

Licking Township Board of Zoning Appeals

c/o Andrea M. Lynch, Zoning Clerk

Phillip Jones, Chair ~ Rex Adkins, Vice Chair

Robert Hansberger, Anton Kissell, Huber Loewendick

Doug Howell – Alternate; Josh Arnett – Alternate

www.lickingtwplc.gov

Minutes from the Licking Township Board of Zoning Appeals meeting, July 23, 2026, at Licking Township Fire Station #600 9384 Jacksontown Road, Jacksontown, OH 43030.

Members present: Josh Arnett; Robert Hansberger; Anton Kissell; Huber Loewendick; Phil Jones

Members absent: Rex Adkins

Others in attendance: Andrea Lynch; Dave Moraine; Mike Payne; Chase Payne; Zoran Saveski; Eric Moore; Shannon Moore; Sharon McKinney; Jay McKinney

The Meeting was called to order at 7:00 p.m.

The Pledge of Allegiance was recited.

All in attendance were sworn in.

Roll call was called. The meeting was recorded.

Mr. Jones explained the hearing procedure to all in attendance and stated there are a total of 3 variances to be heard as follows:

Eric & Shannon Moore – 703 Zanesville Road Thornville, OH

Mark & Amy Dobransky – 39 Cornell Road Hebron, OH

Applicant Zoza Holdings w/Paul & Cheryl Brown – 6820 National Road Jacksontown, OH

Mr. Jones opened the 1st hearing : Eric & Shannon Moore.

Mrs. Lynch read the legal notice advertising all 3 variances.

Mrs. Lynch reported receiving no additional correspondence.

Eric Moore provided testimony. Stated that they wish to replace the pre-existing pickleball court on their property with a garage. The pickleball court was there when they purchased the home. The garage placement is limited based on the irregular lot shape and other structures on the property.

Zoning Inspector Dave Moraine provided a visual of the proposed garage and specs of the structure including an explanation of the 3' walkway between the accessory structure and a shed. Mr. Moraine said they are just asking for a variance on distance from the residence side as all other setbacks are met.

Public Comment:

1) Michael Payne – supports the variance request

Mr. Jones asked if the property was purchased this way?

Mr. Moore response – yes.

Mrs. Moore said this is their full-time home whereas the previous owners used it as a summer home and did not need a garage.

Mr. Jones asked if a smaller footprint garage would change the variance being requested.
Mr. Moraine response – No.

Mr. Hansberger asked why not attach the garage to the residence to eliminate the need for a variance?

Mr. Moore response – It is not possible

Mrs. Moore response – Attaching the garage would result in it being attached to a bedroom, bathroom, and living room. There is no open wall to attach it to allowing a pass through.

Mr. Loewendick made a motion to close the hearing at 7:13 p.m.

Mr. Hansberger seconded the motion.

Roll Call: Kissell, yes; Arnett, yes; Loewendick, yes; Jones, yes; Hansberger, yes.

The Board deliberated the matter. A discussion took place including irregular lot size and shape, applicants did not design the property structures but instead bought the property as is, reason for zoning regulations for distance between structures for prevention of fire spread. Mr. Jones said that the property owner is assuming the risk of fire spread as the garage distance from the home is being reduced as opposed to imposing that on a neighboring house. Mr. Kissell said that it is a tight neighborhood and the proposed garage fits in with other structures in neighborhood. The Board reviewed several other similar structures with similar circumstances.

Mr. Moore confirmed for the Board that the garage at its highest peak is 14'-14'6".

Mr. Jones clarified roll call vote of yes = approve the variance as requested; vote of no = deny the motion.

Mr. Kissell made a motion to approve the variance for the structure only as presented.

Mr. Loewendick seconded the motion.

Roll Call: Arnett, yes; Hansberger, yes; Kissell, yes; Loewendick, yes; Jones, yes.

The variance request was approved as presented 5-0. Notice of Final Order will be mailed to the Applicant.

Mr. Jones excused Moore variance attendees at 7:42 p.m.

Mike Payne, Chase Payne, Shannon Moore, and Eric Moore exited.

Mr. Jones opened the 2nd hearing @ 7:24 p.m.

Mr. Jones explained the hearing procedure.

