

**Brunswick Hills Township
Board of Zoning Appeals Regular Meeting Minutes
July 1, 2026**

Call Meeting to Order

Mr. Schigel called the Brunswick Hills Township Board of Zoning Appeals Regular Meeting on July 1, 2026 to order at 7:00 PM. Mr. Schigel asked all present to rise for the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. Schigel noted that the meeting has been properly advertised and is being recorded. He stated that a simple majority vote is required and is considered in favor of the applicant, with a three-vote majority out of five members constituting approval. He further noted that the Board of Zoning Appeals operates within the regulation of Section 519 of the Ohio Revised Code.

A roll call of the board was executed.

- **Board Members in Attendance:** Mr. Schigel, Ms. Barron, Mr. Timura, Mr. Krall, Mr. Radesic
- **Board Members Absent:** None
- **Others in Attendance:** Mr. DeCastra, Trustee; Ms. Beck, Secretary; Mr. Humphrey, Assistant Zoning Inspector

Mr. Schigel asked all residents in attendance to sign in on the sign-in sheet.

Approval of Minutes

Mr. Schigel made a motion to approve the minutes of the June 10, 2026 meeting as written. Mr. Timura seconded the motion.

Roll Call: Mr. Radesic – Yes; Ms. Barron – Yes; Mr. Timura – Yes; Mr. Krall – Yes; Mr. Schigel – Abstain

NEW BUSINESS

Variance Application — Circle K, Corner of Sleepy Hollow Road and Pearl Road Parcel No. 001-02C-18-008

Mr. Schigel asked whether any board members needed to be recused due to any relationship with this case. No recusals were declared. Mr. Schigel swore in the applicant's representatives.

Richard Blasey, Project Manager and Civil Engineer with Colliers Engineering and Design, 7050 West Saginaw Highway, Lansing, MI, was sworn in. Brett Lamb, was also sworn in. Both representatives presented on behalf of the applicant.

Mr. Blasey and Mr. Lamb presented the five variance requests associated with the proposed Circle K at the corner of Sleepy Hollow Road and Pearl Road. The board agreed to review each variance individually and vote on each one separately following the Duncan factor analysis.

VARIANCE REQUESTS:

Variance 1: Landscape Strip Width — Front Yard Reduction to 6.4 Feet (Pearl Road)

Mr. Blasey explained that four employee parking spaces are proposed within the front yard setback facing Pearl Road. These four spaces are necessary to meet the minimum parking requirement of 20 spaces, calculated at one space per 200 square feet for the approximately 4,000 square foot store. The applicant wishes to designate these spaces for employee use in order to preserve customer-facing spaces closer to the building entrance. The spaces are surrounded by landscaping and are separated from Pearl Road by a

six-inch curb. Mr. Blasey confirmed all parking spaces are the required sizing. Ms. Barron asked about impact protection along Pearl Road, including wheel stops or bollards; Mr. Blasey stated that a six-inch curb is proposed and that wheel stops are not typically installed where a curb is present. The approximate distance from the front of parked vehicles to the Pearl Road right-of-way is approximately 20 feet based on the scale of the plans. The board asked if there is a possibility of having the parking towards the back instead. The applicant noted that the rear of the site drops off steeply into a drainage ditch and a large retaining wall is required along both the west and north sides, which constrains the ability to shift parking further west.

Variance 2: Maximum Driveway Width Increase to 36 Feet (Sleepy Hollow Road)

Mr. Blasey explained that the driveway on Sleepy Hollow Road requires a width of 36 feet rather than the standard 30-foot minimum. The wider driveway is necessary to accommodate fuel tanker truck turning movements. Mr. Blasey presented turning movement diagrams showing the fuel tanker entering and exiting the site from both directions on Sleepy Hollow Road, demonstrating that the wider driveway width is required for safe ingress and egress without the truck encroaching into opposing traffic lanes. The applicant has submitted a memorandum of understanding to the county engineer and had a follow-up meeting the day of the BZA hearing; initial feedback from the county indicated the proposed driveway design is consistent with their expectations. The driveway on Pearl Road remains at the standard 30-foot width. Mr. Timura raised concerns about the suitability of Sleepy Hollow Road for heavy truck traffic given the narrow roadway and drainage ditches on each side; the applicant noted that the fuel tanker, averaging deliveries approximately every other day, is the largest vehicle expected on site and that delivery vendor trucks are smaller. Mr. Schigel noted that if the county engineer requires changes to the driveway configuration, the applicant would need to return to the BZA for a revised variance.

