

Licking Township Zoning Commission
Paul Matthews, Chairperson; Max Ungerman, Vice Chairperson;
Edna Latham; Michael Smith; Michael Stack
Lori Green – Alternate ; Matt Mathias - Alternate
Andrea M. Lynch, Zoning Clerk ~ Dave Moraine, Zoning Inspector
www.lickingtwplc.gov

Minutes from the Licking Township Zoning Commission Hearing & Regular Meeting held on August 6, 2026

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

The Pledge of Allegiance was recited.

All in attendance were sworn in.

The meeting was recorded.

Commission Members present @ roll call: Ms. Green; Ms. Latham; Mr. Matthews; Mr. Stack; Mr. Ungerman
Absent: Mike Smith; Matt Mathias (alternate)

Others in Attendance: Beverly Coffman; Rich Hennesy; Kevin McConaha; Courtney McConaha; Pam Kissell; Rodney Kissell; 1 male (sign in sheet illegible); Zoning Inspector Dave Moraine (*); Zoning Clerk Andrea Lynch (*)

(*) *Present but not signed in*

The Zoning Clerk read the ad.

Mr. Matthews explained the hearing process.

Courtney McConaha provided testimony regarding the map change request. She explained the reason for having applied for the map change.

Public Comment:

- 1) Beverly Coffman - 3850 Ridgely Tract Road, Newark, OH – asked if there is painting being done in the building? Smells paint fumes occasionally.

Ms. McConaha response – yes, a small paint booth and a new ventilation has been installed.

Zoning Inspector: Mr. Moraine said the structure has been on the property for quite some time functioning as a business. The McConaha request is in alignment with the Comprehensive Plan and future site map. Finds no issue with bringing this property into compliance.

Ms. Green asked if they brought a copy of the lease agreement as mentioned in previous hearings testimony? Ms. McConaha response – No as the Tenant is hesitant to sign one without knowing if the map change will be approved. They are on a month-to-month. Mr. Moraine clarified that there is no previous lease in place. Ms. McConaha said that was correct.

Mr. Ungerman read the Licking County Staff Report – non-binding recommendation to approve the proposed map amendment to rezone +/-15.7 acres from Residential (R) District to General Business District (GB) on the LTWP Official Zoning Map.

Mr. Matthews stated that he was in attendance at the 7/27/26 LCPC meeting on the matter and it passed quickly.

Ms. Green made a motion to adjourn the hearing at 7:13 p.m.

Ms. Ungerman seconded the motion.

Roll Call: 5 ayes

Ms. Green called the regular meeting to order at 7:17 p.m.

Ms. Latham seconded the motion.

Roll Call: 5 ayes

Commission Members present @ roll call: Ms. Green; Ms. Latham; Mr. Matthews; Mr. Stack; Mr. Ungerman
Zoning Inspector Dave Moraine; Zoning Clerk Andrea Lynch.

Mr. Matthews opened the regular business meeting and explained the next steps in the map change application process including deliberation, vote, and recommendation process to Trustees.

Mr. Moraine provided details regarding the build dates for the structures situated at 3874 Ridgely Tract using the LC Auditor's website. Mr. Moraine said based on the LC Auditor's information, in 1998 the pole barn structure in question was not there however it appears to have been built in 2001.

Mr. Ungerman said he is in support of the request but has concerns with the future use should it no longer be an automotive business. Mr. Ungerman shared his thoughts on a possible buffering/screening requirement vs grandfathering which can not be done. Mr. Ungerman said that it is admirable the applicants wish to bring the property into compliance however the zoning building setback can not be resolved.

A discussion took place among the Zoning Commission, Zoning Inspector, and applicant regarding buffering/screening. Ms. McConaha said there are currently 2 small trees and shrubs on the westside.

Ms. Latham inquired if the Zoning Commission had authority to prescribe a condition on a map change and also asked if they would also need a variance. A discussion took place.

