



Bath Township Zoning Commission September 11, 2025 – Public Hearing Minutes

Approved: 10/9/25

Untable ZC-25-01: Ghent Interchange Mixed-Use Overlay text amendment

Mr. Chairman called the meeting to order. Roll call was taken, the Pledge of Allegiance conducted, and the oath/affirmation was administered.

Members present: Chairman Richard Bradner, Vice Chair Marshal Pitchford, Emily Hete, Kyle Craven, Kristin Sanchez, Tyler Bolanz, Legal Counsel Bob Konstand, Planning Director Bill Funk, Zoning Secretary Nanci Noonan and Envision Consultant Ryan Smalley. Joy Kosiewicz was excused.

Motion to untable Case ZC – 25 – 01 by Mr. Pitchford; seconded Mrs. Hete. All in favor motion passed.

Zoning Secretary certified that the public notice was posted on the Township website, per Ohio Revised Code. The legal notice was read into the record.

Planning Director and Legal Counsel Presentation: Mr. Funk presented an update as to where we stand with the Overlay. The process was started a few months back and at that point, he reported to the Board that we have been speaking with several different developers who are interested in the property, specifically the U. H. or the Dimitroff property. Mr. Funk stated that we have gotten a little bit further with one developer who has shown pretty strong interest in the property and has actually reached a purchase agreement with U. H. to buy the property. So, before we kept going through with the text amendment and the process of creating the language for the Ghent Interchange Overlay, he felt it would be good to discuss this with the Board and the public regarding what we are seeing and/or who the interested party is for this project. Currently, again, the developer is just looking at the U. H. property. They are really focused in on the commercial side of their development at this point in time; they are looking at potentially working on a residential portion as and to develop underneath the Ghent Overlay District. Mr. Funk shared that we think that is better for us, as our regulations and standards are higher than the existing B-1 which they could currently develop under. He reported that the developer does have a letter of intent. They are working with Sheetz gas station. It is a very similar project to what was previously proposed at the Holiday Inn property. Some may recall, for the last few years, we worked with them to redevelop the Holiday Inn property. There was a Sheetz, a Texas Roadhouse, and a third user that ultimately could not get approvals. There was some traffic access management that the developer could not meet, so they were not able to get approvals. The developer ended up abandoning that project. The good news is we do have another user for the hotel, and the Hyde Park restaurant is coming back. The Holiday Inn will be revamped and updated to a Hilton product. Again, on the U. H. Property, they do have a letter of intent. It's for a Sheetz and is very similar to what was proposed on Route 18. Mr. Funk stated that you will see vehicle fueling, light truck fueling, but no truck stops, nothing commercial along those lines. It is a 24 hour operation and again, we are trying to get them to develop it underneath that Overlay District. At the moment they are not working with a residential developer but they claim that they are trying to. At this point, this would be good time, since we talked about it, for us to take a step back and look at that language again and make sure that we draft this as tight as we can. Bob and I, and Ryan from Envision are kind of looking at some things, and

we'll have some recommendations. Mr. Funk stated that ultimately, he thought we would recommend postponing this public hearing so we can do another Work Session. Mr. Funk asked Mr. Konstand to touch on a few other zoning issues that pertain to this property from the legal side.

