

**MONTVILLE TOWNSHIP
ZONING COMMISSION MEETING
October 26, 2011**

PRESENT

Alan Piatak, Chairperson
John Vujevich, Vice Chairperson
Mary Pawlowski
Pat Ryan
Dave Wetzel
Elayne Siegfried, Alternate

ALSO PRESENT

R. Bischof, Trustee
P. Jeffers, Field Assistant
B. Schwehm, Zoning Secretary
T. Macosko
J. Gerspacher

HANDOUTS: Automotive Service Center Paperwork
Trails of Montville Accessory Building Paperwork
Schedule 450.5 Commercial District Conditional Use Paperwork for
Review/Discussion
Woodford Commons/Preliminary Development Plan Review Paperwork
(11/9/11)
Draft of Text Amendments for Congregate Care Facilities for 11/9/11
Public Hearing

AGENDA: 1. Approval of Minutes – None
2. Development Plan Discussion: Automotive Service Center
3. Discussion: Accessory Building/Trails of Montville
4. Zoning Text Review/Discussion: Conditionally Permitted Uses in Non-
Residential Districts

The October 26, 2011 meeting of the Montville Township Zoning Commission was called to order at 7:02 p.m. by Chairperson, Mr. Alan Piatak.

ROLL CALL: Ms. Pat Ryan – here; Ms. Mary Pawlowski – here; Mr. Dave Wetzel – here;
Mr. John Vujevich – here; Mr. Alan Piatak – here.

Commission Chairperson Piatak asked, “Paul, has the meeting been properly advertised and the necessary contiguous property owners notified?”

Field Assistant Jeffers responded, “Yes, it has.”

Commission Chairperson Piatak said, “Anyone in attendance should sign in if they have not already done so. Anyone who wishes to speak should state their name and address for the record. The meeting is taped for transcription purposes. The official minutes of the meeting are the typed transcripts.

1. Approval of Minutes None

2. Development Plan Discussion: Automotive Service Center

Commission Chairperson Piatak introduced the agenda item, and Mr. Ted Macosko, Architects, Inc., 24 Glen Oaks Lane, Berea, OH 44017 introduced himself as the representative for the item.

Mr. Macosko said the plan for the automotive service center was submitted for discussion/review purposes. After submitting the plan, Mr. Macosko was made aware of the Township's landscaping requirements.

Commission Chairperson Piatak said that the building would be located to the north of McDonald's on State Route 3 in the Community Business (C-B) zoning district. An automotive service station was a conditionally permitted use in the C-B District.

Mr. Macosko presented a photograph of an existing store, Strongsville Express Tire & Automotive, located on Prospect Road in Strongsville, Ohio. The proposed plan for the site in Montville Township duplicated the building at the Strongsville location, but another bay was added to the plan. The building was placed on the lot within the required setbacks with the bays facing State Route 3 for visibility.

Mr. Macosko said that the property had been filled (five or six feet) and fell off severely to the rear. As it was, it was going to be tens of thousands of dollars to level the site; and the project would become more expensive if the building was set back more from State Route 3. Mr. Macosko did not want to re-orient the building in any way.

Mr. Macosko said that the owner of the proposed automotive service center, Mr. Dave Justice, wanted access off of State Route 3, which was the Ohio Department of Transportation's (ODOT) jurisdiction. Mr. Macosko had not yet fully investigated the easements on the property, but he had been told that a drive off of State Route 3 may be prohibited. If another egress/ingress onto State Route 3 was not an option, access off of the common road would be sufficient. There was supposedly an extension off of Lexington Ridge Drive that had not yet been fully developed, but that would not work for the owner as the only point of access.

If he remembered correctly, Commission Chairperson Piatak said the access off of State Route 3 was a private street. The intent was to access both parcels from the private street.

Mr. Macosko thought that was likely the case. The driveway was split between the two parcels. Eliminating a second access point on State Route 3 would provide additional space for landscaping.

Mr. Macosko said that the perimeter of the property could be heavily landscaped (rolling mounds, trees, etc.) to meet the requirements of the zoning text; however, it was unlikely that they could landscape 75 percent of the perimeter of the building within twenty feet of the building. The business depended on all of the overhead doors; at least 50 percent of the building was open to the pavement. He thought the parking on the south side of the building (near the common road) could be eliminated, and landscaping planted in that area.

Mr. Macosko wondered if the Commission had any suggestions to address the requirement for landscaping adjacent to the building. McDonald's did not have 75 percent of the building landscaped within twenty feet of the perimeter, but he had been told that McDonald's was developed prior to the current landscaping regulations.

