

**MONTVILLE TOWNSHIP  
ZONING COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES  
MARCH 13, 2024**

**PRESENT**

Alan Piatak, Chairperson  
Justin Carr, Vice Chairperson  
Brad Novotny  
Mary Pawlowski  
Dave Wetzel

**ALSO PRESENT**

P. Jeffers, Planning and Zoning Director  
B. Schwehm, Zoning Secretary  
T. Devanney, Legal Counsel

---

**HANDOUTS:** Additions and Height Restrictions – Draft  
Taco Bell Paperwork for March 27, 2024

**AGENDA:** 1. Discussion: Additions and Height Requirements  
2. Zoning Updates

Commission Chairperson Alan Piatak called the Wednesday, March 13, 2024 meeting of the Montville Township Zoning Commission to order at 7:00 p.m.

**ROLL CALL:** Commission Member Mary Pawlowski – “Here.”; Commission Member Brad Novotny – “Here.”; Commission Member Justin Carr – “Here.”; Commission Member Dave Wetzel – “Here.”; Commission Chairperson Alan Piatak – “Here.”

Commission Chairperson Piatak 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. There were not any contiguous property owners to be notified.

Commission Chairperson Piatak 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.

**1. DISCUSSION: ADDITIONS AND HEIGHT REQUIREMENTS**

Commission Chairperson Piatak introduced the agenda item.

Planning and Zoning Director Jeffers said several resources were used to draft regulations for additions to principal buildings and storage buildings/sheds. Attachments and additions were being done in many different ways, and clarification was needed.

The Commission referred to the draft that was provided as a handout that evening. The proposed regulations for Section 410.6, Height Requirements; Section 412.7, Dwelling

Unit Requirements; and Section 414.11, Dwelling Unit Requirements, were discussed and amended as follows:

First paragraph - proposed wording:

*A residential addition shall be attached, connected and/or joined to a principal building by means of a shared wall with permanent open interior access between living spaces. Additional garage space shall meet all applicable building code requirements. All additions shall be limited to 35% of the gross floor area of the original structure.*

- The second sentence was intended to address standard fire/building code regulations related to the addition of garage space. A permanent interior opening would not be required for garage space.
- Existing garage space could be converted to living space; however, garage space could not be converted into an apartment with an additional kitchen.
- For clarification, *a shared wall* meant either a shared interior wall or a continuous exterior wall.
- Using *dwelling unit floor area* – instead of *gross floor area* – would simplify calculations and clarify that finished and/or unfinished basement area would not be included in determining the allowed maximum size for an addition. The last sentence would read as follows: *All additions shall be limited to 35% of the **dwelling unit** floor area of the original structure.*
- Especially in a subdivision, a large addition could change the character of the neighborhood; however, setback requirements could limit the size of an addition in a subdivision. Two-story additions may allow for additional square footage while meeting the setback requirements. Was 35% too little? Was 50% too much?
- Since many additions were 35% to 45% of the original structure, the Commission compromised and agreed to increase the maximum percentage for additions to 40%. A larger addition would require a variance to be approved by the Board of Zoning Appeals.

Based on the above discussion, the last sentence would read as follows: *All additions shall be limited to **40%** of the **dwelling unit** floor area of the original structure.*

- The floor area of the original dwelling unit would be based off of the information in the zoning file and/or the information available on the Medina County Auditor's website.
- The addition would have to meet the applicable setback requirements; however, the Commission agreed it would not be necessary to state that in the regulations.
- As the Architectural Review Board for Montville Township, the Zoning Commission could add architecture guidelines for additions.

Since only a few residential additions occurred each year (approximately 12 in 16 years), applicants could be required to submit an actual site plan to the Zoning Commission for review.

To add interest, architectural features of the principal structure could be required on the addition to break up long expanses of flat, exterior building walls. If windows were required, property owners may complain about safety. The Commission did not want to see an addition with a flat roof. Most homeowners would want an addition to look good.

Based on the discussion related to the objective of ensuring the addition looked similar to the original structure, the following sentence would be added at the end of the paragraph: *The exterior of the structure shall be architecturally designed around the theme of the original principal structure in terms of character, material, texture, color and scale.*

- To prevent a shed from being attached to the side of a house and called an addition, language would be included to require interior access into the addition. Everything had to be enclosed, with a shared wall and access wider than a standard door opening. A width greater than the ADA (Americans with Disabilities Act) minimum requirement was discussed.