Variance 3: Minimum Lot Size in C3 Zoning — Reduction to 1.48 Acres

Mr. Blasey explained that the subject parcel is 1.48 acres, whereas C3 zoning requires a minimum lot size of two acres. The nonconformity arose from a prior blanket rezoning that applied C3 zoning across the area without accounting for this smaller parcel. Mr. DeCastra provided background, noting that when the applicant initially sought a rezoning, the Zoning Commission indicated that spot-rezoning the parcel to a lower classification would be contrary to planning principles and would likely be declined by the county planning commission. The variance route was identified as the more appropriate and efficient path, as it can be resolved within 30 days compared to a six-month map amendment process. Mr. Lamb confirmed the applicant was following the direction provided by the Township. Ms. Barron raised a question about whether the application was completed and signed by the property owner; Mr. Blasey confirmed that the applicant's team prepared the application and the owner signed it, affirming the statements within. Ms. Barron noted that the application states the owner was unaware of the nonconformity at the time of purchase. The applicant confirmed the owner purchased the property after that. The board also discussed whether additional land behind the parcel could be purchased to bring the site into conformance; Mr. Lamb stated the land behind the parcel drops off sharply, contains no development value, and the site already faces significant challenges estimated at \$250,000 to \$300,000 in additional engineering costs due to existing fill soils.

Variance 4: Minimum Directional Sign Setback to Street Right-of-Way Line — Reduced to 4.6 Feet (Sleepy Hollow Road)

Mr. Blasey explained that a small directional entry/exit sign is proposed at 4.6 feet from the Sleepy Hollow Road right-of-way line, where the minimum required setback is 10 feet. The sign is located at the curb line near the corner of Pearl Road and Sleepy Hollow Road. Placing the sign at the required 10-foot setback would position it within the area where vehicles are actively traveling. The sign is a small directional only sign, not an illuminated pricing or identification sign, intended to safely guide customers to the correct driveway entrance. Mr. Blasey noted that the sign is located approximately 15 to 20 feet from the edge of pavement and is adjacent to an existing traffic control box at the intersection, providing

additional physical separation. Mr. Timura initially raised concerns about plow truck interference but confirmed his concern was addressed upon reviewing the sign's location relative to the control box and distance from the pavement edge.

Variance 5: Minimum Freestanding Identification Sign Setback to Street Right-of-Way Line — Reduced to 11.3 Feet (Pearl Road / Corner)

Mr. Blasey noted that while his reading of the zoning ordinance suggests C3 gas station uses may be permitted within 10 feet of the right-of-way under one section of the code, the variance was included because other commercial uses require a 25-foot setback, and the applicant wished to address any ambiguity. The proposed 20-foot identification sign with electronic gas pricing display is located at 11.3 feet from the right-of-way at or near the corner of Pearl Road and Sleepy Hollow Road. A second identical sign is proposed on the Pearl Road frontage to provide visibility for eastbound travelers on Sleepy Hollow who would not have a sightline to the corner sign. Mr. Timura confirmed that the two signs visible on the plan labeled "E" are both pylon/monument style signs. Mr. Schigel clarified that the board approves the placement location of the sign only; the sign height, size, and design will be subject to a separate variance application brought by the sign vendor after site plan and building permit approvals are obtained.

STAFF COMMENTS:

Mr. Humphrey, Assistant Zoning Inspector, was sworn in and addressed the board regarding the minimum lot size variance. He noted that Denise Testa of Medina County Planning Services had confirmed the parcel is a legal nonconforming lot.

Mr. DeCastra noted that fire, police, and service departments were provided with the site plan during the zoning commission review process and returned no comments; the service department had minor questions that were answered and were not safety related.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

Ron Wetterman, 1085 Substation Road

Mr. Wetterman asked whether there are plans to fill in or pipe the storm drainage ditch along the south side of Sleepy Hollow Road adjacent to the property, and whether the township could require that work. Mr. DeCastra and Mr. Humphrey noted that Sleepy Hollow Road is a county road and that any work in the right-of-way would be under the jurisdiction of the Medina County Engineer, not the Township. Mr. Blasey confirmed the applicant has no plans to alter the drainage along Sleepy Hollow Road.

Kenneth Burroughs, 2132 Pearl Road

Mr. Burroughs stated he owns the property at 2132 Pearl Road and approximately four and a half acres wrapping the corner, including land behind the proposed Circle K site. He noted that the history of the corner involves significant filling of the land and that the grade of the road itself was raised years ago. He expressed concern that the strip of land between the rear of the proposed Circle K site and his remaining acreage may become landlocked and unusable, as it would be bounded on one side by the Circle K retaining wall and on the other by a residential lot to the west on Sleepy Hollow. He stated he had offered to sell the land to the applicant but the offer was not accepted.

