



**Summit County Planning Commission  
(SCPC) Thursday, June 30, 2022 - 3:00 p.m.**  
County of Summit, County Council Chambers  
175 South Main Street, 7<sup>th</sup> Floor, Akron, Ohio

**Meeting Agenda**

- A. Call to Order
- B. Roll Call
- C. Approval of the May 23, 2022, SCPC Minutes
- D. Business Items

**Chair Mavrides  
Tubbs  
Chair Mavrides  
Knittel**

**Old Business**

**Item # 1 - Springfield Township – Text Amendment** - From O-R to I-1 this will allow for offices or research facilities in the I-1 district. The change will eliminate the need for variances for the existing businesses as they expand. This will allow the Zoning Department to require more stringent enforcement of screening and landscaping requirements.

**New Business**

**Item # 1 - Sagamore Hills Township – Zoning Text Amendment** - To revise section 3.6 garages on page 3-14 (Residential District) of our zoning resolution

**Item # 2 – Sagamore Hills Township – Zoning Text Amendment** - To revise Section Fourteen (Planned Unit Development) PUD Boundary Setback .

- |    |                                  |                       |
|----|----------------------------------|-----------------------|
| E. | Report from Assistant Director   | <b>Tubbs</b>          |
| F. | Comments from Public             | <b>Chair Mavrides</b> |
| G. | Comments from Commission Members | <b>Chair Mavrides</b> |
| H. | Other                            |                       |
|    | 1. Legal Update                  | <b>Matz</b>           |
| I. | Adjournment                      | <b>Chair Mavrides</b> |



**Summit County Planning Commission (SCPC)**

Thursday, May 26, 2022 - 3:00 p.m.  
 County of Summit, County Council Chambers  
 175 South Main Street, 7<sup>th</sup> Floor, Akron, Ohio

**Meeting Agenda**

A. Call to Order

**Chair Mavrides**

*Allen Mavrides* called the meeting to order on **Thursday, May 26, 2022 at 3:00 pm** in the County of Summit Council Chambers, 175 South Main Street, 7<sup>th</sup> Floor, Akron Ohio 44308. A roll call was conducted by *Dennis Tubbs* the attending members constituted a quorum.

B. Roll Call

SCPC Member	Present
Beckham, George	X
Kline, David	X
Mavrides, Allen	X
Reville, Rich	X
Segedy, Jason	X
Snell, Jeff	X
Stoiber, Dennis	X
Terry, Robert	X
<i>Open Seat</i>	
<i>Open Seat</i>	
<i>Open Seat</i>	

C. Approval of the March 31, 2022 SCPC Minutes  
 SCPC Action: Approval

**Chair Mavrides**

SCPC Member	Motion	Second	Yea	Nay	Abstain
Beckham, George		X	X		
Kline, David			X		
Mavrides, Allen			X		
Reville, Rich			X		
Segedy, Jason			X		
Snell, Jeff	X		X		
Stoiber, Dennis			X		
Terry, Robert			X		
Open Seat					
Open Seat					
Open Seat					

**Motion**

Jeff Snell made a motion to approve the March 31, 2022 SCPC meeting minutes and it was seconded by George Beckham, the motion passed with no abstentions. Meeting minutes for March 31, 2022 are approved as submitted.

**D. Business Items**

**Knittel**

**Item #8 Lugging**

Email was sent out to all members, though that one of the items were table initially when agenda was sent out then thought that both items were tabled when the agenda was sent.

**Motion**

Motion made by Chair Mavrides to amend the agenda and add item #8 Section 29 Lighting to the agenda for May 26, 2022 SCPC meeting minutes

Motion to amend and approve by Allen Mavrides and it was seconded by Jason Segedy, the motion passed with no abstentions.

SCPC Member	Motion	Second	Yea	Nay	Abstain
Beckham, George			X		
Kline, David			X		
Mavrides, Allen	X		X		
Reville, Rich			X		
Segedy, Jason		X	X		
Snell, Jeff			X		
Stoiber, Dennis			X		
Terry, Robert			X		
Open Seat					

**Old Business**

- Item #1 Riparian Variance – 3649 W. Galloway Dr – Richfield township – A variance from the Riparian Ordinance proposed the construction of a home pool in the backyard for health reasons. Riparian set back present as it was previously heard at the March 31, 2022 meeting and was tabled for more discussion. Staff recommendations follows the Summit County small water conservation which is the disapproval of Riparian request. Lighthouse Pools Jeff Krist was present representing homeowners Mr. and Mrs. Key 3649 W. Galloway Dr – Richfield township as they could not be present. States that Sasha was not present and did not see the location of where the pool was to be placed. They stated that they were not at the site when the first discussion of construction of pool is supposed to be. What changes have become present from last discussion to today? Jeff Krist stated that the contractor was not present to see the location of the pool. SCPC member stated that the the slope of the location of where the pool is to be located is stated to be at 33% slope which is a steeper slope which was discussed. Jeff Krist stated that the slope of the pool was going to be 20 feet away from where the installation of the pool would be and it would not be on the edge of the slope. States that the installation and location of the pool will require a small retaining wall about 2 feet tall as the pool has to be dug in slightly, the pool will need to be dug into higher ground per Jeff Krist-Lighthouse Pools. The contractor was asked by SCPC members to do more site inspection as they were questions about the steeply sloped area.

