

**Brunswick Hills Township  
Zoning Commission Public Hearing Meeting Minutes  
May 7, 2026**

**Call Meeting to Order**

Mr. Witt called the Brunswick Hills Township Zoning Commission on May 7, 2026 public hearing meeting to order at 6:15 pm.

A roll call of the board was executed.

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

Mr. Witt asked everyone to stand for the Pledge of Allegiance and for a moment of silence for our troops and first responders.

**Purpose of Public Hearing**

The purpose of the public hearing was stated by Mr. Witt, as the consideration of the rezoning of parcel 001-02D-27-037, located on the south side of Blue Bell Parkway, from RR (Rural Residential) to R-3 for the development of single family homes. The floor was then opened for public comment. Speakers were asked to state their name and address for the record.

**Applicant / Property Owner Presentation**

John Slagter, Attorney for Property Owner, Tucker Ellis LLP , 950 Main Avenue, Suite 1100, Cleveland, OH 44113

Mr. Slagter was present on behalf of Blue Bell Series of Bennett Land Holdings LLC. Representatives Present: Matt Schmahl, Scott Bennett and Proposed Builder, Drees Homes, represented by Tom Sutcliffe.

Mr. Slagter provided the following key points:

The request is to rezone the parcel to permit single family, owner occupied residential development of approximately 30 lots, consistent with the existing single family development to the north. The parcel was involved in a 2006 lawsuit and settlement which allowed for commercial development on Route 42, and a multi story, multifamily senior housing project of up to 140 units on this parcel. Mr. Slagter emphasized that the current owner and applicant were not involved in that prior lawsuit or settlement and are not seeking commercial development or senior multifamily use. The proposed single family development would be more compatible with surrounding uses and would be less intensive in terms of density and public safety service demands than the previously allowed senior multifamily use. The applicant stated they are willing to work with the community, believe the project will benefit the township, and were present primarily to listen to public comments.

Matt Schmahl, Property Owner Representative.

Mr. Schmahl expressed full agreement with Mr. Slagter's presentation and highlighted the quality and long standing working relationship with Drees Homes. Design considerations include mature trees at the entryway, additional landscaping, a walking trail and similar amenities. Stated that the proposed development is a perfect fit for the area and that Drees Homes produces high quality homes.

Tom Sutcliffe, Drees Homes Representative

Mr. Sutcliffe shared that Drees Homes has been building in Brunswick, Brunswick Hills, Valley City, and Hinckley for approximately 20 years. Drees intends to bring its standard home products to this parcel if approved. Brochures were distributed to Commission members of styles and designs of the homes proposed. Mr. Sutcliffe clarified he was not speaking to legal or procedural aspects but simply illustrating what neighbors could expect from Drees Homes.

**PUBLIC COMMENT:**

Kris Kormos, 4215 Butterfly Cir, Brunswick, OH

Mr. Kormos referenced the 2006 settlement which permitted two buildings of housing for older persons (up to 70 units per building). He noted that under Section 808.04-11 of the Zoning Resolution, such senior housing would require a 120 foot setback from the road right of way and a one acre park with no buildings and no parking, which would significantly constrain the site. He shared that the 2006 settlement (Section 3, Paragraph 1) provides that 32 lots (noting there are actually 33 lots) shall be developed as a conservation development. He stated that if consistency with the development to the north is the goal, the site should remain a conservation development rather than be rezoned to R3. Mr. Kormos cited setback requirements of 50 feet and expressed concern that the submitted plans do not clearly demonstrate compliance, and that a proposed retention pond adjacent to an existing retention pond may negatively impact riparian areas. Mr. Kormos also cited R3 zoning standards under Section 405-3, including a 15,000 sq. ft. minimum lot area per dwelling unit, 90-foot minimum lot width, 60-foot minimum frontage, 50-foot front yard, 25-foot rear yard, and 10-foot side yards. He questioned how many variances would be required to fit the proposed homes and whether such extensive variances would be appropriate.

Kathleen Scheutzow, 3926 Foskett Road, Brunswick, OH

Ms. Scheutzow Provided historical context, approximately 20 years ago, a prior rezoning of this area went to a public referendum in which approximately 88% of voters rejected the rezoning. The township had indicated it would cooperate if the developer built under the existing RR zoning. She raised a procedural concern, citing zoning code language requiring that the Zoning Commission "shall consider" the recommendation of the County Planning Commission. She noted that the current rezoning case had not yet been heard by the County Planning Commission, and therefore the Commission does not yet have that recommendation available. She expressed concern that the process may be procedurally deficient if this step is not properly integrated. She questioned the accuracy of minutes or information provided from an earlier meeting in which a question was asked about whether an approximately 28 acre parcel east of Blue Bell Parkway was part of the 2006 settlement agreement. Ms. Scheutzow stated that the minutes showed that the parcel was not part of the agreement, which is incorrect, and that the parcel is part of the court order and development plan. She emphasized the importance of accuracy when informing the public. She stated that the 2006 settlement agreement binds the township, township representatives and employees, and the developer and its successors. She noted that she has consulted legal counsel and understands there are differing opinions on whether the agreement must be reworked with the current owner. She urged that proper procedures be followed by all parties when dealing with the settlement and any proposed changes.

Applicant Representations Response to Public Comment

Mr. Slagter offered the following clarifications in response to public comment:

Mr. Slagter Agreed that the Medina County Planning Commission has not yet reviewed the rezoning request. Stated his understanding that the Zoning Commission would not vote on the rezoning at this hearing, and that the matter would be continued until after the Planning Commission meeting in early June. He cited Ohio Revised Code 519.12 confirming the role of the County Planning Commission

recommendation in the rezoning process, and expressed the applicant's desire to follow proper procedure. Mr. Slagter clarified that the original consent entry (settlement) from 2006 falls under a separate process under ORC 505.07 if it is to be amended. The applicant initially considered that route, but the township opted to proceed by standard rezoning, which it is legally permitted to do. The applicant is not seeking to amend the settlement agreement in this proceeding, but only a zoning map amendment to R3. He acknowledged that variances will likely be needed for setbacks, lot dimensions, and related matters, and that such variances would be sought later through the appropriate procedure. Emphasized that no variances are before the Commission at this time; only the rezoning is at issue. Mr. Slagter reiterated that the applicant has no involvement in the prior litigation establishing the commercial zoning on Route 42, and believes the proposed single family development is an appropriate and beneficial use in light of changed conditions since 2006.

**Commission Discussion**

Mr. McFarland noted that reworking the 2006 settlement agreement is not within the purview of the Zoning Commission, and that such matters would be for the parties to the settlement agreement, not this commission. Mrs. Wetterman noted that the request currently before the Commission is to rezone the parcel from RR to R-3, that this is the issue the Commission should focus on, and that the Commission should await the County Planning Commission's recommendation before proceeding further. The commission asked about the timing of the County Planning Commission's meeting and the issuance of its recommendation. Trustee, Mr. DeCastra explained that the Medina County Planning Commission meets on the first Wednesday of each month. The Department of Planning submits materials to the Commission, which decides that evening. The decision is typically published the following day or shortly thereafter. He stated that this rezoning would be heard on June 3, with the recommendation available within a day or two after.

**MOTION TO ADJOURN**

**Motion:** Mrs. Wetterman motioned to adjourn the meeting. Mr. McFarland seconded.

**Roll Call:** Ms. Brunn- yes, Mrs. Wetterman- yes, Mr. McFarland- yes, Mr. Witt- yes.

Adjourned at 6:40 PM

Respectfully Submitted,  
Dalith Beck, Zoning Secretary

---

Edward Witt, Chair

Date