

**Licking Township Zoning Commission**

*c/o Andrea M. Lynch, Zoning Clerk*

*Paul Matthews, Chairman;*

*Christopher Powell, Vice Chairman*

*Edna Latham; Max Ungerman*

*www.lickingtwpplc.gov*

---

Minutes from the Licking Township Zoning Commission Public Hearing & Regular Meeting held on, October 23, 2025

Hearing was called to order at 7:04 p.m.

The Pledge of Allegiance was recited.

All in attendance were sworn in.

The meeting was recorded (PQO due to fire bays, audio recording device, and road noise ).

Commission Members present at roll call: Ms. Latham; Mr. Matthews; Mr. Powell; Mr. Ungerman

Others in Attendance: Terry Clark; Christine Robinson; Dale Wise; Matt Jones (\*) Andrea Lynch (\*); Ben Harder . (\*) *Present but not signed in*

Mr. Matthews introduced the ZC Members, Zoning Clerk, and the consultant to the public in attendance. Mr. Matthews shared that the Zoning Inspector is out of town.

Mr. Matthews explained the purpose of the hearing and the manner in which the hearing would be conducted including regular business to follow.

Mr. Matthews explained that tonight is the 1<sup>st</sup> public hearing/meeting to present the LTWP Mixed Use Overlay District (MUOD) document. This document was drafted by the Licking Township Zoning Commission with the guidance of Crossroads Community Planning & Development, and through the gathering of input from the Licking Township Trustees and Licking Township Fire Chief, with the intent to be an amendment to the Licking Township Zoning Resolution as Article 11. Mr. Matthews explained this hearing will be conducted by the Zoning Commission & Consultant and explained the process by which a text amendment gets reviewed and approved.

Mr. Matthews further explained that on September 18, 2025, the LTWP Zoning Commission met in regular session and voted to accept the finalized Mixed Use Overlay District document and formally request a non-binding recommendation from the Licking County Planning Commission by September 23, 2025. Mr. Matthews stated that the ZC is required within a period of not less than twenty (20) days and not more than forty (40) days of accepting the application, the zoning commission must schedule a public hearing to consider the application. The zoning commission must also provide notice as required by the township and pursuant to Section 519.12 of the Ohio Revised Code. And that tonight's hearing complies with this requirement.

Mr. Matthews further explained that at the conclusion of tonight's presentation and public comments, the hearing will be continued until 11/13/25 @ 7:00 p.m. at which time the Zoning Commission will reconvene to read the Licking County Planning Commission's non-binding recommendation and render a vote to either accept the document and move it on to the Licking Township Trustees for consideration OR not accept the document and make necessary corrections/edits/etc.

Mrs. Lynch read the legal notice advertising the hearing and regular meeting.

Mrs. Lynch stated that the MUOD was posted for public view on the LTWP Website on 9-26-25; at the Hebron USPS on 10-14-25 (due to Columbus Day); and the Jacksontown USPS on 10-14-25 (due to Columbus Day). Mrs. Lynch said that the public document was removed without permission from the Jacksontown USPS on 10-17-25 and was not replaced.

Mrs. Lynch indicated having received no correspondence regarding the hearing.

Mr. Matthews turned the hearing over to Mr. Ben Harder, Planner, Crossroads Community Planning. Mr. Harder led a presentation which explained what and how a zoning overlay is/works. Mr. Harder led a power point presentation outlining the Mixed Use Overlay District being proposed by the LTZC. Throughout the presentation the public interacted with the ZC and Consultant as follows:

