



APPLICATION FOR ZONING APPEAL

Name: Michael & Rebecca Tersigni	
Address:	
2042 Crestdale Dr	
Stow, Ohio 44224	
Phone No. (A.M.) 330-351-2427	(P.M.)
Address of Property where Variance is requested:	
122 Wymore Ave Akron Ohio 44319	
Name, address and telephone number of property owner (include zip code):	
Michael & Rebecca Tersigni 330-351-2427 330-352-8405	
Zoning District:	
Variance Requested:	
Variance of the 300' distance between short term rentals for Airbnb	
Proposed construction will be:	
Your Reasoning for Requesting a Variance (applicant may attach a statement on separate paper):	

Adjacent Owners: Names	Mailing Address and Zip Code:
Shane Dockrill	118 Wymore Ave Akron Oh 44319
George Beckham	126 Wymore Ave Akron Oh 44319
James Augustine	123 Wymore Ave Akron Oh 44319
Richard Stephens	117 Wymore Ave Akron Oh 44319
Mason Stephens	133 Wymore Ave Akron Oh 44319
Little Lake Front	129 Wymore Ave Akron OH 44319

Signature of Applicant:*	Date:
--------------------------	-------

Date of Hearing:

**By signing this application, the applicant acknowledges they have read the attached "Procedure for Zoning Variance," "Guidelines for Decisions on Variances," "Conduction of Zoning Appeals Meeting," and "Coventry Township Board of Zoning Appeals" before the hearing.*

Please attach the required site plan and any additional drawings to this application.

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY

TYPE	FEE AMOUNT	DATE	PAYMENT TYPE	RECEIPT NUMBER
VARIANCE APPLICATION FEE	\$250.00	12/16/25	Check	756002
CONDITIONAL USE APPLICATION FEE	\$300.00			

Variance Application Narrative

Short-Term Rental Spacing Requirement

Property Owner: Michael Tersigni

Location: Portage Lakes Area, Coventry Township, Ohio

Date: December 2025

Prepared for submission to the Coventry Township Board of Zoning Appeals

1. Will the property in question yield a reasonable return or have beneficial use without the variance?

Without the variance, the property will suffer a significant loss in reasonable return and beneficial use. The property was purchased on June 13, 2025, as a secondary family residence, with the understanding that occasional short-term rentals would help offset mortgage payments and fund property maintenance and improvements. The inability to rent the property eliminates a critical financial component that made ownership feasible. While the home can still be used as a personal retreat, the intended mixed personal and limited rental use is no longer possible, creating a substantial financial hardship not anticipated at the time of purchase.

2. Is the variance substantial?

The requested variance is minimal and limited in scope. The only obstacle is the arbitrary enforcement of the 300-foot spacing requirement, despite the presence of other short-term rentals in close proximity. Granting this variance would not increase density beyond what already exists, nor would it change the character of the neighborhood or create a commercial district. The request simply seeks equal treatment under the ordinance.

3. Will the essential character of the neighborhood be substantially altered by the variance?

No. The Portage Lakes area already contains multiple short-term rentals, including at least one permitted rental approximately 100 feet away across the street. Other nearby properties also appear to operate adjacent short-term rentals. The proposed occasional rental of this single-family lake house would be fully consistent with the existing character of the neighborhood and would not introduce any new or disruptive use.

4. Will the variance have a substantial detrimental effect on adjacent property values or the general public?

No evidence suggests that this variance would negatively impact surrounding property values or the public. Short-term rentals already exist in this immediate area without documented harm. The property will remain well-maintained, owner-supervised, and used primarily as a family home. Occasional rentals are intended to support upkeep and investment into the property, which benefits the surrounding community.

5. Will the variance adversely affect the delivery of governmental services?

No. Occasional short-term rentals will not place any additional burden on municipal services beyond what already exists for surrounding properties with permitted rentals. The property will continue to be responsibly managed, and no change in public service demand is anticipated.

6. Did the property owner purchase the property with knowledge of the zoning restriction?

No. The property was purchased without any knowledge of the 2024 ordinance establishing the 300-foot restriction. This limitation was never disclosed during the purchase process. The owner relied on reasonable expectations based on the surrounding uses of neighboring properties, many of which appear to operate as short-term rentals in close proximity. Discovery of the restriction occurred only after the transaction was complete.

7. Can the predicament be obviated through any other method than a variance?

No practical alternative exists. Because another permitted rental is located within 100 feet across the street, the property is permanently excluded from participation under the current ordinance, regardless

of responsible operation, scale, or compliance. There is no structural modification or operational change that can remedy the spacing conflict without formal relief.

8. Did the property owner create the condition themselves?

No. The owner did not create this condition. The spacing limitation was imposed through a 2024 ordinance prior to their ownership and was not disclosed at closing. The hardship arises solely from the ordinance's application and not from any action taken by the owner.

9. Is the spirit and intent of the zoning code observed by granting the variance?

Yes. The spirit of the ordinance appears to seek reasonable regulation—not elimination—of short-term rentals. Granting this variance supports responsible use, protects neighborhood character, aligns with existing conditions, and ensures fair and consistent application of the law. Denying the variance would create unequal treatment and impose an unnecessary hardship on a new homeowner acting in good faith.

Summary Statement

This lake house is not a commercial enterprise. It is a family retreat that was purchased with the reasonable expectation of limited short-term rental use to help support ownership and maintenance. The hardship was not created by the owner, is unique to this property's location, and results from a newly enacted ordinance that was undisclosed at the time of purchase. Granting the variance would not alter neighborhood character, create harm, or undermine zoning intent—it would simply restore fairness and reasonable use.

