

**Brunswick Hills Township
Zoning Commission Public Hearing Minutes
April 2, 2026**

Call Meeting to Order

Mr. Witt called the Brunswick Hills Township Zoning Commission on April 2, 2026 Public Hearing meeting to order at 6:15 pm.

A roll call of the board was executed.

- **Board Members in Attendance:** Mr. Kalina, Mr. Witt, Mrs. Wetterman, Mr. McFarland
- **Alternate Board Members as voting members:** Mr. Smerek, Alternate Member
- **Board Members Absent:** Ms. Brunn
- **Others in Attendance:** Mr. DeCastr, Trustee, Mr. Humphrey, Assistant Zoning Inspector, Ms. Beck, Secretary.

NEW BUSINESS: Bluebell Properties PP # 001-02D-27-035 & 001-02D-27-036

Chair, Mr. Witt provided a background to the 2005 settlement between Brunswick Hills Township and Blue Bell properties, which allowed the parcels to be developed as C1 under the zoning resolution despite the land being designated as rural residential. The township recently began exploring updates to the zoning map to align with recent annexations and rezoning activities. The township consulted the County Department of Planning Services and County Prosecutor’s Office. The guidance from the county was that the 2005 settlement does not by itself change the map. The township must still follow the standard map amendment procedure, including a public hearing, to formally show the parcels as C1.

Purpose of this hearing:

To consider amending the zoning map so that it matches the 2005 settlement (marking the two front parcels as C1). This is framed as not a new proposal, but a formal alignment of the map with the existing settlement, meant to avoid future misunderstandings between the township, landowners and the public.

Mr. Witt opened the meeting to public comment.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

Kristen Hunter, 4293 Butterfly Circle

Kristen Hunter expressed concern that the project would likely attract small contractor-type warehouse units that operate early in the morning, potentially beginning around 6:00 a.m., which would result in noise from garage doors, trucks, and general activity directly behind nearby homes. She also raised concerns about light pollution, noting that the site plan shows parking lots adjacent to residential properties and that bright lighting could shine into bedroom windows throughout the night. Ms. Hunter further stated that the location of dumpsters near the neighborhood could create odor issues, particularly with prevailing west winds carrying smells into the development.

She discussed existing flooding problems on Pearl Road and warned that additional paving and development would increase stormwater runoff, worsening already dangerous conditions. She also expressed concern about increased crime and safety risks associated with bringing business operations close to homes where children live. From a property value standpoint, she noted she has lived in her home for 16 years and is considering downsizing, but believes homes located within approximately 100 feet of a warehouse-style building would be difficult to sell. She also raised traffic concerns, specifically objecting to the proposed access point on Blue Bell Parkway, which she described as a more residential street compared to Pearl Road where most businesses are located.

If the development were to proceed, she requested mitigation measures such as a fence, hedgerow, or both to provide separation. Finally, she stated that she never received notice of previously granted variances

related to parking and setbacks, despite township ordinance requiring certified mail notification to property owners within 200 feet and requested proof of such notification.

Kelly Friedel, 4201 Butterfly Circle

Ms. Friedel spoke in opposition and echoed many of Kristen Hunter’s concerns. She described her personal connection to the area, noting that she grew up in Hinckley and chose to build her first home in Brunswick Hills approximately 15 years ago because of its rural and family friendly character. She emphasized that Fox Village is home to many young families with children and expressed concern that the proposed development would erode the neighborhood’s character and sense of community. She also raised safety concerns, stating that she has previously had to call the police multiple times due to intruders on Blue Bell, and believes increased business activity could worsen those risks, particularly for children. In addition, she discussed traffic concerns, noting that the proposed driveway placement could create challenges for residents entering and exiting the neighborhood and could interfere with multiple school buses serving the area, including those for St. Ambrose and Brunswick City Schools. She concluded by acknowledging that residents may not ultimately be able to stop the project but urged the commission to consider the real life impact on families and the potential loss of the neighborhood’s quality of life.