Field Assistant Jeffers said that McDonald's received their final development plan approval prior to the adoption of the 2006 landscaping requirements. A copy of the paperwork for Ganley Nissan was given to Mr. Macosko; it may be helpful in determining how to meet the landscaping requirements.

Mr. Macosko said that Mr. Justice was very community and service oriented. His business was sensitive to community concerns and was a good neighbor. The store in Strongsville backed up to a relatively dense residential community, and it was handled without any ramifications.

Commission Chairperson Piatak said that landscaping between the building and the sidewalk was something that the Zoning Commission (ZC) liked to see. He did not know if that was possible along the south side of the building.

Mr. Macosko said the parking spaces in that area could be eliminated and landscaping added. There was not a lot of area between the access drive and the parking area.

Commission Member Pawlowski suggested using potted plants.

Commission Member Vujevich asked if the building could be rotated.

Mr. Macosko said that was exactly what he could not do.

Commission Chairperson Piatak asked if there was an existing retention basin.

Mr. Macosko said that the block of properties had a dedicated retention basin in the back, to the east. It was not located on the same property as the proposed automotive service center, but there was an easement.

Commission Member Pawlowski asked about the color of the building. She thought it appeared monochromatic. (However, Field Assistant Jeffers pointed out that the photograph was taken on a rainy day.)

Mr. Macosko thought that Mr. Justice would be willing to work with the ZC on colors for the building.

The Zoning Commission said that they also did the architectural review for new development.

Commission Member Vujevich said that the façade of the building needed to be broken up. As shown, it was one straight, long building.

Mr. Macosko said the building would be constructed using decorative block up to the soffit, and beyond that point there would be a stucco finish.

Commission Member Wetzel said that it would help to break up the façade of the building, but he thought a couple of gables with windows on the roof would be nice. He wondered if the attic space was needed for storage.

Mr. Macosko said there was no storage space in the attic area. The ceiling height was approximately thirteen/fourteen feet.

Mr. Macosko said a grading plan had not yet been done. The preliminary elevation was close, but not final.

Commission Member Wetzel said there was residential property to the east of the site. Depending upon the drop in elevation, the pavement may need to be stabilized in some manner. He thought a visual buffer (evergreens, etc.) would be nice along that area. The

landscaping for the outbuildings at Buehler's (off of State Route 18) was a good example to follow.

Mr. Macosko said that the residential properties were relatively far from the building/parking area. The land would be relatively level as it went north to south in that area. He thought a row of buffering could be provided.

Commission Chairperson Piatak asked if there were any landscaping issues on the north side of the building.

Mr. Macosko did not see a problem with landscaping on the north side. There was a big wall of mature trees along the property line to the north, but he did not know if the trees were located on the development site.

Mr. Macosko was aware that a mound was required along State Route 3. He planned to use a rolling/undulating mound, with a height of three feet. He would leave it up to his landscape advisor to suggest what was best. Mr. Macosko talked with Mr. Justice about landscaping – whatever they could do, they would do.

Commission Member Vujevich said that the mound could be higher than three feet.

Mr. Macosko said that he did not know the specific hours/plans for the proposed location; however, in Berea and Strongsville, the stores closed around 5:00 p.m. and were not open on the weekends.

Commission Member Wetzel asked if the lighting shown on the front of the building was duplicated on the rear of the building.

Mr. Macosko said that the plan showed what had been done in Strongsville. The Township's lighting criteria would be followed. He said the owner was not extremely concerned about the nighttime display. He acknowledged that a photometric plan was required.

Commission Chairperson Piatak mentioned that some of the neighbors had issues with the lighting when McDonald's opened. Full cutoff fixtures were required.

Commission Member Wetzel noted that sufficient lighting was necessary for nighttime security purposes.

Commission Chairperson Piatak asked about a HVAC unit.

Mr. Macosko said there would not be any roof units. There was a small office (approximately 1,000 square feet) to the south which would have a conventional split system (house furnace with air conditioner). The unit would be on the east side, protected by bollards. The service bays had overhead radiant heat.

Commission Member Wetzel asked if the doors on the bays were open in the summer. He was concerned about air hammers at 8:00 a.m.

Mr. Macosko said that he would let the owner address that concern. The same concern was expressed in Strongsville. In that situation, Mr. Justice was very responsive and said that he would take care of any concerns regarding noise.