SCPC Chair Mavrides asked for more time to review new findings before decision made.

Finding by Soil and Water inspector:

Determined its not a discardment at the site it was found in the area it wasn't a stone wall it was a regular slope, the client had a pretty big ravin. What was also found was that the trees are at a pistol grip meaning that the trees are not coming out straight they are coming out in an angle which is an indicator that the trees are slipping and they are correcting by bending, its not severe but it is happening, meaning that the creek is eating away at the toe of the slope.

Soil and Water states that if the clients install the pool it may be ok for about 15-20 years but the weight of the pool and the slope will be very costly and there will be no resolution for whomever owns the property in the future and there will be no solution to the future issues. The Soil and Water department states that on the ordinances this is not a permissible use and they do not recommend installation.

Soil and Water recommends that the SCPC has a hold harmless clause as they feel as though the client will be looking for someone to blame. The other issues are sun and the trees are they are going to cut the trees down to get sun as this is also not permissible under the Riparian Variance ordinance.

Soil and Water reports water measurements of eight (8) pounds per gallon of water, the location of the pool area where the homeowner would like to build is 20 to 30 feet from the slope and treelines.

It is asked if the homeowner would do a geographical report, they will ask the homeowners.

It is asked that if the SCPC would like to table to build until the contractor talks to the homeowner about doing a geographical reports, but if it found that the build would be a liability to the homeowners then the contractor would like to take to variance off the table and speak to the homeowners about the findings.

SCPC Member	Motion	Second	Yea	Nay	Abstain
Beckham, George		X	X		
Kline, David			X		
Mavrides, Allen			X		
Reville, Rich			X		
Segedy, Jason			X		
Snell, Jeff	X		X		
Stoiber, Dennis			X		
Terry, Robert			X		
Open Seat					
Open Seat					
Open Seat					

**Motion**

*Jeff Snell* made a motion to take Old Business Item#1 off the table for the purpose of conducting a geological survey and it was seconded by *George Beckham* the motion passed with 0 abstentions.

***Open Discussion from Engineer and the Public:***

Zoning Inspector Patricia Ryan Richfield Township states that they would like to table this item as there are a lot of ravines and slippage.

County Engineer Joe Paradise would also like to request that the geotechnical report detail solutions as the ravine goes down and out. This is requested so there are no future issues should the build receive approval.

If a geotechnical reports is completed they would like a real-person report from whom someone actually identifies and prepares soluitions.

The motion for Item#1 Old Business to table for the purpose of conducting a geological survey was approved with no abstentions.

2. Rezoning – Springfield Township – From O-R to I-1 this will allow for offices or research facilities in the I-1 district.

The change will eliminate the need for variances for the existing businesses as they expand. This will allow the Zoning Department to require more stringent enforcement of screening and landscaping requirements.

SCPC Member	Motion	Second	Yea	Nay	Abstain
Beckham, George			X		
Kline, David			X		
Mavrides, Allen	X		X		
Reville, Rich			X		
Segedy, Jason		X	X		
Snell, Jeff			X		
Stoiber, Dennis			X		
Terry, Robert			X		
Open Seat					
Open Seat					
Open Seat					

The applicant nor Springfield township were present in reference to this item, Chair Mavrides moves to table the item as this is the third (2<sup>nd</sup>) time that the applicant nor Springfield township were not present.

**Motion**

*Allen Mavrides* made a motion to move the motion for Item#2 Rezoning to end of new business to give the applicant and Springfield township time to appear at meeting motioned that the item be moved to the end of the agenda and also if the applicant or Springfield township not appear to the meeting to table it so that there will be no vote for the second time at end of meeting it was seconded by *Jason Segedy* the motion passed with 0 abstentions.

**New Business**

**1. Item # 1 - Pamer Estate – Lot Split and Variance – Coventry Township**

- a. **Frontage Variance – Coventry Township** – Applicant is requesting a variance from Subdivision Regulation 1105.05 (e) Access to Public Streets “Unless otherwise permitted herein, the subdividing of land whether as a Major or Minor Subdivisions, shall provide each lot with a minimum of thirty (30) feet of continuous frontage on a dedicated Street. Access to public streets shall comply with the Access Management Manuel.” The applicant is proposing to split a parcel into three parcels, with two parcels having no frontage on a dedicated street.
- b. **Lot Split – Coventry Township** – The Applicant is requesting to split parcel 1909349 into three lots, to split a 7.3 parcel to 2.85 acres, 2.48 acres and 1.94 acres.

The variance request is that the two parcels to be exempt from subdividing of land (set plans included in packet).

***Questions in reference to variance:***

On the one public street, Hilltop Drive is the north to south

This street is a huge flaglot to the lot.

Coventry Township was present at the meeting to explain that there is a home that shares the driveway of this lot.