Ms. Clark inquired about the red portions located on the map that was included in the MUOD document. The ZC allowed members of the audience to review a larger map provided by Ms. Latham which offered a better visual concerning the areas that the MUOD addresses. Mr. Wise inquired as to why several large properties situated to the west of Area A (on the map) such as Barton, Cooper, & Parish properties were not considered in the MUOD? A discussion took place. Mr. Harder explained that the catalyst initiating the MUOD was based on a large developer seeking to develop areas south of Cristland Hill around the lakefront. Mr. Matthews explained that this overlay may be the 1<sup>st</sup> of several overlays in the township. Ms. Latham also said that it was explained that some of the development will not happen until water comes to these areas. Mr. Wise inquired if all the landowners falling within the MUOD have been contacted. Mr. Harder responded that they have not as the LTWP Zoning Resolution pertaining to their property is still in effect. The overlay is simply a proactive measure should the property owner wish to sell their land to a developer or be approached by a buyer wishing to develop the land. Mr. Ungerman explained the ORC pertaining to notification of landowners based on the number of parcels being impacted by this specific overlay district and that this overlay did not require individual property owner notification. Mr. Wise asked if the MUOD re-zones the property? Mr. Harder explained that it does only if the landowner pulls down the “cloud”. Mr. Harder again explained how an overlay zoning district functions. Ms. Clark inquired about how to interpret pages 19-23 of the document specific to the key code. Mr. Harder explained the chart and coding.

Mr. Harder concluded the power point presentation and asked for questions in public comment.

#### Public Comment:

Dale Wise – 538 Avon Place – asked the following:

- 1) Sub Area “D” – proximity to shoreline why is there no minimum tract size?

Response: *Mr. Harder - do not want to discourage development due to lot size, goal is to be walkable and accessible area. Mr. Harder provided an example which illustrated that the township sets the requirements that the developer cannot go outside of. Mr. Matthews added that the buildings would be offset and staggered.*

- 2) If under 25 acres there is an ability to by-pass the 20% open space requirement. A creative developer could side-step this.

Response: *Mr. Harder agreed with Mr. Wise and said that we do not want this. Mr. Harder stated that the township will add a correction to the document and thanked Mr. Wise for identifying this in the document. Mr. Matthews concurred with Mr. Harder and noted the change.*

- 3) Concerned with the potential for heightened density & referenced 11.03.D.3. Mr. Wise asked if a 25 acre tract could be 50 units no matter the type of housing such as single family , studio, etc. ?

Response: *Mr. Harder said yes it has the potential for heightened density which is expected when water comes to that area. Mr. Harder explained 11.03.D.2. Mr. Harder asked Mr. Wise if he was concerned with heightened density. Mr. Wise said yes. Mr. Matthews addressed page 14 of the document, 11.03.D.1. A discussion took place regarding 2 dwelling units max per tract.*

- 4) Concerned with accessory building unit – are these attached to the dwelling – could this be a duplex? Mr. Wise referenced 11.05.F.3.

Response: *Mr. Harder said no. These are more like a “mother-in-law suite” or similar accessory building unit. An accessory building has to be an accessory to the primary dwelling. Mr. Wise said that the document could be interpreted differently and could be developed as a duplex which he said would be a creative way for a developer to add density without penalty. A discussion took place regarding the matter including a 1000 sq. foot minimum. Mr. Harder concluded that the township would need to add language to clarify 11.05.F.3 and definitions to eliminate the possibility of rentals/duplexes. Mr. Wise said that if not, this has the potential to raise the density quite a bit in those areas and the net area density becomes 2/10 of an acre per dwelling which could result in even more of an increase in variances. Mr. Wise stressed that high density = increased variances which is not ideal.*

5) What is the philosophy for the minimum dwelling Size for a single-family home?

Response: *Mr. Harder said that it is not recommended nor does the township want to preclude a developer for minimum square footage size. Mr. Wise said that a township needs to put in a minimum square footage size. Mr. Wise asked why there is not a minimum sq. ft identified for a single family dwelling? Mr. Harder said that LTWP does not want to drive that. That if a developer wishes to propose a 600' sq. ft house to the LCPC then it becomes the LCPC role to discourage that. Mr. Wise disagreed and said that there should be a minimum of 1000 sq. ft requirement for single family dwellings.*

6) Appears a contradiction regarding accessory structures. Mr. Wise cited 11.05.L.3 & 11.05.L.4. A discussion took place.