Commission Chairperson Piatak said that the wind predominately blew to the east (the direction of the residential properties).

Commission Member Ryan asked if there would be night drop-off provisions.

Mr. Macosko knew there was a night drop in Berea, and he assumed there would be at the proposed location.

Commission Chairperson Piatak asked if any of the supplies were stored outside.

Mr. Macosko referred to the north side of the plan. All of the tires would be stored inside. There was outside storage for used tires and trash. The outside storage area would be covered and locked. There were full-height walls on three sides; it would only be open to the south. All of the oil was stored inside.

Commission Member Wetzel asked what services would be provided.

Mr. Macosko said the main business was tires, but he thought brakes, oil changes, and other automotive services were provided.

Commission Chairperson Piatak asked if the signage would be lit.

Mr. Macosko was not sure about signage, but said that the zoning regulations would be used as a guide. He had not yet read the regulations and was not prepared to talk about signage. There was a ground sign (stone monument with a sign in between) at the Strongsville location. He was not sure if it was or was not lit.

Commission Chairperson Piatak said that the Zoning Commission would review the signage, but it would be necessary to go to the Zoning Office for permits. He asked that information about the signage be submitted with the preliminary development plan.

Commission Member Wetzel thought it would be nice to have some continuity between the brick at McDonald's and the exterior of the automotive service center. The Commission thought it would be nice to have the buildings complement one another. Commission Chairperson Piatak said that something other than square windows in the overhead doors may help enhance the appearance of the building. Commission Member Vujevich suggested an arch-type window.

Field Assistant Jeffers said that two parking spaces per service bay and one parking space per employee were required. If the parking to the south was removed, the plan would have twenty-nine parking spaces.

Mr. Macosko said that the service bays were through bays. There were ten service spaces for cars at one time. The tools were located in the center between the two bays. The office space included a sales area with a waiting area, office space, restrooms (men, women, and employee), and mechanical space.

Commission Chairperson Piatak confirmed that Mr. Macosko would bring a topo map for the preliminary development plan review.

Mr. Macosko would make changes based on the discussion. He again stated that landscaping 75 percent of the building within twenty feet of the building was going to be a challenge. He could not landscape in the area of the bays. Mr. Macosko was confident that the landscaping requirements along the street and the rear of the building, as well as the north and south sides of the building, could be accomplished.

Commission Chairperson Piatak said that the landscaping beds could be broken into smaller sections – it did not have to be one continuous landscaping bed.

Commission Member Wetzel asked if consideration had been given to using similar windows along the west and south sides of the building.

Mr. Macosko said that the window shown on the plan went all of the way around the corner. It was an angled, three-sided window. He planned to bring a copy of the floor plan to the next discussion. It would be difficult to add windows on the south side of the building due to the layout of the building.

Commission Chairperson Piatak asked Mr. Macosko to bring samples of the building materials and colors that were chosen for the building.

Mr. Macosko planned to revise the plan and return to discuss the plan with the Zoning Commission on November 9, 2011.

3. Discussion: Accessory Building/Trails of Montville

Field Assistant Jeffers explained that the Trails of Montville planned to construct a permanent accessory building for the storage of maintenance equipment (for the rental units). It would be similar in style and color to the existing buildings – like the garage unit of one of the attached single-family homes, and would have two car doors. He referred to the plans showing the location of the accessory building. Also shown on the plan was a gazebo that may be constructed in the future. Pride One would have to apply for a variance since both the accessory building and gazebo were considered accessory buildings, and only one accessory building was allowed.

The Commission discussed that the building should be landscaped and similar in style to the existing buildings. The ZC suggested that the garage have windows – at least on the street side of the building. The Zoning Commission requested more details regarding the proposed accessory building, including:

- Rendering of building with proposed landscaping
- Would building have electricity/water? Lighting?

Commission Chairperson Piatak acknowledged Trustee Ron Bischof was present at the meeting.

Trustee Bischof mentioned that yard signs were available for the upcoming ambulance levy, and he discussed the new Safety Services Center.

4. Zoning Text Review/Discussion: Conditionally Permitted Uses in Non-Residential Districts

The item would be rescheduled for an upcoming meeting.

MOTION: Commission Member Ryan moved to adjourn the meeting.

SECOND: Commission Member Wetzel

A collective oral vote was taken with all Zoning Commission members in favor of adjourning. The October 26, 2011 Zoning Commission meeting was adjourned at 7:42 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Bonnie Schwehm

Signature _____
Chairperson

Date _____