***Open Discussion from the Public:***

Bishop Rod Pamer of Apostolic Church of Barberton was present in reference to the variance of the property in question. States that the church bought the property in 1967 and built the first building in 1972 by his father who was the Senior Pastor at the time and then built a house in 1996 which is the home adjoining the property in question.

The reasoning for the variance was that the property owner passed in October 2021, and it was inherited by the executors (the children). They decided as a family to divided the 7.3 acres into 3 with the center lot for original home that is on the property (sold to neice and her husband) a granddaughter who would like to build a home as well on that lot and the other two lots they would like to build two homes on each lot for other family members. While it is a private drive it is well maintained, \$44K was paid by the family to repave the drive which makes it look like a street.

The drive that is in question and the lots in question are current being used by community which make it look like a public street, but it is a private drive that are to be used by persons in that private sector.

Letters of recommendation on file and received to the Chair Mavrides from:

- Board of Zoning of Coventry
- Coventry Police Department
- Summit County Sheriff's Department

County Engineer had no comment at this time.

Steve Pernesky representative from Buckingham, Doolittle & Burroughs lawfirm, states would like to discuss legal issues of this variance. Went over the details of the estate and who utilizes the properties.

Atty Pernesky provided an Agreement to Provide Reciprocal Easement which means that in case of an emergency the police/fire/emergency response would not have any issues finding all parties. Should this be approved all parties will go into a provide easement agreement where all parties are liable for the cost of repair and will have access to that drive.

He spoke in reference to a familiar parcel property in Green that has the same type of easement agreement in place with Don Schultz #54237590 (Driveway easement) at this time there was a stream that the drive had to run over and there was no issue with splitting the lot. He states that there is already a family member living on the this parcel and any future use should not be an issue.

The documents provided by the planning department was with the burden fire and safety which is stated to not pose an issue.

Atty Pernesky is asking on behalf of the applicant request to approve the variance and allow the lot splits and allow the lots to be created without the frontage and will welcome conditioning on the easement of access.

***Questions:***

Q: If the 2 homes are built how many total parties would there be?

A: Atty Pernesky states, All parties of the Pamer family has signed the Agreement to Provide Reciprocal Easement

Q: Does the conditions of the easement link to the property deed, if the house changed hands in the future or would it be a change of hand for the next owner?

A: Atty Pernesky states, It would be recorded at any time ownership changes hand.

Q: Could you please explain the 30 feet of drive? Does the neighbor on this lot still utilize this entrance?

A: Atty Pernesky stated, Neighbors Mr. Martin and Mr. Babbich both have frontage and access to the drive currently as well as the owners of the parcel. Mr. Babbich currently does not use the drive as he has his own frontage.

***Concerns:***

If this variance is approved, one of the conditions that the planning commission would like to see, if more house pop up in years time on this parcel, that the variance becomes a public road as access does not remain a private road any longer.

Chair Mavrides addressed the Commission states that the township has already approved this and as long as we as the Commission has nothing to do with this. If it is approved he would like to see any subcontract included in there as we are just looking at a plan what the family decides is strictly up to them.

The family has been in close contact with Craig Davis Summit County Health Department in reference to the septic system, also has a report from Todd Houser.

Joe Paradise County Engineer, agreed with Mr. Snell, states that he also has concerns as he feels as though if the church was offered funds they would sell as then this parcel would populate and the building of more homes would become an issue.

He states that he would prefer to see a public roadway instead of the splitting of the lots.

Stephen Knittle states, it was stated that there is also other Riparian setbacks due to slope on this property as there is an additional 25 to 75 feet in the rear of the home by the septic that is located on the property (Stephanie Diebold reported).

There would be no issues with the development of the lot as long as they stay well away from the Riparian setback.

At this time the Riparian setback does not come into play until a site plan of development is in place for the variance.

Q: @ SKnittle: From a strictly planning theory standpoint, what are the problems that having a provision in our development code that prevents having isolated lots that do not open on a public street? What problems are we trying to avoid by having that provision?

A: Stephen Knittle reports, the main issue is ease of access for property owners, neighbors, and first responders. It would have to come to the owners and the neighbors agreeing to the provision set in place.

If the current variance be granted and a future lot split take place it would have to be brought upon the commission for approval, but at this time the variance is about ***Item # 1 - Pamer Estate – Lot Split and Variance – Coventry Township.***



1a.  
SCPC Action:

SCPC Member	Motion	Second	Yea	Nay	Abstain
Beckham, George					X
Kline, David	X		X		
Mavrides, Allen			X		
Reville, Rich				X	
Segedy, Jason		X	X		
Snell, Jeff				X	
Stoiber, Dennis				X	
Terry, Robert			X		
Open Seat					
Open Seat					
Open Seat					

**Motion**

*David Kline* made a motion to approve the **Pamer Estate – Lot Split and Variance – Coventry Township** and it was seconded by *Jason Segedy* the motion passed with 1 abstentions.