Mr. Konstand spoke to add on to Mr. Funk's comments. He stated, if you recall, we initially had two different sectors in our overlay. We had the commercial sector, which was at the corner of I 77 and Ghent Road. We had a 500 foot radius which was going to be for commercial. All the rest of the property was going to be residential. Currently, what we're being told by the developer is that Sheetz would be using even less than the 500 feet so they're going to stay within the commercial area that we've designated. Mr. Konstand stated that the developer has seen and we have kept them updated as to where we stand with the Overlay, and they are reviewing it with Sheetz at this point. But their intention is, thus far, that they're going to follow the Overlay. That's really good for Bath Township and I'm going to tell you why. Speaking to the public, Mr. Konstand shared that we have a moratorium right now that says, in a B-1 Zoning District you cannot build anything new. We have stopped it. The reason this was done was because as soon as U. H. put a for sale sign on that 12 plus acres, we were concerned because it was zoned all B-1; there could be a strip center there, you could have a big box store, you could have another Lowe's or even an office building. It was wide open. Mr. Konstand shared that we do have a requirement under the B-1 that you can only have a 3,000 foot footprint. But honestly, every time that's come to the Township, particularly through the BZA, they've granted variances for size. From a legal perspective, we couldn't defend that if we told a developer they had to keep it at 3,000 foot; there's no way. Everything across the street in the new development at Ghent and Cleveland Massillon is B-1 and that footprint is probably four or five times greater than 3,000. So, Mr. Konstand stated, from a zoning perspective, even though the B-1 says 3,000 for footprint for each building, you can have multiple buildings and we haven't followed that. But going back to the moratorium, we thought the best thing to do was to at least try to freeze things until we could implement an overlay or do something to protect us on the B-1 so we did the moratorium. It's been over a year now and the moratorium, and to be honest with everyone, there's no legal precedent in the Ohio Revised Code to do a moratorium. Townships routinely do that. There hasn't been a whole lot of litigation. But if you ask me to go in court tomorrow and defend the moratorium that's been on now for over a year, he thought we would lose. Mr. Konstand stated fortunately, none of the developers we've talked to have been aggressive about the moratorium. They've all respected it. So, whether it's lawful or not, I'll take it because everybody's following. We're very fortunate with that, even to the point now where the developer who has the property under contract has clearly stated to Bill and me, they will go under the overlay district. We're not going to develop the whole thing, because that's the point I need to make. The U. H. property is 12 acres on the B-1; if they threw out the moratorium in court, they could do retail, office, they could do whatever within those confines on that full of 12 acres. Under the overlay, we're restricting it probably to about three acres of commercial and then the rest is residential. So, they've either got to go one way or the other; if they go with the overlay then they can't pick and choose. They've got to develop within the 500 foot radius that has to be commercial, and the rest of it has to be residential. Mr. Konstand shared that he and Bill how felt the same way when they first heard it was Sheetz; we were not thrilled with that. It is a 24 hour operation. It was something that was okay, maybe down on route 18 in Montrose. But then we started thinking about it, and he asked all in attendance to think about it. If you need to have a commercial operation there, that makes sense and will stay there, what else can we do besides a gas station like a Sheetz? He stated he is very comfortable with Sheetz only because when we collaborated with them on Springside, we wanted an all brick building like the one now being proposed. They did not hesitate to make the changes we asked for. They worked with us; even with the signage they came in and they cut their signage in half. They still got more than what we require, but they were willing to talk. So, Mr. Konstand has good comfort level with Sheetz. He told the audience if they could think or knew of something better that's a commercial use that would go there, we have open ears. It's just it's going to be the lesser of two evils. His own opinion is, as reluctant as he is, he would rather take a Sheetz and be done with it in terms of commercial development in that area. The rest would be residential. He thought it was a great trade off. He did want everybody to be aware of where we are legally with the moratorium

and where we are right now with the current zoning because someone could go in there and “say that's illegal. We're going to sue you guys and we're going to take the whole property and make it commercial.” Mr. Konstand shared that, originally, that was why U.H. bought it. They wanted to put a medical facility there so you would have helicopters, ambulances and everything else going on there. Fortunately, for Bath, it didn't work out for them and that's why they put it up for sale. At least we know who's interested, so we could work the Overlay District and finalize it and get it done. It would be harder if we finalize the Overlay and then Sheetz came in and said, “Well, I want variances, and I want this, and I want that.” Mr. Konstand stated we're going to be very reluctant to be honest with everyone, and I think this is the opinion of the Zoning Commission, to not allow much deviation from what we're doing with the overlay. We're giving them the right to do a lot, but they have to do a lot for us too, and we can control a lot with that. So, it's a tradeoff. That's the way an overlays work. This is where things are today and in the course of the hearing if you have questions, please feel free to ask them.