Mr. Moraine said that a variance would be needed for any add-on to the existing structure and/or a variance would be needed if building a new commercial building on the property. A variance would be needed if the new building's (that was permitted as a residential building) use changed.

Ms. Latham confirmed that there is no evidence to support his property being grandfathered.

Mr. Moraine said the McConaha's were issued a residential zoning permit for a residential new pole barn which initiated the discussion regarding the pole barn structure at the front of the property being used as auto repair. A discussion took place regarding use of residential pole barn for commercial should the map change be approved.

A discussion took place regarding screening/buffering requirements. Mr. Moraine provided an overhead view of the current property and auto repair building which showed some small trees/bushes which were the length of the building. Ms. Coffman stated that she would like to see the buffering extend beyond the building to the south where cars were being parked.

Ms. Latham inquired why the applicant did not apply for a variance instead of a map change? Mr. Moraine said he suggested the map change instead of a variance request.

A discussion took place regarding adding conditions to the map change recommendation to include buffering/screening.

Ms. Latham expressed concerns with placing conditions on one property that has not been done on another and has concerns with whether the ZC has authority to place such conditions on a map change. Ms. Latham suggested tabling the decision until further research with the LCPO regarding conditions and map changes.

Mr. Stack said he supports the map change but agrees that screening/buffering is necessary in consideration of the residential neighbors.

Mr. Ungerman agrees with Mr. Stack and suggests that the ZC move forward with a vote and obtain an opinion from the LCPO regarding conditions which could then be part of a supplementary letter/suggestion for the Trustees to consider as they hold the final vote on the matter.

Mr. Moraine asked Ms. Coffman her opinion regarding screening/buffering. Ms. Coffman stated that the barn doesn't bother her but the parking area for the cars needs screening.

Mr. Stack asked the applicant if she were opposed to planting trees for screening? Ms. McConaha response – No but would not be in favor of a fence.

Mr. Moraine inquired about the neighbor at 3860 Ridgely Tract Rd (not present at hearing). Ms. McConaha response – Said she could not speak for the property owner but would doubt a fence on the east side would be attractive.

Mr. Ungerman made a motion that the Licking Township Zoning Commission follow the LCPC non-binding recommendation to approve the proposed map change to the Licking Township Official Zoning Map as presented and forward the ZC recommendation to the Licking Township Trustees for their consideration and final action.

Ms. Green seconded the motion.

Roll Call: Green, yes; Latham, yes; Matthews, yes; Stack, yes; Ungerman, yes

Ms. Latham made a motion to approve the 7/16/26 minutes as presented.

Mr. Ungerman seconded the motion.

Roll Call (**): Latham, yes; Ungerman, yes; Green, yes.

(**) *Roll Call was based on ZC members present at the 7/16/26 hearing & regular meeting.*

Correspondence:

- 1) Zoning Clerk Andrea Lynch relayed an email response from Darcy Cook, Assistant Prosecutor, LCPO Civil Division re: Consent Agenda Request Form from LCPC on recent map change and prior text amendment change. Mrs. Lynch sought an opinion from the LCPO regarding this new form and concerns with how it may affect ZC voting. Attorney Cook suggested LTZC not sign this form and allow the full process to take place for map changes/text amendments.
- 2) Zoning Clerk Andrea Lynch shared email drafted to Darcy Cook, LCPO, regarding hearing continuances and proper protocol with the extended deadlines from LCPC.

Zoning Inspector: Mr. Moraine presented recent updates/concerns:

- 1) Seeking clarification on swimming pools and fencing related to above ground pools 4' vs 3'. A discussion took place. Verbiage in the Zoning regulations may need clarification.
- 2) Reviewed recently approved variance for property at 6820 National Road (former JackTown pub) and conditions of the variance approval.
- 3) Reviewed the following:
 - a. Mead Lane LLC - 4281 Cristland Hill Road (041-120072-00.000): Originally planned for a subdivision but now parceling into 5 tracts of land for single family homes. One will need a variance.
 - b. Raymond & Cheryl Reynolds – 828 Lakeshore - Rae's Auto Sales (043-138654-00.000 & 043-138672-00.000) building a new building will require a variance for front yard setback.
 - c. F&F Holdings – 11272 Avondale Road (041-120372-00.000) may apply for a map change due to east part of parcel split by roadway being zoned residential vs west side of road zoned business. May seek map change from residential to business on 041-136496-00.009.
 - d. F&F Holdings also seeking zoning permits on potentially 6 commercial advertising signs. Signs 1-4 are on the residential property at 11272 Avondale Road address; 1 on the dock; 1 on the island. A discussion took place regarding whether LTWP can permit signs on docks and islands as this is ODNR's jurisdiction not LTWP.

Old Business:

- Mr. Ungerman led a discussion regarding Short Term Rentals including verbiage drafted for parking, occupancy, signs, long-term vs short-term. This topic will be discussed at a future meeting.

New Business:

- Next ZC meeting to be held on 8/20/26.
- Ms. Latham & Mr. Matthews attended recent OTA Training on 7/23/26. Ms. Latham will share comments and details at the next regular ZC meeting.
- Ms. Green will be absent on 8/20/26.

Public Comment:

Rich Hennosy- 4383 Jacksontown Road – read the following letter expressing his concerns about Section 10.00 G. - Rear Houses being removed from the zoning regulations:

Dear Members of the Licking Township Zoning Commission:

I am here today to ask the Commission to reconsider the elimination of Section 10.00.G (Rear Houses) from the Licking Township Zoning Resolution and to consider replacing it with a modern ordinance that allows a single rear homesite on qualifying residential parcels under clearly defined design standards.

Like Corey and Sarah Enders and Mr. Reed, whose recent requests for rear homesites were denied, I had planned to divide my five-acre property into a three-acre parcel containing my existing home and a two-acre rear parcel where my wife and I could build a smaller home as we approach retirement. We have lived in Licking Township for many years, enjoy our property, and would like to remain here rather than relocate to another community or into an expensive subdivision. The rear two acres of my property are the perfect place for this and would have qualified under the previous township zoning resolution.

The practical effect of removing Section 10.00.G extends well beyond eliminating one type of lot split. It removes one of the few affordable ways for longtime residents to remain in Licking Township as their housing needs change. The fact is, there are very few if any 2 acre lots suitable for building a home without being in a subdivision. The one lot I found is \$65,000 per acre and is in a subdivision, which is not desirable for everyone.

I understand and appreciate the Commission's responsibility to protect public safety and encourage orderly development. If the concern behind removing Section 10.00.G was emergency access or the ability of first responders to locate rear homes, I believe those concerns can be addressed without eliminating this housing option. Requirements such as clearly visible address signage at the road, minimum driveway width and construction standards capable of supporting emergency vehicles, and recorded access standards would directly address those concerns while preserving reasonable property rights.

It is also important to recognize that allowing a single rear homesite would not eliminate the many safeguards already built into the approval process. Property owners would still be required to comply with minimum lot size requirements, minimum lot width requirements, maximum lot depth requirements, building setbacks, Licking County Health Department septic and well approvals, county subdivision regulations, and Township zoning review. These protections ensure that only appropriate homesites can be created while preserving the rural character of Licking Township.

I believe as more township residents learn of this change to the zoning code, you will find it affects more people than you realize.

Thank you for your time, and your willingness to consider the impact this change has had on longtime residents like myself. I appreciate your thoughtful consideration of this request and ask the Commission to revisit this issue in light of its practical effects on the people it serves.

Respectfully,

Rich Hennosy

The ZC requested a copy of the letter from Mr. Hennosy for consideration at the next meeting.

Ms. Green moved to adjourn the meeting @ 9:10 p.m.

Mr. Ungerman seconded the motion.

Roll Call: 5 ayes

Minutes approved by:

Meeting Minutes recorded by Andrea M. Lynch, Zoning Clerk – 8-06-26