1b.  
SCPC Action:

SCPC Member	Motion	Second	Yea	Nay	Abstain
Beckham, George					X
Kline, David	X		X		
Mavrides, Allen		X	X		
Reville, Rich			X		
Segedy, Jason			X		
Snell, Jeff			X		
Stoiber, Dennis			X		
Terry, Robert			X		
Open Seat					
Open Seat					
Open Seat					

**Motion**

*David Kline* made a motion to approve the **Pamer Estate – Lot Split and Variance** and it was seconded by *Allen Mavrides* the motion passed with 1 abstentions.

**Item # 2 – Heritage Centre Replat – Copley Township** – Creating Sublot A-R3 (2.3716 acres) and A-R4 (1.1632 acres) from Sublot A-R2.

SCPC ACTION:

SCPC Member	Motion	Second	Yea	Nay	Abstain
Beckham, George			X		
Kline, David			X		
Mavrides, Allen			X		
Reville, Rich			X		
Segedy, Jason	X		X		
Snell, Jeff			X		
Stoiber, Dennis			X		
Terry, Robert		X	X		
Open Seat					
Open Seat					
Open Seat					

**Motion**

*Jason Segedy* made a motion to approve the **Heritage Centre Replat – Copley Township** and it was seconded by *Robert Terry* the motion passed with 0 abstentions.

**Item # 3 – Map Amendment – Heritage Centre - Copley Township** - Rezone 2.3716 Acres of Parcel 1702658 Land Area: 3.53 Acres Current Zoning: PDD-Business/Office/Community, Regional, Convenience Retail, Personal Services Proposed Zoning: PDD-Residential High Density 22 Units Per Acres

SCPC Action:

SCPC Member	Motion	Second	Yea	Nay	Abstain
Beckham, George			X		
Kline, David		X	X		
Mavrides, Allen			X		
Reville, Rich			X		
Segedy, Jason			X		
Snell, Jeff			X		
Stoiber, Dennis	X		X		
Terry, Robert			X		
Open Seat					
Open Seat					
Open Seat					

**Motion**

*Dennis Stoiber* made a motion to approve the **Map Amendment – Heritage Centre- Copley Township** and it was seconded by *David Kline* the motion passed with 0 abstentions.

**Item # 4 – Text Amendment – Northfield Center Township – Performance Bonds Chapter 530 – Proposal to add new definition of Performance Bond, and to add language to Chapter 530 “Board of Zoning Appeals” about Performance Bonds.**

SCPC Action:

SCPC Member	Motion	Second	Yea	Nay	Abstain
Beckham, George			X		
Kline, David	X		X		
Mavrides, Allen			X		
Reville, Rich					X
Segedy, Jason		X	X		
Snell, Jeff			X		
Stoiber, Dennis			X		
Terry, Robert			X		
Open Seat					
Open Seat					
Open Seat					

**Motion**

*David Kline* made a motion to approve the **Text Amendment – Northfield Center Township** and it was seconded by *Jason Segedy* the motion passed with 1 abstentions.

**Item # 5 – Text Amendment – Northfield Center Township – Chapter 351 Business-Residential District –**

Proposal to add new chapter, Chapter 351 Business-Residential District, to the Northfield Center Township Zoning Resolution. To provide a Business-Residential District (B-R) that allows professional, administrative, and executive offices that are compatible with residential uses, and which serve as transitional areas between more intensive land uses such as major thoroughfares and/or commercial districts, and less intensive uses such as single-family residential developments.

SCPC Action:

SCPC Member	Motion	Second	Yea	Nay	Abstain
Beckham, George			X		
Kline, David			X		
Mavrides, Allen			X		
Reville, Rich					X
Segedy, Jason		X	X		
Snell, Jeff			X		
Stoiber, Dennis	X		X		
Terry, Robert			X		
Open Seat					
Open Seat					
Open Seat					

**Motion**

*Dennis Stoiber* made a motion to approve the **Text Amendment – Northfield Center Township** and it was seconded by *Jason Segedy* the motion passed with 1 abstentions.

**Item # 6 – Text Amendment – Twinsburg Township – Chapter 12 Interchange Mixed Use District-** proposal to add certain single family residential uses as permitted uses in the Interchange Mixed Use (IMU) District.

SCPC Action:

<b>SCPC Member</b>	<b>Motion</b>	<b>Second</b>	<b>Yea</b>	<b>Nay</b>	<b>Abstain</b>
Beckham, George			X		
Kline, David			X		
Mavrides, Allen			X		
Reville, Rich			X		
Segedy, Jason			X		
Snell, Jeff		X	X		
Stoiber, Dennis	X		X		
Terry, Robert			X		
Open Seat					
Open Seat					
Open Seat					

**Motion**

*Dennis Stoiber* made a motion to approve the **Text Amendment – Twinsburg Township – Chapter 12 Interchange Mixed Use District** and it was seconded by *Jeff Snell* the motion passed with 0 abstentions.

**Item # 7 – Kings Creek Riparian Variance – Richfield Township** – The applicant is requesting a variance to allow for up to 44 feet of encroachment, ( less than 0.25 acres) for the construction of a house.