*Pedestrian* would be added to the first sentence to clarify the permanent, open interior access had to be large enough to allow a person to walk through. The sentence would be changed to read as follows: *A residential addition shall be attached, connected and/or joined to a principal building by means of a shared wall with permanent open interior pedestrian access between living spaces.*

Based on the above discussion, the first paragraph would read as follows:

*A residential addition shall be attached, connected and/or joined to a principal building by means of a shared wall with permanent, open, interior pedestrian access between living spaces. Additional garage space shall meet all applicable building code requirements. All additions shall be limited to 40% of the dwelling unit floor area of the original structure. The exterior of the structure shall be architecturally designed around the theme of the original principal structure in terms of character, material, texture, color and scale.*

Second paragraph – proposed wording:

*An accessory building addition shall be attached, connected and/or joined to an existing accessory building by means of a shared wall with permanent open interior access between the original accessory building and addition. The combined square footage of the existing shed/storage building and addition shall not exceed the maximum size requirements of Section \_\_\_\_\_.*

- The regulations would apply when additional space was added to an existing storage building/shed or when a storage building/shed was connected to another storage building.

Since only one storage building/shed was allowed, property owners sometimes attached two storage buildings together to become a single structure or added onto the original storage building/shed. However, without a variance, the storage building could not exceed the maximum allowed size.

- Since accessory buildings were now defined as storage buildings/sheds in the zoning code, all references to an *accessory building* would be changed to *storage building/shed*. The paragraph would read as follows:

*A storage building/shed addition shall be attached, connected and/or joined to an existing storage building/shed by means of a shared wall with permanent open interior access between the original storage building/shed and the addition. The combined square footage of the existing storage building/shed and addition shall not exceed the maximum size requirements of Section \_\_\_\_\_.*

- The Board of Zoning Appeals reviewed each variance request for a second storage building/shed on an individual basis. The size of the property was often taken into consideration. Agricultural exemptions were based on the acreage of the property.
- If two storage buildings were joined, the Commission agreed interior access between the two structures would not be required; however, the exterior of the structure had to appear as one with a continuous roofline and wall. The first sentence was changed to read as follows:

*A storage building/shed addition shall be attached, connected and/or joined to an existing storage building/shed by means of a shared continuous exterior wall from floor to roof over the entirety of the structure and a continuous roofline over the entirety of the structure.*

- The intent was for an addition to a storage building/shed to match the architectural elements of the original storage building/shed. The following sentence would be added to the paragraph:

*Additionally, the exterior of the structure shall be architecturally designed around the theme of the original storage building/shed in terms of character, material, texture, color and scale.*

- The reference to the section number for maximum size requirements would be inserted once the recent text amendments were finalized.

Based on the above discussion, the second paragraph would read as follows:

*A storage building/shed addition shall be attached, connected and/or joined to an existing storage building/shed by means of a shared continuous exterior wall from floor to roof over the entirety of the structure and a continuous roofline over the entirety of the structure. Additionally, the exterior of the structure shall be architecturally designed around the theme of the original storage building/shed in terms of character, material, texture, color and scale. The combined square footage of the existing*

*storage building/shed and addition shall not exceed the maximum size requirements of Section \_\_\_\_\_.*

The revised paragraphs would be added to Section 410.6, and the title of the section would be changed to read, *Additions and Height Restrictions*. The revised paragraphs would also be added to Section 412.7 and Section 414.11, Dwelling Unit Requirements.

Section 410.7 A., Dwelling Unit Requirements/Floor Area Requirements

Since attached storage buildings/sheds would be considered additions based on the above revisions, the Commission agreed to remove *attached or detached* from the last sentence and to change *accessory building* to *storage buildings, sheds*. The sentence would read as follows:

*For the purposes of calculating the floor area, all areas within basements, garages and any ~~attached or detached accessory building~~ storage buildings, sheds or accessory structures shall not be included.*

All references to *accessory building(s)* within Chapters 410, 412, and 414 would be changed to *storage building/shed* per the most recent updates to the zoning code.

The changes would be made to Chapters 410, 412 and 414 and forwarded to the Zoning Commission members for review. A motion would be made at the next Zoning Commission meeting to set the public hearing.

**2. ZONING UPDATES**

No zoning updates were presented.

**ADJOURNMENT**

MOTION: Commission Member Pawlowski moved to adjourn the meeting.

SECOND: Commission Member Carr

A collective oral vote was taken, and the March 13, 2024 meeting of the Montville Township Zoning Commission was adjourned at 8:28 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Bonnie Schwehm  
Zoning Secretary

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

Date \_\_\_\_\_