

## RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

*Minutes of*      **Greenfield Township Trustees**      *Public Hearing*  
February 26, 2026 - Held 6:30 PM

The Greenfield Township Trustees met for a public hearing at the Greenfield Township Firehouse. Trustee Sitterley called the hearing to order, and then led those present in the Pledge of Allegiance. Jennifer Sitterley, Lonnie Kosch and Dave Cotner were present. Jill Maiher, Zoning Commission Board Member, was in attendance representing Jeff Williamsen, Zoning Inspector, who is working remotely.

Trustee Sitterley opened the hearing by giving the following information: Havens Limited Zoning Request: Parcel ID: 0150119820; address: 463 Pleasantville Road, Baltimore, Ohio; Current zoning is R-1 residential; requested zoning is PRB - Planned Rural Business. Current status is a continuance of the last meeting and so the Board had an opportunity to review the revised plan.

Trustee Sitterley stated public comments would be heard, and asked that the participants be respectful in doing so. She noted the plan was revised on 1/30/2026, and offered a copy to those who had not seen it. She read the following statement: "Behavior that obstructs the hearing or intimidates the participants will not be tolerated. Those that cannot participate appropriately will be asked to leave, and the hearing will proceed thereafter". Each participant will be sworn-in individually. She noted three people were signed-in to speak.

Jacqueline Desloges, 260 Pleasantville Rd., was the first speaker, and was sworn-in. Ms. Desloges expressed her continued concerns with the rezoning request, even with the revised business plan that was provided. The concerns include what activities can occur on the property now and in the future with the rezoning, and that the revised business plan does not accurately represent the boundaries and greenspace as stated. She asked that the rezoning request be denied in order to protect the character and expectations of the neighborhood.

Travis Young was the next speaker. After being sworn-in, Mr. Young spoke to Jessica Stewart, owner of the property. He stated he had researched and found three suitable and comparably priced local properties that could be used by Ms. Stewart for the purpose for which she was requesting the rezoning. He also questioned her insurance information, policy limits, IRS status and status with the state board of commerce. He also questioned her actual financial ability to cover damages caused by the dogs proposed to be on the property and in the neighborhood. He stated rezoning would not be necessary if the use of the property was compatible with the neighborhood, noting there were properly zoned properties nearby. He noted the residents stand united in opposition to the rezoning request.

Christian Tencza was the next speaker. After being sworn-in, he stated he felt both sides could leave with a compromise, and get what they want, including protecting the needs of the property they own, while understanding the limitations of the Zoning Commission. He noted there was a precedent in Greenfield Township for kennels in an R1 district, and stated he felt this was spot zoning. He distributed some copies of the proposal, and noted the measurements were off by thirty percent, citing Google Earth and the Auditor's website. He asked the Board to uphold the precedent established by the Township laws, and to concur with the Zoning Commission to protect the concerns of the residents.

Chris Wallace responded to the speakers and their concerns, after being sworn-in. He was not aware of the drawing showing a thirty percent difference in the property lines, and did not agree with these measurements. At this point, Mr. Tencza interjected to explain the measurements he had found. In order for Mr. Wallace to have his allotted amount of time to speak, Mr. Tencza

## RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

*Minutes of*

**Greenfield Township Trustees**

*Public Hearing*

February 26, 2026 - Held 6:30 PM

was allowed to explain his drawing and information in more detail as to how the boundaries and property lines were incorrect. With both parties disagreeing on the scale and measurements on the map and drawing, Trustee Sitterley suggested a note be made of the discrepancies being shared on this information. After an outburst by a different participant, which was promptly dealt with, the hearing continued.

At this time, Mr. Wallace was then allowed his allotted time to speak. He noted changes that had been made to the development plan by his client, Ms. Stewart, including a single primary structure, and a training facility with attached kennels. The grooming structure and any temporary housing structures have been removed. The remainder of the site is a fence, grass training areas, a pool and a pond, consistent with a rural setting. He noted the Fairfield County Regional Planning Commission had reviewed the proposal, and adopted a motion recommending approval concerning setbacks, buffering, and coordination with the appropriate agencies, and they intended to comply with those recommendations. He noted the Regional Planning Commission would not have recommended approval if they felt the proposal was spot zoning. He cited all of the groups involved in making decisions on this request, and noted the Planned Rural Business district - approved development plan - must be adhered to - nothing more could be added. Any additions or changes would require approval by the Zoning Commission and the Board of Trustees. He noted the PRB designation provides the Township with more clarity and control on how the property is used now and in the future, and makes it enforceable. He noted his client had made every effort to collaborate with the Township on this rezoning request.

Trustee Cotner referenced the Ohio Revised Code information he had made available for participants to review. Discussion continued regarding the differences in the zoning designations - R1 vs. Planned Rural Business - and when and what the Township can control, based on those designations. A participant expressed his view that the zoning should be left as R1, and then if residents needed to start litigation on any violations that they see, they could do so.

Danielle Keefer raised the issues of whether or not this change would be considered spot zoning. Trustee Kosch noted the Regional Planning Commission did not have anything in their review of the plan that indicated spot zoning.

Christina Hanson asked to speak, although she had not signed in to do so. After being sworn in, she expressed her concerns that she and the other families who make up the area community would be the ones who will be impacted by the rezoning change, as they are the neighbors to this property.

Chris Wallace again spoke on behalf of Ms. Stewart, and emphasized that she was new to the area, wanted to work with the community as a good faith effort, and work within the parameters of the Township zoning. He noted she had made changes and amendments to the development plan as requested. He also noted the PRB designation would give more control to the Township about what happens on the property going forward.

Trustee Sitterley noted her concern with setting a precedent when asking a resident to use the process in place to request the rezoning, and once the proper steps are taken and processed, then the Board would deny the request.

**RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS**

*Minutes of*      **Greenfield Township Trustees**      *Public Hearing*  
February 26, 2026 - *Held 6:30 PM*

There was continued discussion about the differences in the zoning and control of the activities on the property, confirmation that Ms. Stewart lives on the property, and the legal advice received on both sides of the issue.

Trustee Sitterley made a motion to approve the request to rezone the parcel from R1 to PRB; seconded by Trustee Cotner.

ROLL CALL: Cotner: Yes      Kosch: Yes      Sitterley: Yes      Motion Passed 3-0

With no further business to come before the Board, Trustee Sitterley made a motion to adjourn; seconded by Trustee Cotner.

ROLL CALL: Cotner: Yes      Kosch: Yes      Sitterley: Yes      Motion Passed 3-0  
The meeting adjourned at 7:07 p.m.