In response to questions from the board regarding the possibility of Circle K purchasing that land, Mr. Blasey explained that a deep drainage ditch runs along the rear of the site and a retaining wall is proposed within the 25-foot rear setback, beginning approximately 20 feet from the rear property line. There is no connectivity between the two sites without filling 15 to 20 feet of grade change. Mr. Blasey noted there is still approximately 200 feet of frontage on Sleepy Hollow Road accessible from Mr. Burroughs' remaining parcel, though the suitability for development would depend on soil conditions, wetlands, and other due diligence not yet performed.

DUNCAN FACTORS:

Ms. Beck read each Duncan factor for each of the five variances. The board voted on each factor individually. Results are recorded below. Per Mr. Schigel's direction, final votes on each variance were then conducted separately.

Variance 1: Landscape Strip Width — Front Yard Reduction to 6.4 Feet (Pearl Road)

A. Whether the property in question will yield a reasonable return and whether there can be any beneficial use of the property without the variance.

Roll Call: Ms. Barron – Yes; Mr. Schigel – Yes; Mr. Krall – Yes; Mr. Timura – Yes; Mr. Radesic – Yes

B. Whether the variance is substantial.

Roll Call: Mr. Schigel – No; Mr. Krall – No; Mr. Timura – No; Mr. Radesic – No; Ms. Barron – No

C. Whether the essential character of the neighborhood will be substantially altered and whether adjoining properties will suffer interference with their proper future development and rights as a result of the variance.

Roll Call: Mr. Radesic – No; Mr. Schigel – No; Ms. Barron – Yes; Mr. Timura – No; Mr. Krall – No

D. Whether the variance will adversely affect the delivery of governmental services.

Roll Call: Mr. Krall – No; Ms. Barron – No; Mr. Schigel – No; Mr. Radesic – No; Mr. Timura – No

E. Whether the property owner purchased the property with knowledge of the zoning restriction.

Roll Call: Mr. Timura – Yes; Ms. Barron – Abstain; Mr. Krall – Abstain; Mr. Schigel – Yes; Mr. Radesic – Yes

F. Whether the property owner's predicament can be obviated through some method other than a variance.

Roll Call: Mr. Radesic – Yes; Mr. Krall – Yes; Mr. Schigel – Yes; Mr. Timura – Yes; Ms. Barron – Yes

G. Whether the spirit and intent of the Zoning Resolution will be observed and substantial justice done by granting the variance.

Roll Call: Ms. Barron – No; Mr. Krall – No; Mr. Timura – No; Mr. Schigel – No; Mr. Radesic – No

H. Whether the property in question has unique or exceptional circumstances or conditions that do not generally apply to other properties in the vicinity and within the same district.

Roll Call: Mr. Radesic – Yes; Mr. Timura – Yes; Mr. Schigel – Yes; Mr. Krall – Yes; Ms. Barron – No

Variance 2: Maximum Driveway Width Increase to 36 Feet (Sleepy Hollow Road)

A. Whether the property in question will yield a reasonable return and whether there can be any beneficial use of the property without the variance.

Roll Call: Ms. Barron – Yes; Mr. Timura – No; Mr. Krall – Yes; Mr. Schigel – No; Mr. Radesic – Yes

B. Whether the variance is substantial.

Roll Call: Mr. Radesic – No; Mr. Schigel – No; Mr. Krall – No; Ms. Barron – No; Mr. Timura – No

C. Whether the essential character of the neighborhood will be substantially altered and whether adjoining properties will suffer interference with their proper future development and rights as a result of the variance.

Roll Call: Mr. Timura – No; Mr. Radesic – No; Mr. Krall – No; Ms. Barron – Yes; Mr. Schigel – No

D. Whether the variance will adversely affect the delivery of governmental services.

Roll Call: Mr. Schigel – No; Mr. Krall – No; Ms. Barron – No; Mr. Timura – No; Mr. Radesic – No

E. Whether the property owner purchased the property with knowledge of the zoning restriction.

Roll Call: Mr. Radesic – Yes; Mr. Schigel – Yes; Mr. Krall – Abstain; Ms. Barron – Abstain; Mr. Timura – Yes

F. Whether the property owner's predicament can be obviated through some method other than a variance.

Roll Call: Mr. Timura – No; Mr. Krall – No; Mr. Radesic – No; Mr. Schigel – No; Ms. Barron – Yes

G. Whether the spirit and intent of the Zoning Resolution will be observed and substantial justice done by granting the variance.