The legal ad was already read at start of 1st hearing

Mrs. Lynch reported receiving the following correspondence:

- 1) Letter from adjacent property owner Lucinda Gidlow dated 7/20/26 indicating that she is in process of selling her property and provided a copy of the hearing notice to the new owners.
- 2) Mrs. Lynch stated that she had corresponded both via email and telephone with Mr. & Mrs. Dobransky. They are unable to attend the hearing in person to testify due to a previous engagement. Mrs. Lynch asked them to provide testimony in written form with the understanding that if the Board had questions and/or could not reach a decision, the matter would be continued to a hearing in August.
- 3) Returned certified notice addressed to adjacent property owner ABD properties.

Mrs. Lynch distributed and read a copy of the testimony from Mark and Amy Dobransky that was emailed to her on 7/12/26. See file for testimony.

Zoning Inspector Dave Moraine reviewed the setbacks, the Harbor Hills Civic Association HOA approval, and said that he does not have actual pictures of the deck but that the deck is pretty basic and not using unusual design/materials.

Mr. Jones noted no representatives from the Harbor Hills Civic Association were present.

Public Comments: None

Mr. Jones moved to close the hearing
There was no 2nd
Motion died on floor

Mr. Kissell moved to extend/continue the hearing to August
There was no 2nd
Motion died on the floor

Mr. Kissell made a motion to close the hearing at 7:35 p.m.
Mr. Jones seconded the motion.
Roll Call: Jones, yes; Arnett, yes; Hansberger, yes; Kissell, yes; Loewendick, yes.

The Board deliberated the matter. The discussion included opinions on the structure, Duncan Factors, review of other decks in neighborhood with similar circumstances.

Mr. Hansberger made a motion to approve the variance as requested for the deck as requested.
Mr. Arnett seconded the motion.
Mr. Jones clarified voting a yes = approve the variance no = deny the motion
Roll Call: Jones, yes; Kissell, yes; Hansberger, yes; Arnett, yes; Loewendick, yes.

Mrs. Lynch will notify Mr. & Mrs. Dobransky of the variance approval, notice of final order, and obtaining a permit prior to construction start.

Mr. Jones opened the 3rd hearing @ 7:40 p.m.

Mr. Jones explained the hearing procedure.

The legal ad was already read at start of 1st hearing

Mrs. Lynch reported receiving the following correspondence:

- 1) Emails exchanged between Zoning Clerk and Mr. Saveski as it related to POA or Notarized letter permitting Mr. Saveski to speak on behalf of applicant
- 2) Notarized letter from Mr. & Mrs. Brown authorizing the applicant to speak on their behalf
- 3) Phone call from Sharon McKinney regarding concerns on project. Mrs. Lynch stated that Mrs. McKinney is in attendance at the meeting and she will allow her to speak in person about her questions/concerns.

Mr. Zoran Saveski – Zoza Holdings LLC gave testimony as the Applicant and on behalf of the property owners Paul & Cheryl Brown. Mr. Saveski said that he currently owns Highpoint Taxidermy and recently sold gun store and wants to reinvest monies into the community. Mr. Brown approached him with the opportunity to purchase the property at 6820 National Road. Mr. Saveski presented full scale and digital plans to create a 6 unit “Ladies Center” plaza that could include doctor’s office; chiropractor; dentist; salon; real estate office; possible sandwich shop. Said that he has no desire to lease to a bar, vape store rather businesses that were geared towards ladies. Mr. Saveski explained that he had considered a coffees shop but due to no drive-thru window and traffic, not feasible. The actual footprint of the structure is under 10,000 sq ft. The Plaza will have 44 parking spaces and has the option to lease an additional 22 parking from Mr. Vierstra who owns Crossroads. The additional parking would be the lot diagonal and north east from the plaza which currently serves as Crossroads overflow parking. If this was required as part of the variance, Mr. Saveski said the additional parking would be used for the employee parking of the proposed plaza. Mr. Saveski said that the majority of the tenant business would conclude by 5-6:00 p.m. while the sandwich shop (i.e. Jersey Mikes) may be open until 9 p.m. He does not anticipate leasing to a full service restaurant. Mr. Saveski distributed pictures of the proposed plaza, sign, interior and exterior renderings. A discussion took place regarding the materials being considered, design standards, and roof pitch is planned as a 3-12 or 4-12.

The Zoning Inspector provided comments on the project including the following: drawback of current LTWP Zoning Resolution relative to JB; Section 12.00; front parking vs rear parking and safety; 12.00 C – structure bulk; discrepancy in other business districts (GB) concerning structure bulk and lot requirements within current zoning regulations vs JB District ; feels that the Zoning Commission needs to review the structure bulk for JB; supports the proposed building being larger than currently permitted in JB district; feels applicant is presenting a good plan & supports the design and strongly suggests the BZA consider approval.