Ben Woods, 2660 Hollyhock Lane

Ben Woods, a recent homebuyer who moved into the neighborhood in August, explained that he selected his home based on expectations of a quiet neighborhood with low traffic, minimal light pollution, and privacy provided by a wooded buffer along Route 42. He stated that this buffer contributed significantly to the rural residential character and created a safe environment for children to play. Mr. Woods described the recent clear cutting of trees on the front lots as a preview of what is to come and expressed concern that the development would substantially alter the essential character of the neighborhood. He referenced prior board discussions questioning whether such a change would occur and argued that it clearly would, citing plans for approximately 45 parking spaces, an eight foot tall commercial structure with overhead doors facing homes, and the inclusion of dumpsters and commercial lighting. He predicted increased traffic, noise, light pollution, stormwater runoff, and wind exposure due to the removal of the natural tree barrier. He also argued that there is no shortage of commercially zoned land along Route 42, noting that most of the corridor is already designated for commercial or industrial use and includes underutilized parcels. He characterized the proposal as creating a “commercial island” within a residential neighborhood. Additionally, he raised concerns about long term risks, stating that once rezoned, the property could evolve into more intensive or undesirable uses over time. He questioned why the proposal is being advanced now, given its origins in a 2005 settlement, and concluded that the project is unnecessary, unwanted, and represents a breach of trust that could negatively impact property values.

Kris Kormos, 4215 Butterfly Circle

Mr. Kormos, a 16 year resident and former Brunswick Hills Township firefighter, questioned whether the proposed use aligns with C1 zoning, noting that C1 is generally intended for retail and personal service uses, while the proposal appears to involve multiple units for storage, contractor operations, and similar activities that resemble industrial use. He suggested that the original court decision designating the property as C1 may not have fully accounted for the township’s zoning definitions. Mr. Kormos also raised concerns about the structure of the development, describing it as similar to condominium units and questioning whether each unit would need to be treated as a separate parcel under Ohio law. He further questioned the traffic study presented, noting that it was based on only one day of data and recommending that the Ohio Department of Transportation be involved in a more comprehensive review, particularly given its jurisdiction over Route 42. He referenced examples cited by the developer and stated that those comparable facilities are typically located hundreds of feet away from residential homes and often

separated by highways or large buffers, unlike the current proposal which would place buildings approximately 50 feet from homes. He also pointed out discrepancies in public records, noting that the Medina County Auditor still lists the property as residential, suggesting that the court ordered zoning change may not have been properly recorded. He questioned whether all required legal and administrative steps were completed and raised additional concerns about notification and documentation.

Ron Sabo, 2728 Pearl Road

Mr. Sabo, who owns a 10 acre property across from Fox Village, spoke primarily about stormwater concerns. He explained that a creek running through his property already receives runoff from the existing Fox Village development and that it was not designed to handle that volume, resulting in erosion and property damage, including the loss of a large tree. He expressed concern that additional development, including more pavement and rooftops, would significantly increase runoff and further damage his land. Mr. Sabo stated that such impacts would be unacceptable and indicated that he would consider legal action if his property were further affected. He also noted that he had previously attempted to have his property rezoned residential and was denied and stated that he would prefer residential development on the subject property over commercial or warehouse use. He concluded by referencing past development patterns in the area and expressed concern about the continued loss of rural character and natural buffers.

Erin Neale, 2666 Hollyhock Lane

Mr. Neal spoke about the personal impact of the proposed development. He stated that he purchased his home approximately six years ago seeking a quiet environment and a fresh start. He indicated that he and his significant other are already discussing the possibility of moving if the project proceeds and warned that decisions like this could result in the loss of residents who value and contribute to the community.

Kathleen Scheutzow, 3926 Foskett Road

Ms. Scheutzow, a former Township Trustee, provided historical context regarding the property and prior zoning actions. She explained that in 2003 there was a proposal to develop the property with both high density residential and commercial uses, which led to significant opposition and a referendum effort by residents. She noted that she was later involved in a lawsuit brought by the developer, which resulted in a settlement agreement around 2005. According to her recollection, the settlement included a map designating the front parcels as C1 commercial and required the developer to market those parcels for commercial use for two years. If unsuccessful, the developer would then have the option to construct townhouse style residential units. She stated that for a period of time, township zoning maps reflected the court order, but at some point, the records appeared to revert to showing the property as residential, creating confusion. Ms. Scheutzow emphasized that she was not speaking in favor of or against the current proposal but rather to clarify the legal and historical background. She also noted that much of the relevant information is contained in older records that are not easily accessible, which contributes to the difficulty residents face in understanding the situation.

