A-15-020 in the Mixed-Use Overlay District subject to the comments.

SECOND: Commission Member Wetzel

ROLL CALL: Commission Member Wetzel – “Aye.”; Commission Member Pawlowski – “Aye.”; Commission Member Vujevich – “Aye.”; Commission Member Novotny – “Aye.”; Commission Chairperson Carr – “Aye.”

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

2. PRELIMINARY LAND DISTURBANCE PLAN REVIEW

Application No.: 09-24-039

Applicant: GBC Design, Inc.
Brad R. Booth, P.E.
565 White Pond Drive
Akron, OH 44320

Owner: Myron R. & Tracy L. Abrams New Leaf Cobblestone LLC
PO Box 8165 3200 W Market Street, Ste 104
Yakima, WA 98908 Fairlawn, OH 44333

Project: Retreat at Cobblestone
Parcel Number: 030-11A-19-008/030-11A-15-020

Zoning District: Mixed-Use Overlay District/Community Business
Montville Township, Medina County, Ohio

Commission Chairperson Carr introduced the agenda item.

A brief discussion ensued regarding the site being open and all of the trees having been cut down, including the big, hollow tree.

Commission Chairperson Carr opened the meeting to the public. No one had any comments or questions, and the public portion of the meeting was closed.

MOTION: Commission Member Novotny moved to approve the Preliminary Land Disturbance Plan Review per Application #09-24-039 submitted by GBC Design, Inc., Brad R. Booth, P.E., 565 White Pond Drive, Akron, Ohio 44320 for the Retreat at Cobblestone, Parcel #030-11A-19-008 and 030-11A-15-020 in the Mixed-Use Overlay District regarding all of the comments.

SECOND: Commission Member Wetzel

ROLL CALL: Commission Member Novotny – “Aye.”; Commission Member Wetzel – “Aye.”; Commission Member Pawlowski– “Aye.”; Commission Member Vujevich – “Aye.”; Commission Chairperson Carr – “Aye.”

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

3. ZONING UPDATES

No zoning updates were presented.

ADJOURNMENT

MOTION: Commission Member Pawlowski moved to adjourn the meeting.

SECOND: Commission Member Vujevich

A collective oral vote was taken, and the October 23, 2024 meeting of the Montville Township Zoning Commission was adjourned at 8:17 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Bonnie Schwehm
Zoning Secretary

Signature _____
Chairperson

Date _____