Mr. Chairman thanked Mr. Funk and Mr. Konstand. He noted for the record they have had eight dedicated meetings with quite a bit of paperwork involved while working on this. We will continue to work at this, that's one of the reasons why we're taking this action and we want to hear from the public today. But before moving on, he asked the Commission members if they had questions for Mr. Funk or Mr. Konstand. Mrs. Hete asked Mr. Konstand what he meant when he was addressing the citizens and said, “if you have a better suggestion, let us know.” Are you saying is, if you have another buyer, you have someone else who's going to buy it out from under? But it sounds like we have a very we have a serious buyer. Mr. Konstand replied yes, the property is under contract. And, under a commercial purchase agreement there are a lot of outs for the developer. Everything has to go their way, but one of them would be zoning. But also, they've now taken it to the next step and they have a letter of intent with Sheetz. So that's between the developer that's buying the property; they're going to ground lease the Sheetz. So that's getting pretty serious. Mrs. Hete asked, so when you say, if you have a better suggestion; Mr. Konstand stated they're still going to go through U. H. to buy the property. We can suggest to developers that there's something better that would work for Bath. But this developer has been very honest and said they will look at it, but it's got to meet their financial criteria. If it doesn't work, and if Sheetz doesn't work, then the developer walks. Mrs. Hete stated if we were a betting group, we bet this is going to happen. They're going to put a Sheetz there. Mr. Konstand said yes if we let them. if we do nothing, though, they can put a Sheetz in legally under our current zoning. He was surprised they hadn't threatened that and just said they would just do it under the B-1. But they've been very cooperative for developers. They're out of Cleveland, so that's good. They're a big developer, they're local, and they don't want to burn down any bridges. They are very proper. Mrs. Hete then clarified with Mr. Konstand that they could develop under B-1 but they are willing to sit here and wait for us to finalize some things for us to control. Mr. Funk spoke to say that when the developer originally came in, they were proposing a truck stop (not Sheetz) and he told them no and the developer respected that. When they saw the overlay, they knew they couldn't do it.

Mr. Funk spoke to clarify couple things. When we say we're looking at other potential changes to the regulations, like I said, one of the things we are looking at is some buffering standards between Subarea 1 and Subarea 2. We also want to look at a good question that was brought to me the other day that was regarding the approval process. The typical approval process goes through our Appearance Review Commission and the zoning department and if it's a variance, it goes through the Board of Zoning Appeals. So, we are looking at what the approval process is for going into the actual Overlay District. That is one of the things we would like to talk about further as well.

Discussion continued and Mrs. Sanchez asked where traffic assessment comes into this? She was stopped there yesterday with a backup just from the 77 construction. So, where does that come into the process because it will add a lot more traffic. Mr. Funk replied that the developer will have to get approval from Summit County as well as from O.D.O.T., because from his understanding they want to access the light there and add a different

head to that light. They would have to meet both O.D.O.T. standards, and then the County standards as well for traffic. She had a second question regarding the flexibility on the 24 hours. She didn't see anything in our guidelines around that but there is a lighting concern around that and around safety and traffic to have the need for something that is 24 hours. Mr. Funk stated that we have not got to that level of questions with them. We have given them the Overlay language and they are reviewing it.

Public Comments:

Proponents - James McClellan, 1026 Rambling Way had two comments. "Bill actually said them just before I walked up here. So, things that I'm asking the Commission to consider is, will the visual buffers and green space be permanently protected? I know you've talked about that several times to make sure that that's discussed appropriately. Then, the draft language that's currently for this Overlay District indicates the project will be reviewed only by the Board of Zoning Appeals, as mentioned earlier. Does that draft review offer enough oversight and accountability compared to the three tiered review required for rezoning? Just offering that for the Commission to consider as you go through this process. Thank you very much."

Mr. Funk responded to say those are two things that we are definitely looking at and we'll take those into consideration.

Opponents: - Mike Ackermann, 649 Westridge Road, stated "that was quite a curve ball there. Wasn't expecting that. So not really opposed, I guess, I just have some questions based on, you know, what was just discussed. He asked which person were U.H. property. Mr. Funk referred to the last presentation and stated it's parcels 040225 and 0407546 and pointed them out on the screen. Mr. Ackermann asked if there would be any truck fueling there. Mr. Funk stated there will be diesel pumps but not a separate pump canopy for tractor-trailers. If you remember the plans for the one on route 18, it's very similar to that. Mr. Ackerman spoke to the six units per acre and asked if we have anywhere else in Bath Township where we have six units per acre and residential?"