SCPC Action:

<b>SCPC Member</b>	<b>Motion</b>	<b>Second</b>	<b>Yea</b>	<b>Nay</b>	<b>Abstain</b>
Beckham, George			X		
Kline, David			X		
Mavrides, Allen			X		
Reville, Rich			X		
Segedy, Jason	X		X		
Snell, Jeff			X		
Stoiber, Dennis		X	X		
Terry, Robert			X		
Open Seat					
Open Seat					
Open Seat					

**Motion**

Jason Segedy made a motion to table upon applicants request the **Kings Creek Riparian Variance – Richfield Township** and it was seconded by *Dennis Stoiber* the motion passed with 0 abstentions.

**\*\*Comments:**

*Applicant made a request for table, to then look at wetlands on the site in question upon returning to the planning commission.*

**Item # 8 – Text Amendment – Section 29 Lighting– Coventry Township**

Proposal to amendment of Section 29 Lighting to regulate outdoor lighting in order to reduce or prevent light pollution and to minimize lighting impacts on surrounding properties.

SCPC Action:

SCPC Member	Motion	Second	Yea	Nay	Abstain
Beckham, George					X
Kline, David			X		
Mavrides, Allen			X		
Reville, Rich			X		
Segedy, Jason			X		
Snell, Jeff			X		
Stoiber, Dennis		X	X		
Terry, Robert	X		X		
Open Seat					
Open Seat					
Open Seat					

**Motion**

Robert Terry made a motion to approve the **Text Amendment – Section 29 Lighting– Coventry Township** with due consideration to Summit County Engineers comments and it was seconded by *Dennis Stoiber* the motion passed with 1 abstentions.

**\*\*Comments:**

*SCE Joe Paradise, to add language that the section is for business/commercial business only.*

- E. Report from Assistant Director **Dennis Tubbs**
- F. Comments from Public **Chair Mavrides**  
  - No comments from the Public*
- G. Comments from Commission Members **Chair Mavrides**  
  - No comments from Commission Members*
- H. Other **Matz**
  - 1. Legal Update **Matz**  
    - No Legal Update*
- I. Adjournment **Chair Mavrides**

SCPC Action: Approval to Adjourn

SCPC Member	Motion	Second	Yea	Nay	Abstain
Beckham, George			X		
Kline, David			X		
Mavrides, Allen			X		
Reville, Rich			X		
Segedy, Jason			X		
Snell, Jeff		X	X		
Stoiber, Dennis	X		X		
Terry, Robert			X		
Open Seat					
Open Seat					
Open Seat					

**Motion**

*Dennis Stoiber* made a motion to adjourn, and it was seconded by *Jeff Snell* the motion passed to adjourn meeting with 0 abstentions.

*These minutes were prepared by Stephen Knittle and represent the writer's best recollection of the items discussed.*

*Recorded by: Tazena Long, Administrative Assistant  
 June 23, 2022*



Planning Commission  
**Zoning Map Amendment**  
 O-R to I-1  
 Springfield Township

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

Proposal: To rezone parcels 51-02670, 51-06600, 51-09804, 51-09833, 51-02273, 51-02281, 51-02280, 51-02275, 51-02276, 51-08482, 51-08483, and 51-03302 from O-R to I-1. This would allow for offices or research facilities in the I-1 district. The change will eliminate the need for variances for the existing businesses as they expand. This will allow the Zoning Department to require more stringent enforcement of screening and landscaping requirements.

Staff recommends APPROVAL

<b>Meeting:</b>	June 30, 2022	<b>Proposed Zoning:</b>	I-1
<b>Item No.:</b>	Old Business 1	<b>Council Dist.:</b>	District 8
<b>Current Zoning:</b>	O-R	<b>Processor:</b>	Stephen Knittel

**Parcel Number:** 51-02670, 51-06600, 51-09804, 51-09833, 51-02273, 51-02281, 51-02280, 51-02275, 51-02276, 51-08482, 51-08483, and 51-03302

**Location:** Located on Massillon Rd east of Boyer Pkwy.

**Proposal:** To rezone parcels 51-02670, 51-06600, 51-09801, 51-09833, 51-02273, 51-02281, 51-02280, 51-02275, 51-02276, 51-08482, 51-08483, and 51-03302 from O-R to I-1.

Allen Swift: *“As Zoning Administrator, I recommend the Board pass a resolution to change the following parcels.*

*51-02670, 51-06600, [51-09804], 51-09833, 51-02273, 51-02281, 51-02280, 51-02275, 51-02276, 51-08482, 51-08483, and 51-03302.*

*From O-R (Office-Research) to I-1(Light Industrial).*

*When this district was first established, it was hoped that new professional offices/research facilities would be encouraged to locate there. This has not happened, and the nature of the district has continued to be more industrial with businesses like Ohio Edison, Pence Brothers and Treno, LLC occupying the majority of the district. The I-1 district is established to accommodate industrial uses in the fields of repair, storage, manufacturing, processing, wholesaling, and distribution, free from encroachment of residential, retail, and institutional uses. The uses allowed are those that because of their normally unobjectionable characteristics can be in proximity to residential districts. The proposed change will still allow for offices or research facilities in the I-1 district. The change will eliminate the need for variances for the existing businesses as they expand. This will allow the Zoning Department to require more stringent enforcement of screening and landscaping requirements.”*