Response: *Mr. Harder said that the township will need to remove accessory structure short term rentals language.*

7) Why the urgency for heightened density?

Response: *Mr. Harder said that the mixed use makes the development more meaningful and family friendly while holding a township expectation instead of being developer driven. Mr. Matthews concurred and said that there are developers looking at developing those areas and it allows the township to proactively decide what the area is to look like rather than being driven by a developer. Mr. Ungerman stated that the LTWP Trustees were concerned with annexation and that the township has several large tracts of land that are attractive to developers and that if they can't develop them, they could go to the other municipalities and drive them to annex the township. Mr. Harder concurred and said that it helps establish development standards; fight municipal annexation interest; and allows the township to be proactive and purposeful as it relates to zoning.*

8) Why the large tracts of land that are too far away from annexation risk? Why not address the border properties?

Response: *Mr. Matthews said that the residential tracts are vulnerable and that we do need to look at the borders in the future however the township started with the areas in which potential developers were seeking to purchase and develop. Mr. Matthews identified the potential future need for an Entertainment District (ex. Legend Valley) and Education District (ex. Dawes Arboretum). Mr. Matthews said the area around Buckeye Lake was chosen 1<sup>st</sup> for an overlay however there's a potential for several other overlays. Mr. Ungerman reiterated that it is best for a township to establish the zoning 1<sup>st</sup> instead of letting a developer dictate what is going to be built. Mr. Harder concurred and said that not having an overlay favors the developer not the community. Mr. Harder said the township should drive the zoning not be driven by the developer. Mr. Matthews also mentioned that these areas may include JEDDs or NCAs.*

Mr. Matthews and Mr. Harder thanked Mr. Wise for his observations, questions, and suggestions.

There was no other public comment.

Mr. Matthews explained to the public that the hearing would be continued until 11/13/25 at 7:00 p.m. due to not having the finalized non-binding recommendation from the LCPC for review for tonight's hearing. Mrs. Lynch confirmed that this continuance has already been advertised.

The Hearing was concluded and the ZC suspended the meeting at 8:14 p.m. for a 10 minute break. Mr. Matthews excused those members of the public who did not wish to attend the regular business meeting.

Mr. Matthews reconvened the meeting at 8:25 p.m.

Commission Members present at roll call: Ms. Latham; Mr. Matthews; Mr. Powell; Mr. Ungerman  
Other present: Ben Harder; Andrea Lynch; Matt Jones.

Minutes from 10/02/25 meeting were read with 1 addition noted (add 10/16/25 for meeting cancellation)

. Mr. Powell made a motion to approve the minutes with 1 noted addition.

Mr. Ungerman seconded the motion.

Roll Call: 4 ayes

### **Correspondence:**

- 1) Mr. Matthews presented a copy of the LCPC's Staff Report received via email on 10/23/25 for Case 15:Z-25-21 Licking Township Zoning Resolution – Text Amendment to add Article 11: Mixed Use Overlay District. Mr. Matthews indicated the LCPC hearing will be held on Monday, October 27, 2025 and he plans to attend. A discussion took place regarding the Staff Report and the LCPC staff recommendation #1 & #2 and if the ZC wished to respond. Mr. Harder said that the language we use has been vetted previously and does not necessarily see the need to have vetted through the LCPO. Mr. Ungerman said that it might be worth having the LCPO weigh in on mobile homes. Mr. Harder said that if the overlay allows single family homes, then mobile homes have to be allowed. The ZC concurred that the ZC should thank the LCPC for the Staff Report and await the final draft of the non-binding recommendation.

Mr. Harder and ZC members had a discussion regarding the minor edits discussed during the hearing. The ZC agreed on the following: 1) add clarifying language to ensure that for 25 acres or less developers could not split down the lots to divert the Sub Area D requirements and the need for developers to comply with the regulations. 2) resolve conflicting language pertinent to short term rentals 11.05.L a and 11.05.L.4b. Mrs. Lynch inquired if any of the minor edits were required to be provided to the LCPC for their hearing on 10/27/25. Mr. Harder said no.