Mr. Funk stated no, our current maximum density in our R-4 is four units per acre. Mr. Chairman asked Mr. Funk to review how we came to our maximum amount homes being 56 in the worst-case scenario. Referring to the exhibit on the screen, Mr. Funk showed what Ryan Smalley, from Envision, put together last meeting. Using our Overlay language, Ryan looked at the setbacks, the minimum house sizes, buffering and tried to include what else was in there. From that he basically produced of a generic site plan. Mr. Smalley claims he's not a developer, not an architect or an engineer and doesn't do subdivisions. He basically drew out, box by box by box, what it potentially could be. Mr. Smalley claims you could probably get around 55 to 65 homes. He said six units per acre and his thought was that there could be, in one of those acres, you could have with that density, potentially six homes on one of those acres. But total site, overall, you're looking at more towards two and a quarter units per acre, as he has drawn out here. Now, somebody could come in here who has done this for years and really knows how to maximize the site. You could potentially get a few more homes, but he felt that all being detached, with the minimum house size, minimum setbacks, and then some of the restrictions of wetlands, slope, you'd be hard pressed to probably get much more than that 65. Mr. Konstand spoke to say to keep in mind this diagram is for the entire Overlay District, which goes north of Cleveland Massillon and Ghent Roads. Presently, the only land we're talking about would be the U.H. property area to the south. He pointed this out on screen. Mr. Konstand said there are four or five different other properties that we have under the Overly District. So, at this time, they've been approached by the developer, and either they don't want to sell or they want crazy amount of money. So, the reality is all that we're talking about, in terms of Sheetz and the developer, is just for the U. H. property. He pointed out what we would have for residential and estimated it could be between 10 and 13 homes. Particularly because you've got all the steep slopes and everything. He felt that once you look at it, because you're allowed to count steep slopes towards your density, you'll be lucky to be at maybe three per acre. Mr. Konstand stated he can't overstress that all we're talking about is U. H. Property. At this point, the Overlay is

for all these other properties, but unfortunately, it doesn't look like those are going to be part of the deal. We have a design that in the future, if someone wants to take advantage of the Overlay, and they acquire at least 12 acres, they can do that. But to answer Mike's question, that's one of the advantages. We're saying, okay, we're going to have stricter standards for the commercial area, but we're going to give the developer more density for the rest of the property, and that is the trade-off.

Mr. Ackerman replied you are not really giving it more density, because the way the code is written, he can't build more than three units per acre. Mr. Konstand explained that it's overall density. Because this land is part of the parcel. The land also includes under 77, we're not counting that. This is a goal for developments. There's good land and there's bad land, and you show overall densities for the whole parcel. That's the only way we control it. We can't say right here, it's got to be six to the letter, four to the letter; and over here, something different. It's overall density. Firestone Trace was done that way. Mr. Ackerman agreed it's overall density; but we say the overall density is six units per acre, and then you say there's no way they'll ever get there; so why not write three? Mr. Chairman replied to say because we don't want to challenge our existing code and weaken it. That would be a liability to that. Instead, we want to enforce it. It's time tested and goes back to 1953 or 54, and we want to keep that intact. That gives Bob a better leg should we need to use it. Mr. Ackermann argued it gives him a weaker leg. Because if I buy this property and I read this in your book, and it says six units per acre, and I do the quick math in my head, and I'm like, okay, I can build six per acre. Then I come in here and I talk to Bill, or whoever, and then they say, well, that's physically impossible because of the code. And you've had meetings and you've had newspaper articles saying that it's physically impossible. You've got a non-defensible position.

Extended discussion was had on the units per acre and Mr. Ackermann wondered if somebody came in and read "six units per acre" and took us to court and said, well, if I built duplexes or quads, I could get six units per acre, I'd want six units per acre. They'll have to take you to court and build quads. Mr. Konstand replied that he was comfortable with that. He was not comfortable with the moratorium. He'll defend the six acres in court. Mrs. Hete chimed in to say what we talked about was that if, under the overlay, someone would have to have all of these parcels together. They can't develop one piece here, one acre there. They have to develop the whole thing. So, density, that's a developers term that there's an understanding about density. It has to apply to the whole area, not just piecemeal. Mrs. Hete said we will talk about it and see if it makes sense in our next discussion. Mr. Chairman continued the public comment.

Mr. Paul Dindo, 2105 Glengary Road, stated he had a couple things to note. "First, I am absolutely against the gas station in all forms. We should be looking for something to put in that property that benefits the citizens best, not the folks on the highway driving through our Township. Once we start letting Fairlawn and those kinds of things at Route 18 come up this way, it will be never ending. There's got to be something else we could do for that property. As far as the housing development goes. You know, my mom has been here her whole life. It could be a nice place for somewhere for her to go when she doesn't need a big two story house. There are a couple things that I noticed. I know, in the last meeting, they mentioned over on Crystal Lake Road, the housing development there. That space was designed so you didn't have to see your neighbors. There's lakes and ponds. I used to ride in them when they were building them. This should not be a cookie cutter place like they did in Fairlawn. That's just that's not who we are. That should not be allowed in any form or fashion. We should not have a housing developer coming in building 27 of the exact same thing and moving on. That's again, my thoughts. And then the final point I wanted to make. On this map, it shows an exit not by a stop light. We have two stop lights there in that area. Anything going in there should be required to utilize one of those two stop lights. We do not need a third thing bringing that kind of traffic out. So that's all I had. Thank you for your time."