Wes Humphrey, Assistant Zoning Inspector, 1918 Pearl Road

Mr. Humphrey provided clarification on behalf of the zoning office regarding the status of the property and the reason for the current hearing. He stated that the township does have documentation and maps, developed in coordination with Planning Services, that identify the front parcels as C1 commercial in accordance with the prior court settlement. However, he explained that despite the existence of this court order, the county and Planning Services will not update their official zoning maps without the township completing a formal amendment process. He indicated that this requirement is the reason the township is holding the present public hearing, even though the settlement already outlines C1 development rights. Mr. Humphrey also clarified that the proposed access point from Blue Bell Parkway was not determined by the township but was instead required by the Ohio Department of Transportation, which did not permit access from Pearl Road. He expressed frustration with the county's position, noting that he does not

understand why the documentation already provided has not been accepted as sufficient to update official records.

Mr. DeCastra, Trustee

Mr. DeCastra outlined the formal process and notification requirements. He explained that under Ohio law, the township is required to notify only those property owners whose parcels are directly adjacent to the subject property, and that those residents were sent mailed notices regarding the zoning map amendment. He then described the process moving forward, stating that the Zoning Commission has up to 30 days following the hearing to make a recommendation to either approve or deny the map amendment. After that, the matter will proceed to the Board of Trustees, which will hold a separate public hearing to gather additional input. The Trustees then have up to 20 days after their hearing to make a final decision. Mr. DeCastra further explained that if the amendment is approved, it does not take effect immediately but instead becomes effective after a 30 day period. During that time, residents have the opportunity to file a referendum if they choose to challenge the decision. He also noted that notice of the Trustees' hearing would be provided through mailed notices to adjacent property owners, publication in the Medina Gazette, and often through township communication channels such as social media to increase awareness. He added that additional information regarding other proposed activity in the area would be discussed at the upcoming 7:00 p.m. meeting and encouraged to stay if interested.

Additional Resident/Board Discussion

Resident, Mr. Kormos reiterated that the Medina County Auditor's website continues to list the property as rural residential (RR), raising concerns about whether the court ordered zoning change was ever properly recorded. This prompted further discussion among board members and residents.

The discussion centered on the possibility that the court decree from 2005 may not have been formally filed with the county recorder, which could explain why public records and zoning maps remained inconsistent. It was acknowledged that if the zoning map had been updated at that time, subsequent homebuyers would have been aware of the C1 designation earlier. There was also discussion about responsibility for filing the decree, with uncertainty as to whether that obligation fell on the landowner or the township. It was noted that earlier versions of zoning maps had included a notation indicating the property was "subject to court order," further contributing to confusion over how the designation was represented over time.

Mr. Kalina provided additional perspective based on his review of the court order. He stated that the order clearly and repeatedly grants the property owner the right to develop the land in accordance with C1 zoning as it existed under the township's zoning resolution at the time of the settlement in 2005. He also noted that the order references the potential for townhouse or multi family residential development under certain conditions. Based on this, he emphasized that from a legal standpoint, the property is effectively already entitled to C1 development rights, regardless of how it is currently labeled on official zoning maps. He explained that the Medina County Planning Commission had recommended either leaving the zoning map as residential (RR) or formally updating it to C1 to align with the court order. He suggested that, in practice, the settlement already governs the allowable use of the property, and that the board may need to review the specific C1 permitted uses as they existed in 2005 to determine how they apply today. Mr. Kalina also addressed questions regarding the proposed development structure, including whether multiple condominium style business units on a single parcel align with the original intent of C1 zoning. He noted that issues related to parcel division, taxation, and common ownership—similar to residential condominium associations or storage unit developments, may require further legal clarification. He then provided broader context about the township's limitations, explaining that Brunswick Hills Township has historically taken an active role in defending its zoning and maintaining development standards. However, he noted that townships in Ohio operate with more limited authority than cities and face challenges due to state level policies that tend to favor development. He explained that in this particular case, the township previously contested the matter, resulting in the settlement agreement that governs the property today.

Mr. Kalina acknowledged that residents may be dissatisfied with the outcome created by that settlement but emphasized that the township did attempt to act in the community’s best interest at the time. He assured residents that the current board would continue to do the best it can within the legal constraints in place, and that the Board of Trustees would also carefully consider the matter when it comes before them.

MOTION TO ADJOURN

Motion: Mrs. Wetterman made a motion to adjourn the public hearing. Mr. Kalina seconded the motion.

Roll Call: Mr. Kalina- yes, Mr. Smerek- yes, Mr. Witt- yes, Mrs. Wetterman- yes, Mr. McFarland- yes.

Adjourned at 7:03 PM

Respectfully Submitted,
Dalith Beck, Zoning Secretary

Edward Witt, Chair

Date