Roll Call: Ms. Barron – No; Mr. Timura – Yes; Mr. Schigel – Yes; Mr. Krall – Yes; Mr. Radesic – Yes

H. Whether the property in question has unique or exceptional circumstances or conditions that do not generally apply to other properties in the vicinity and within the same district.

Roll Call: Mr. Radesic – Yes; Mr. Schigel – Yes; Ms. Barron – No; Mr. Krall – Yes; Mr. Timura – Yes

Variance 3: Minimum Lot Size in C3 Zoning — Reduction to 1.48 Acres

A. Whether the property in question will yield a reasonable return and whether there can be any beneficial use of the property without the variance.

Roll Call: Mr. Schigel – No; Mr. Radesic – Yes; Mr. Krall – Yes; Mr. Timura – No; Ms. Barron – Yes

B. Whether the variance is substantial.

Roll Call: Ms. Barron – Yes; Mr. Krall – No; Mr. Radesic – Yes; Mr. Timura – Yes; Mr. Schigel – No

C. Whether the essential character of the neighborhood will be substantially altered and whether adjoining properties will suffer interference with their proper future development and rights as a result of the variance.

Roll Call: Mr. Schigel – No; Mr. Timura – Yes; Mr. Krall – No; Ms. Barron – Yes; Mr. Radesic – Yes

D. Whether the variance will adversely affect the delivery of governmental services.

Roll Call: Mr. Radesic – No; Ms. Barron – No; Mr. Schigel – No; Mr. Krall – No; Mr. Timura – No

E. Whether the property owner purchased the property with knowledge of the zoning restriction.

Roll Call: Mr. Timura – Yes; Ms. Barron – Abstain; Mr. Krall – Abstain; Mr. Radesic – Yes; Mr. Schigel – Yes

F. Whether the property owner's predicament can be obviated through some method other than a variance.

Roll Call: Mr. Schigel – No; Mr. Radesic – Yes; Ms. Barron – Yes; Mr. Krall – Yes; Mr. Timura – Yes

G. Whether the spirit and intent of the Zoning Resolution will be observed and substantial justice done by granting the variance.

Roll Call: Mr. Timura – Yes; Mr. Krall – Yes; Mr. Schigel – Yes; Mr. Radesic – Yes; Ms. Barron – No

H. Whether the property in question has unique or exceptional circumstances or conditions that do not generally apply to other properties in the vicinity and within the same district.

Roll Call: Ms. Barron – No; Mr. Schigel – Yes; Mr. Radesic – No; Mr. Timura – Yes; Mr. Krall – No

Variance 4: Minimum Directional Sign Setback to Right-of-Way — Reduced to 4.6 Feet

A. Whether the property in question will yield a reasonable return and whether there can be any beneficial use of the property without the variance.

Roll Call: Mr. Krall – No; Mr. Radesic – Yes; Mr. Schigel – Yes; Mr. Timura – Yes; Ms. Barron – Yes

B. Whether the variance is substantial.

Roll Call: Ms. Barron – No; Mr. Schigel – No; Mr. Radesic – No; Mr. Timura – Yes; Mr. Krall – No

C. Whether the essential character of the neighborhood will be substantially altered and whether adjoining properties will suffer interference with their proper future development and rights as a result of the variance.

Roll Call: Mr. Krall – No; Mr. Radesic – No; Mr. Timura – No; Mr. Schigel – No; Ms. Barron – Yes

D. Whether the variance will adversely affect the delivery of governmental services.

Roll Call: Ms. Barron – No; Mr. Timura – No; Mr. Radesic – No; Mr. Krall – No; Mr. Schigel – No

E. Whether the property owner purchased the property with knowledge of the zoning restriction.

Roll Call: Mr. Schigel – Yes; Mr. Timura – Yes; Ms. Barron – Abstain; Mr. Krall – Abstain; Mr. Radesic – Yes

F. Whether the property owner's predicament can be obviated through some method other than a variance.

Roll Call: Mr. Radesic – Yes; Mr. Krall – Yes; Mr. Timura – Yes; Ms. Barron – Yes; Mr. Schigel – Yes

G. Whether the spirit and intent of the Zoning Resolution will be observed and substantial justice done by granting the variance.

Roll Call: Mr. Schigel – Yes; Mr. Radesic – Yes; Mr. Timura – Yes; Ms. Barron – No; Mr. Krall – Yes

H. Whether the property in question has unique or exceptional circumstances or conditions that do not generally apply to other properties in the vicinity and within the same district.