Joanne Alexander, 270 Harmony Hills Drive. "I had a question for Bob, which involves that parcel that you mentioned to the north. There is one individual who was anxious to sell, whether or not he's realistic in his price.

Is that a 12 acre parcel? Mr. Konstand stated that it is nine. She asked if that individual does not go with this initial thing, then is he basically closed out? Mr. Konstand stated if he tried to do something independently, he's precluded. Mrs. Alexander said what if he got seller's remorse and turned around and said, "I do want you to take the acre at some other price." Mr. Konstand said if he could add it to the U.H. property, today you can. However, you may need extra properties to make 12 acres to comply with the Overlay. Mrs. Alexander stated she was going to address an elephant in the room, and it relates to a couple of the questions and comments that came up. I've sat in on almost every Zoning Commission meeting, and I heard over and over again how you wanted these rules to be written so there was no appeals. There was nothing; this is what it was, and that's what was set in stone. And in the last meeting, I saw a step back from that position, and I am asking you to go back to your original position. Write these so that there is no bad zoning, revisions or anything else. It is what it is. If they like it, they like it. If they don't like it, they don't like it. If they add to the parcel, they already have a buffer. The buffer is the buffer, and they put another buffer so there's more green space than we originally envisioned in the Overlay. That's just the way it's going to work. And now the elephant in the room, I think that there are people in Bath who are extremely unhappy with some of the most visible buildings that have gone in on Cleveland Massillon, Ghent Road. They were appealed to be behemoths. They don't fit on their properties. They stick out. They don't look good. And I think that what you're hearing from a lot of people is, we don't want some developer to come in and start, you know, getting an appeal for this and getting an appeal for that, changing roof lines, changing density, things like that. That's why I will go back to my initial statement, which is, you were trying to write these so that they could not be appealed, and it was in the actual language; hold your position."

Commission Discussion - Mr. Chairman stated that there is some good meat to chew through. He thought the Commission needed the next meeting as Bill outlined and that it made sense. It was good to hear the comments and we want to do the right thing because this is going to change forever. Mrs. Sanchez stated she asked her main points earlier but she thinks one of the action questions she wanted to capture was on oversight. She didn't know if we need to address it now or later. Mr. Chairman stated that is a big thing that we've been talking about for a while. It goes back to the idea that says that what we write is going to be done right, and obviously we don't have the final verbiage in it, but we need to make sure that we do it right. He stated that we are going to ask for a motion here to postpone the case. Mr. Craven asked what the timeline was with Sheetz and the new developer. Mr. Funk stated that the reports from the developer is U. H. is not moving quickly. He has not received any sense of any timeline that they have, other than the fact that U. H. is not in a hurry to do anything. He knows they've been doing some survey work out there but didn't have a whole lot of information. Mr. Funk wanted to get this information to everyone throughout this process as soon as possible and thought this was a good time to do so as we finish drafting this language. We waited to get good information and the agreement was in place, and we got it to the Board and to the public. Unfortunately, we don't have any real sense of a good timeline as to where they are at.

Mr. Pitchford referred to the levels of review to rezone and asked Mr. Funk to briefly speak on what we are envisioning as far as level of review, what is the interpretation of what we currently have is and what the thought process might change. Mr. Funk replied to say that, obviously, this is our first Overlay District for development. Currently we have a riparian corridor overlay and a sidewalk overlay, but those are BZA related, or they are just administrated through me. This is a different overlay that is kind of through that development. Typical development, if it's a permitted use, would go through him for review, then it would go through Appearance Review Commission for site plan approval, and then, basically, I could approve it. Now if it needs a variance, or if it needs a conditional use for a typical one, it will go through the Board of Zoning Appeals as well. Mr. Funk said, you are all familiar with a rezoning. For a rezoning, say I have R-2 now and I want R-4. That goes through this Board, then goes through Summit County Planning Commission and both provide recommendations. Then the Board of Trustees ultimately approves it. Mr. Funk stated that our decision is when a developer comes in