Public Comment:

- 1) Sharon McKinney – Stated that as a resident of Jacksontown for 60 years she has seen many projects proposed for the corner. Stated that her 2 primary concerns are: Traffic from Route 13 and Route 40 and how this has continued to increase. Traffic

on the Cormican Way has increased with people cutting through, Road Department; Church; Recycle bins; etc. She said that the afternoon traffic flow is horrible. Mrs. McKinney said her 2nd concern is lighting. She said that with all of the lighting currently there, she does not have to turn on a porch light.

- 2) Andrea Lynch – Questioned the term “Ladies Center” as men utilize all of the services offered by the tenant’s Mr. Saveski claimed were “ladies” shops and stated that there is no guarantee that the Applicant does not sell the property. She said what is being promised today could become a bar; restaurant; or vape shop. Mrs. Lynch also said that the parking lease arrangement with Mr. Vierstra could go away should they sell their property so to make this a condition of a variance is a risk. Mrs. Lynch said that based on the Applicant’s proposed structure, design, and signage it would be an improvement aesthetically to that corner.

Mr. Jones commented on alignment with the Comprehensive Plan, walkability to the shops; community hub/village center and that there are a lot of moving pieces and parts to this variance.

Mr. Jones asked if the building could have been made smaller?

Response: Mr. Saveski said that he could build a smaller building but he would have to charge more for each space which would likely detract tenants. A discussion took place.

Mr. Jones expressed concerns that the Board of Zoning Appeals would be writing regulations by way of a variance which is not the purpose of the BZA.

Mr. Hansberger said the Applicant has to work with what you have.

Mr. Jones said the following: Square footage is substantial; parking is an issue; hears the intent regarding proposed tenants for today but what does future hold; lighting not addressed; traffic not addressed.

Mr. Jones asked if any traffic study has been conducted?

Mr. Saveski’s response – No. He said he has talked with ODOT and there are no plans for a turn lane nor round-about at the intersection of Route 13 & 40 in the next 5 years.

A brief discussion took place regarding Michael’s Pizza that was approved for a new building and now there is consideration of changing the roadway to 1 way due to traffic increase and challenges. Mr. Jones said he does not want a repeat of the same oversights.

Mr. Moraine said that he disagrees with Mr. Jones’ statement that the BZA is writing zoning regulations. That the Board must look at each case on a property basis. Mr. Jones said he would concur on that but his statement meant that establishing conditions for the variance is where the BZA is writing regulations.

Mr. Moraine said that if the Twp does not take advantage of opportunities such as this one to move our township forward, we may still be looking at sheds on the property.

Mr. Arnett inquired about setback from road?

Mr. Saveski responded 50’.

Mr. Arnett said that by setting the building back from the roadway as proposed, it increases the curb appeal and may increase safety.

The Applicant and Board reviewed the proposed entrance into the parking lot of the plaza from both Route 13 & Route 40.

Mr. Moraine said that denying the variance based on traffic is a mistake.

Mt. Loewendick confirmed no drive-thru.

Mr. Saveski responded – correct.

Mr. Hansberger asked how does the BZA proceed from here? Mr. Jones & Mrs. Lynch explained that the Board may deliberate on the conditions should there be a motion to approve the variance with conditions prescribed.

A discussion took place on the following:

- 1) Amount of parking spaces – currently 44 but will be determined by Licking County
- 2) Dumpster location – not determined
- 3) AC Unit location – mounted at side/rear of unit with bollards
- 4) Delivery truck location – rear of plaza on pavement
- 5) Exterior Materials – metal clad w/wood grain pattern if available. If not, wood boards (not to look like a basic pole barn); metal roof; stone wainscoting
- 6) Square footage of each “business” – TBD
- 7) Fire Suppression – Based on size of plaza, does not require sprinklers but is willing to use a firewall if required. Cost of sprinklers starts at \$258,000.00
- 8) Plaza Center sign may be placed at ground level and must comply with all regulations. Mr. Saveski submitted a mock design of the plaza sign.

Mr. Arnett made a motion to adjourn the hearing at 9:04 p.m.

Mr. Kissell seconded the motion.