---

**Zoning:**

*See attachments for zoning maps.*

<b>Direction</b>	<b>Zoning</b>	<b>Land Use</b>	<b>Jurisdiction</b>
North	R-2	Residential	Springfield Township
East	R-2	Residential	Springfield Township
South	R-2	Residential	Springfield Township
West	PIPD	Planned Industrial Park	Springfield Township

**Current Zoning:** From Springfield Township’s Zoning Resolution, provided on Springfield Township’s website: <https://www.springfieldtownship.us/>

**O-R - Office and Research Park District**

The Office and Research Park District (O-R) is established to provide for areas of the township conducive to the development and protection of modern administrative facilities and research institutions that are office-like in physical appearance and service requirements with allowance for limited light industrial uses that have similar operational characteristics. The regulations of the O-R District are designed to encourage new office/light industrial subdivisions with new streets to minimize curb cuts on existing public streets.

**Proposed Zoning:**

**I-1 - Light Industrial**

The Light Industrial District (I-1) is established to accommodate industrial uses in the fields of repair, storage, manufacturing, processing, wholesaling, and distribution, free from encroachment of residential, retail, and institutional uses. The uses allowed are those that because of their normally unobjectionable characteristics can be in relatively close proximity to residential districts.



(B) **PERMITTED USE TABLE**

<b>TABLE 5.03-A: PERMITTED USE TABLE</b>											
<b>PERMITTED USES</b> P = Permitted Use PS = Permitted with Additional Use-Specific Standards C = Conditional Use Blank Cell = Prohibited	<b>RESIDENTIAL ZONING DISTRICTS</b>				<b>NONRESIDENTIAL ZONING DISTRICTS</b>						<b>USE-SPECIFIC STANDARDS</b>  SEE SECTION:
	OC	R-1	R-2	R-3	C-1	C-2	C-3	OR	I-1	I-2	
	<b>AGRICULTURAL USES</b>										
Agricultural uses	PS	PS	PS	PS	PS	PS	PS	PS	PS	PS	Section 5.04(A)
Nurseries or greenhouses	PS	PS	PS	PS		P	P		P	P	Section 5.04(B)
<b>RESIDENTIAL USES</b>											
Adult family homes or small residential facilities	P	P	P	P							
Bed and breakfast establishments	C	C	C	C							Section 5.04(C)
Conservation subdivision	PS	PS	PS	PS							Section 5.04(D)
Conservation subdivision with attached dwellings	PS	PS	PS	PS							Section 5.04(D)
Dwellings, single-family	P	P	P	P							
Dwellings, two-family			P	P							
Institutional housing		C	C	C	PS						Section 5.04(E)
Permanently sited manufactured housing	PS	PS	PS	PS							Section 5.04(F)
<b>PUBLIC AND INSTITUTIONAL USES</b>											
Active parks and recreation	C	C	C	C	C	P	P	P	P	P	Section 5.04(G)
Campgrounds	C										Section 5.04(I)
Cemeteries		PS	PS	PS							Section 5.04(J)
Churches and places of worship	C	C	C	C	P	P	P	P	P	P	0
Cultural institutions	C	C	C	C							0
Educational facilities (Primary and Secondary) <sup>6</sup>		C	C	C	C	C					0
Educational facilities, higher							P	P	P		
Hospitals						P	P	C			Section 5.04(M)
Passive parks, recreation, and open space	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	
Public safety and service facilities	C	C	C	C	PS	PS	PS	PS	PS	PS	Section 5.04(N)

**TABLE 5.03-A: PERMITTED USE TABLE**

PERMITTED USES P = Permitted Use PS = Permitted with Additional Use-Specific Standards C = Conditional Use Blank Cell = Prohibited	RESIDENTIAL ZONING DISTRICTS				NONRESIDENTIAL ZONING DISTRICTS					USE-SPECIFIC STANDARDS  SEE SECTION:	
	O-C	R-1	R-2	R-3	C-1	C-2	C-3	O-R	I-1		I-2
	<b>COMMERCIAL AND OFFICE USES</b>										
Adult entertainment establishments									C	C	Section 5.04(H)
Banks and financial institutions					P	P	P	P			
Bars, taverns, or restaurants					P	P	P	P			
Club					P	P	P				
Commercial entertainment or recreation (indoors)						P	P		C		
Commercial entertainment or recreation (outdoors)						C					
Building supply or farm sales establishments							P		P	P	
Day care centers (adult or child)	PS	PS	PS	PS	P	P	P	P			Section 5.04(O)
Entertainment Device Arcades											Section 5.04(P)
Funeral homes						P					
General offices (administrative, professional, business)					P	P	P	P	P	P	
Hotels and motels						P	P				
Instructional studios					P	P	P				
Kennels, commercial and animal day cares	C	C	C	C			C		PS	PS	Section 5.04(Q)
Medical and dental offices or clinics					P	P	P	P	P		
Outdoor dining areas					PS	PS	PS				Section 5.04(R)
Outdoor display and sales					PS	PS	PS	PS			Section 5.04(S)
Outdoor storage						C	C		PS	PS	Section 5.04(T)
Personal service establishments					P	P	P				
Retail commercial uses					P	P	P				
Sales offices and showrooms						P	P	C			
Service commercial uses						P	P	C			
Veterinarian offices and animal hospitals						PS	PS	PS	PS	PS	Section 5.04(U)
<b>VEHICLE AND TRANSPORTATION RELATED USES</b>											
Gasoline stations						C	PS				Section 5.04(V)
Farm implement sales and rental <sup>2,7</sup>						C	C				Section 5.04(W)
Motor vehicle sales <sup>2</sup>						C	C				Section 5.04(W)
Parking lot or structure					C	C	C	C	C	C	Section 5.04(X)
Passenger transportation terminal						P	P				
Truck services/truck stop facilities							C				Section 5.04(Y)
Truck/transfer facilities									C	C	Section 5.04(Y)
Vehicle repair garages (major repair)						C	PS		PS	PS	Section 5.04(Z)