and they ask to develop under that Overlay District, what level of review do we want? He envisions some type of concept plan, some type of overview as to what they're looking at doing, and then some type of approval, whether that's just strictly approval through zoning department, whether that's approval through another zoning board, whether that's a higher level like the Board of Trustees to where they say, yes, this meets the intent of the Overlay District. The concept meets the intentions, now go through that Overlay District process; which would involve, again, ARC as well as BZA if necessary. So, there is sort of a pre-approval to go into that Overlay. To clarify, Mr. Funk stated an applicant would have to meet the guidelines for the Overlay Districts, you have approval to move forward, and now you start with your finalized plans. You can do a full engineering and then you can go through the full zoning process, and we can go to for the full approval process, to the County, etc. Mr. Pitchford asked if that is an administrative or a Commission level review and Mr. Funk said that is the question. Mr. Chairman said that we will be talking about this and Mr. Konstand stated this is why we need more time to outline how a developer gets approved and who is going to do the review.

Mr. Pitchford spoke to another comment made regarding no "row" architecture and wondered if we could ask Ryan's team to talk about adding additional residential architectural requirements along those lines. Or, do we leave that up to the Appearance Review Board? Do we want to consider any additional architectural review standards to get different faces and or facades? Mr. Funk stated that we do have some of that in there, but there are potential things we could look at to make it less cookie-cutter. This would be a good question for Ryan to see if he has any recommendations. Mr. Pitchford then noted that there was an interesting comment about the piecemeal and the last holdout parcel. This raised another question for him regarding the 12 acre requirement. He wanted to challenge the Commission and the Administration to think about how we really want that to read and if the 12 acres is going to be required on the commercial side. He said, let's say it's four acres for the commercial, then the developer has to develop the remaining eight. What do we truly intend by that, and what does that look like? He was not saying there's right or wrong answer at this point. He just wondered if we could maybe look at alternatives. Mr. Funk stated that is a great point and he and Mr. Konstand can hopefully address that prior to getting the next draft out. Mr. Pitchford's last comment was related to variances and said let's draw a hard line on our rules. His recollection of the conversation that we had was that we were not going to allow variances on buffers. He knew that we felt really, really strong about that, and then specifically put that in there. In his background and his experience, it's hard to draw a hard and fast rule on everything that says no variances. He wondered if there are any other line items or rules like a buffer. What are the top three things, like nonnegotiable type of things? Is there anything else someone would challenge? He asked his fellow Board members what else would be nonnegotiable and might be considered a no variance rule for those as well.

Mr. Bolanz spoke to say this was his second meeting with this and felt like he was jumping into the middle of it and picking up with everything. He felt that the original intention was to get this right the first time and have it set permanently. But now with the Sheetz proposal, it almost feels like we are on the clock for getting this done, to work within this offer's parameters and not drag our feet so long that they say they are just going to stick with B-1 and develop the 12 acre truck stop instead. It's almost like balancing the lesser of two evils. He did agree with the approval process being a big part of it, as well what we put in as permanent fixtures, i.e., no variances, etc. Again, balanced against, we've been doing this now for eight months, how much longer can we drag this on? Mr. Funk added that we have postponed this a few times and felt the flip side of that is we've had the advantage of having these public hearings and been able to get a lot of great public comment that's enabled us to go back, rethink and tweak this. And then we have another public meeting, and you get more really good comments, and then, all right, that's a good way to think of it. Mr. Funk stated it has helped us, hopefully, create a better document than if we just kind of rush through it, had a quick public hearing and passed it on. Mr. Funk thought it has been advantageous for us to have multiple hearings by postponing and getting the public comment. Mr. Chairman expressed his thanks to everybody on the Committee and for talking to the community. Mrs. Hete expressed the desire to move to postpone the Public Hearing. It was then recommended to first hold

a Work Session on the next scheduled meeting on October 9th and to reconvene the Public Hearing on the November 13th meeting date to have time to properly post the legal notice.

The hearing was closed with no further information or questions by the Commission or applicant.

Motion and vote:

Motion to postpone the Public Hearing for application ZC-25-01 – Ghent Interchange Mix-Used Overlay, to November 13, 2025 at 6:00 P.M.; by Mrs. Hete; seconded by Mr. Pitchford. Roll Call: Mr. Pitchford, Mrs. Hete, Mr. Craven and Mrs. Sanchez. Vote: 4 – 0 approved.

The next meeting will be a Work Session on Thursday, October 9, 2025 at 6:00 P.M.

Mr. Chairman adjourned the hearing.