Roll Call: Jones, yes; Hansberger, yes; Loewendick, yes; Arnett, yes; Kissell, yes.

Jay McKinney and Sharon McKinney left the meeting. Mr. Saveski remained as well as the Zoning Clerk, Zoning Inspector, and the BZA members.

The Board deliberated the matter.

Mr. Jones reviewed the Duncan Factors and shared his comments on the request including square footage required to make a property viable for development, ROI, attracting tenants, concerns with parking, respecting the Comprehensive Plan, and discussion with Zoning Commission Chairs regarding work being done by the ZC to better align township zoning resolution to the new Comp Plan.

Mr. Arnett commented that if the parking was in the rear, it would push the building up closer to Route 40 and may pose more issues for safe egress and ingress.

The Board discussed sidewalks and future for such walking paths; elevation of the property which helps to provide a visual and safety barrier from traffic; signage and lighting; ac units; anticipated time of deliveries and what if any conditions they may wish to consider. The Board concurred to outline conditions for the following items:

- 1) Lighting
- 2) Signage
- 3) Parking
- 4) Exterior Finishes

A lengthy discussion took place on all 3 outlined conditions. Mr. Jones read into the minutes a proposed billboard and lighting resolution being considered by the LTWP Zoning Commission for consideration of the lighting condition for the variance. The BZA concurred that they wanted to use that language for lighting as follows:

shall not contain flashing or rapidly changing lights and shall be so shaded as not to interfere with the vision of persons on the highway [to cause a nuisance] or to annoy neighbors.

shall be shielded, hooded, and/or directed downward so that the light does not create light trespass, a public or private nuisance, and/or unreasonable interference with:

Adjacent or nearby residential properties, including illumination that artificially increases the ambient light levels of residential structures or yards.

The safe operation of motor vehicles on public or private roads, including illumination that causes glare, blinding flashes, distraction, or vision impairment to driving. shall not contain flashing, blinking, scrolling, or rapidly changing lights, animations, or moving video. All illumination must remain static and constant in intensity

Condition #1:

Mr. Jones made a motion that Condition #1 Lighting shall be in compliance with the proposed language read into the minutes during this hearing.

Mr. Loewendick seconded the motion.

Roll Call: Jones, yes; Arnett, yes; Hansberger, yes; Loewendick, yes; Kissell, yes.

Condition #2:

Mr. Jones made a motion that Condition #2 Exterior Storefront Signage shall be wall-mounted above each individual storefront and must be uniform in structure, shape, and size.

Mr. Kissell seconded the motion.

Roll Call: Hansberger, yes; Kissell, yes; Arnett, yes; Loewendick, yes; Jones yes.

The Board discussed a condition for parking. Consensus was that it was not needed as a prescribed condition as the parking would have to meet all conditions set forth by Licking County.

Condition #3:

Mr. Jones made a motion for Condition #3 Exterior Finishes must be substantially representative of the renderings provided during the hearing on 7/23/26 see official variance file.

Mr. Arnett seconded the motion.

Roll Call: Jones, yes; Kissell, yes; Arnett, yes; Hansberger, yes; Loewendick, yes.

Mr. Jones led a discussion about the variance request being made as per the application: Locating building midway on the parcel; 10,000 sq ft variance for structure bulk; and request for parking to be located in front of the structure not rear.

Mr. Jones made a motion to approve the variance request as per the application and supporting documents to include the 3 prescribed conditions for Lighting; Exterior Signage; and Exterior Finishes.

Mr. Kissell seconded the motion.

Mr. Jones clarified voting a yes = approve the variance no = deny the motion

Roll Call: Arnett, yes; Loewendick, yes; Kissell, yes; Jones, yes; Hansberger, yes.

Mr. Saveski thanked the Board for their consideration and vote. Mr. Saveski will receive a Notice of Final Order as soon as possible and will need to begin the permitting process.

Mr. Jones transitioned to regular business.

The previous meeting minutes were reported as unofficial by Mrs. Lynch due to her absence on that date and the recorder failing. Notes were given to the Board regarding the hearing but are unofficial and serve as informal documentation only.

Old Business - None

New Business – None

Public Comment - None

Mr. Jones made a motion to adjourn the meeting at 10:12 p.m.

Mr. Kissell seconded the motion.

Roll Call: 5 ayes

Minutes approved by:

Meeting Minutes recorded by Andrea M. Lynch, Zoning Clerk – July 23, 2026