**TABLE 5.03-A: PERMITTED USE TABLE**

PERMITTED USES P = Permitted Use PS = Permitted with Additional Use-Specific Standards C = Conditional Use Blank Cell = Prohibited	RESIDENTIAL ZONING DISTRICTS				NONRESIDENTIAL ZONING DISTRICTS						USE-SPECIFIC STANDARDS  SEE SECTION:
	O-C	R-1	R-2	R-3	C-1	C-2	C-3	O-R	I-1	I-2	
Vehicle service uses (minor repair)						PS	PS		PS	PS	Section 5.04(V)
Vehicle washing establishments						C	C				Section 5.04(AA)
<b>INDUSTRIAL USES</b>											
Distribution facilities									P	P	
Foundry									C	P	
Industrial service uses									P	P	Section 5.04(BB)
Industrial uses, heavy										C	Section 5.04(CC)
Industrial uses, light								P	P	P	Section 5.04(BB)
Laboratories								PS	PS	PS	Section 5.04(DD)
Research and development facilities								PS	PS		Section 5.04(DD)
Self-storage facilities									C	C	Section 5.04(EE)
Warehouses								P	P	P	
<b>OTHER USES</b>											
Essential Services	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	
Gas and Oil Wells	PS	PS	PS	PS	PS	PS	PS	PS	PS	PS	Section 5.04(FF)
Mixed Use Development						PS	PS				Section 5.04(GG)
Radio and television stations (no towers or satellites)						P	P	P	P	P	
Soil removal or mineral extraction									C	C	Section 5.04(HH)
Wireless telecommunication facilities	C	C	C	C	P	P	P	P	P	P	Section 5.04(II)

**STAFF REVIEW**

1. *Is the proposed zoning change reasonable given the nature of the surrounding area?* The request is reasonable in that the property is adjacent to a Planned Industrial Park District.
2. *Can the property reasonably be used as currently zoned?* Yes.
3. *Is the proposed Map Amendment consistent with the objectives and goals of the Comprehensive Plan?* The Comprehensive Land Use Plan calls for this area to be Office and Research
4. *Is the proposed zoning change consistent with the stated purpose and intent of the zoning resolution and the applicable districts?* Yes.
5. *How will the proposed zoning change impact public services and facilities?* The proposed zoning is a greater intensity use than the current zoning however it should not impact public services and facilities.
6. *How will the proposed zoning change impact traffic, especially traffic safety?* The proposed change should not have an impact on traffic nor traffic safety.
7. *Will the proposed zoning change adversely affect adjoining properties?* The proposed change is a greater intensity use than the current zoning and may adversely affect adjoining properties.
8. *Is this an appropriate location for the proposed use or are there other available locations better suited for it?* The request is reasonable in that the property is adjacent to a Planned Industrial Park District.

- 
9. *Will the proposed zoning change, change the character of the neighborhood?*  
The proposed change is a higher intensity use and has the potential to change the character of the neighborhood.
10. *Has there been a change in conditions that renders the original zoning inappropriate?* No.

**Staff Comments:**

- The site can be used as currently zoned.
- The request is reasonable in that the property is adjacent to a Planned Industrial Park District.
- The Future Land Use Plan calls for this area to be Office and Research – “The office and research areas of Springfield Township provide for an area where office or research and development facilities may be located in a business park setting. These uses may be of varied scale from a small medical office to large, multi-floor office buildings and may include some commercial accessory uses. Beyond general research and development activities, the large-scale manufacturing or distribution of goods should not occur in the office and research area.”

**Recommendation:** Staff recommends APPROVAL.



**To the Springfield Board of Trustees:**

As Zoning Administrator, I recommend the Board pass a resolution to change the following parcels.

51-02670, 51-06600, 51-09801, 51-09833, 51-02273, 51-02281, 51-02280, 51-02275, 51-02276, 51-08482, 51-08483, and 51-03302.

From **O-R** (Office-Research) to **I-1**(Light Industrial).