- 2) Mrs. Lynch presented a text amendment application from applicant J Brand Investments submitted by the Law Office of W. Douglas Lowe for parcel ID#041-119970.00.000 known as 9334 Jacksontown Road, Jacksontown, OH 43030. Mrs. Lynch explained that the text amendment application was sent to Mr. Moraine by Attorney Lowe electronically and that the text amendment fee has been received. She further said that the ZC is to review the application for “completeness” and if all areas are “complete”, then the next step would be to vote to accept the application as presented and send to the LCPC for a non-binding recommendation and begin the text amendment review and hearing process. A lengthy discussion took place regarding the application submitted pertinent to if the application was complete. Mr. Ungerman said that the applicant failed to complete Section A: Text Amendment Change #1D ..., *“Please cite any references and/or research used to develop the proposed text and if possible include copies of said materials”*. The ZC also indicating that the text amendment proposed did not include definitions for text being added (ex. Tractor trailer) and did not meet Section A: Text Amendment Change #1D of the application asking for..., *“any other information that would provide the LCPC staff and the Zoning Commission Board as to the issued involved”* sufficiently.

Ms. Latham made a motion that the Licking Township Zoning Commission not accept the text amendment application as presented.

Mr. Powell seconded the motion.

Roll Call: (Mrs. Lynch clarified prior to roll call that a “yes” vote indicates that the voter is in agreement with the motion which is to NOT accept the application as presented)

Mr. Ungerman – Yes, in agreement to not accept the application as presented

Mr. Powell – Yes, in agreement to not accept the application as presented

Mr. Matthews – Yes, in agreement to not accept the application as presented

Mr. Latham – Yes, in agreement to not accept the application as presented

Mr. Matthews will draft an email to Attorney Lowe explaining the application was not accepted as presented due to portions of the application being considered incomplete by the ZC and will provide Attorney Lowe with the areas needing completed/more information.

Mr. Ungerman said that the current “Application for Zoning Amendment Zoning” would benefit from updates. The ZC concurred. Mrs. Lynch will review and look at other township’s applications for text amendments and zoning map changes and present at a future meeting.

- 3) Mr. Matthews reported the LTWP Trustees response to the email he drafted requesting assistance in the re-writing of the LTWP Zoning Resolution. Mr. Matthews said that that Trustees did not support hiring a vendor at this time however may consider if there are future portions they need assistance with. Mr. Matthews said that the ZC will continue their work on “Package #2” and “Package #3”.

***Old Business:***

- Mr. Matthews reminded the members that Vice Chair Powell is moving out of state and will resign in November from the ZC. Mr. Powell confirmed that his last date on the ZC would be 11/13/25. Mr. Matthews solicited a vice chair to fill the role through 12/31/25. Mr. Ungerman said that he would still consider stepping into the role. A discussion took place.

Mr. Powell made a motion that Max Ungerman serve as the LTZC Vice Chairman for the period of 11/13/25-12/31/25.

Ms. Latham seconded the motion.

Roll Call: Matthews, yes; Latham, yes; Powell, yes; Ungerman, yes.

***New Business:***

- Mr. Matthews reminded the ZC of the hearing continuance to be held on 11/13/25. Mr. Ungerman made a motion the LTZC continue the public hearing on 11/13/25 @ 7:00 p.m. for the mixed use overlay district with regular business meeting to follow. Mr. Powell seconded the motion. Roll Call: 4 ayes

***Public Comment:*** none

Mr. Ungerman moved to adjourn the meeting @ 9:30 p.m.

Ms. Latham seconded the motion.

Roll Call: 4 ayes

Minutes approved by:

---

Meeting Minutes recorded by Andrea M. Lynch, Zoning Clerk – 10/23/25