When this district was first established, it was hoped that new professional offices/research facilities would be encouraged to locate there. This has not happened, and the nature of the district has continued to be more industrial with businesses like Ohio Edison, Pence Brothers and Treno, LLC occupying the majority of the district. The **I-1** district is established to accommodate industrial uses in the fields of repair, storage, manufacturing, processing, wholesaling, and distribution, free from encroachment of residential, retail, and institutional uses. The uses allowed are those that because of their normally unobjectionable characteristics can be in proximity to residential districts.

The proposed change will still allow for offices or research facilities in the **I-1** district. The change will eliminate the need for variances for the existing businesses as they expand. This will allow the Zoning Department to require more stringent enforcement of screening and landscaping requirements.

 Recoverable Signature

---

**X** Allan Swift

---

Allan Swift  
Zoning Administrator  
Signed by: ee0e361d-1075-4891-9474-9f82c8ec5c62



---

**SPRINGFIELD TOWNSHIP  
ZONING COMMISSION  
MARCH 2, 2022  
MINUTES**

---

The Springfield Township Zoning Commission held a meeting on Wednesday, March 2, 2022 at the Springfield Township Town Hall, 2459 Canfield Road, Akron, Ohio at 5:30 p.m.

Board members In attendance: Gary Older, Tracy Cunningham, Gerard Michael. Nancy Dotson and David Lile were absent. Also present Alan Swift, Zoning Administrator and Patty Price, Secretary.

**Purpose of the Meeting:**

1. Change Zoning District on Massillon Road from O-R to I-1 sent from Trustees.
2. Evaluate the current zoning regulations and look to update.
3. Begin work on a property maintenance code.
4. Set up committee to revise the comprehensive plan.

Alan Swift and Tracy Cunningham went over the changes to the Zoning Book in order to have a current up to date book.

Officers for 2022 were elected. Gary Older, Chairman. Gerard Michael, Vice Chairman.

**Amendment to Zoning District:**

Gerard Michael: I move to change the zoning district on Massillon Road including Parcel #'s: 51-02670, 51-06600, 51-09804, 51-09833, 51-02273, 51-02281, 51-02280, 51-02275, 51-02276, 51-08482, 51-08483, 51-03302 from O-R (Office-Research) to I-1 (Light Industrial) and set a public hearing for the Zoning Commission on April 6, 2022 at 5:30 p.m. Seconded by Gary Older. Roll Call: Gerard Michael (yes); Gary Older (yes); Tracy Cunningham (yes).

The Zoning members discussed work to initiate a Property Maintenance Code.

Comprehensive Plan (2002 – updated 2010). Discussed setting up a committee of ten individuals to look at 20 years in future.



---

**SPRINGFIELD TOWNSHIP  
ZONING COMMISSION  
MARCH 2, 2022  
MINUTES**

---

**Gary Older: I move to adjourn. Seconded by Gerard Michael. Roll Call: Gerard Michael (yes); Gary Older (yes); Tracy Cunningham (yes).**

---

**Gary Older, Chairman**

---

**Patty Price, Secretary**

**03022022zcmin**



Planning Commission  
Zoning Text Amendment  
**Residential District, Garages**  
Sagamore Hills Township

---

**Item No.:** 1  
**Meeting:** June 30, 2022  
**Applicant:** Sagamore Hills Zoning Commission  
**Proposal:** **Residential District, Garages**  
**Processor:** Stephen Knittel

---

**Proposal:** The applicant has proposed that the Sagamore Hills Township Zoning Resolution revise Section 3 Residential District to amend language of permitted maximum garage size.

**Proposed Text Amendments:**

**Sagamore Hills Township**

**Section 3.0 Residential District**

**3.1 Purpose**

The purpose of this district is to accommodate residential development that will promote the residential character of this zone.

**3.6 Garages**

All new garage constructions and/or modifications thereto shall be done with a minimum of four hundred (400) square feet and a maximum of ~~eight hundred fifty (850) square feet~~ One Thousand Two Hundred (1,200) square feet. Such garage shall have a separate exit other than through the garage door. A garage shall be required for all residential construction, and should be erected at time of construction of the dwelling.

**Staff Comments:** Proposing to increase maximum garage size from 850 sq ft to 1,200 sq ft.

**Recommendation:** Staff recommends to the Summit County Planning Commission that the proposed text amendments be **APPROVED**.



Planning Commission  
Zoning Text Amendment  
**PUD Boundary Setback**  
Sagamore Hills Township

---

**Item No.:** 2  
**Meeting:** June 30, 2022  
**Applicant:** Sagamore Hills Zoning Commission  
**Proposal:** **PUD Boundary Setback**  
**Processor:** Stephen Knittel

---

**Proposal:** The applicant has proposed that the Sagamore Hills Township Zoning Resolution revise Section 14.6 PUD to add language about the PUD Boundary Setback.

**Proposed Text Amendments:** Proposed new text is underlined.

### **Sagamore Hills Township**

#### **6. PUD Boundary Setback**

No building or structure shall be erected or placed nearer than one hundred (100) feet to any PUD perimeter boundary line.

**Staff Comments:** Adding language to clarify that no building or structure shall be erected or placed nearer than one hundred (100) feet to any PUD perimeter boundary line.

**Recommendation:** Staff recommends to the Summit County Planning Commission that the proposed text amendments be **APPROVED**.