Roll Call: Mr. Krall – No; Mr. Timura – Yes; Mr. Schigel – Yes; Mr. Radesic – Yes; Ms. Barron – No

Variance 5: Minimum Freestanding Identification Sign Setback to Right-of-Way — Reduced to 11.3 Feet

A. Whether the property in question will yield a reasonable return and whether there can be any beneficial use of the property without the variance.

Roll Call: Mr. Timura – No; Ms. Barron – Yes; Mr. Radesic – Yes; Mr. Krall – Yes; Mr. Schigel – Yes

B. Whether the variance is substantial.

Roll Call: Mr. Schigel – No; Mr. Radesic – No; Ms. Barron – No; Mr. Krall – No; Mr. Timura – Yes

C. Whether the essential character of the neighborhood will be substantially altered and whether adjoining properties will suffer interference with their proper future development and rights as a result of the variance.

Roll Call: Mr. Timura – No; Mr. Schigel – No; Ms. Barron – Yes; Mr. Krall – No; Mr. Radesic – No

D. Whether the variance will adversely affect the delivery of governmental services.

Roll Call: Mr. Radesic – No; Mr. Timura – No; Mr. Schigel – No; Mr. Krall – No; Ms. Barron – No

E. Whether the property owner purchased the property with knowledge of the zoning restriction.

Roll Call: Ms. Barron – Abstain; Mr. Timura – No; Mr. Schigel – Yes; Mr. Krall – Abstain; Mr. Radesic – Yes

F. Whether the property owner's predicament can be obviated through some method other than a variance.

Roll Call: Mr. Radesic – Yes; Mr. Krall – Yes; Mr. Schigel – Yes; Mr. Timura – Yes; Ms. Barron – Yes

G. Whether the spirit and intent of the Zoning Resolution will be observed and substantial justice done by granting the variance.

Roll Call: Ms. Barron – No; Mr. Radesic – Yes; Mr. Krall – Yes; Mr. Schigel – Yes; Mr. Timura – Yes

H. Whether the property in question has unique or exceptional circumstances or conditions that do not generally apply to other properties in the vicinity and within the same district.

Roll Call: Mr. Timura – Yes; Mr. Krall – No; Mr. Schigel – Yes; Ms. Barron – No; Mr. Radesic – Yes

FINAL VOTES ON VARIANCES:

Mr. Schigel read the advisory regarding appeals: any person adversely affected by a decision of the Board of Zoning Appeals may appeal to the Court of Common Pleas of Medina County on the grounds that such decision was unreasonable or unlawful, within 30 days of the date the decision letter is signed. Each variance was then voted upon individually.

Variance 1: Landscape Strip Width — Front Yard Reduction to 6.4 Feet.

Motion: Mr. Schigel made a motion to approve. Mr. Timura seconded.

Roll Call: Mr. Radesic – Yes; Ms. Barron – No; Mr. Timura – Yes; Mr. Krall – Yes; Mr. Schigel – Yes

Motion approved 4–1.

Variance 2: Maximum Driveway Width Increase to 36 Feet (Sleepy Hollow Road).

Motion: Mr. Schigel made a motion to approve. Mr. Timura seconded.

Roll Call: Ms. Barron – No; Mr. Krall – Yes; Mr. Timura – Yes; Mr. Radesic – Yes; Mr. Schigel – Yes

Motion approved 4–1.

Variance 3: Minimum Lot Size in C3 Zoning — Reduction to 1.48 Acres.

Motion: Mr. Schigel made a motion to approve. Mr. Timura seconded.

Roll Call: Mr. Radesic – Yes; Mr. Krall – Yes; Mr. Timura – Yes; Ms. Barron – No; Mr. Schigel – Yes

Motion approved 4–1.

Variance 4: Minimum Directional Sign Setback to Right-of-Way — Reduced to 4.6 Feet.

Motion: Mr. Schigel made a motion to approve. Mr. Timura seconded.

Roll Call: Mr. Krall – Yes; Ms. Barron – Yes; Mr. Schigel – Yes; Mr. Radesic – Yes; Mr. Timura – Yes

Motion approved 5–0.

Variance 5: Minimum Freestanding Identification Sign Setback to Right-of-Way — Reduced to 11.3 Feet.

Motion: Mr. Schigel made a motion to approve. Mr. Timura seconded.

Roll Call: Ms. Barron – Yes; Mr. Radesic – Yes; Mr. Krall – Yes; Mr. Timura – Yes; Mr. Schigel – Yes

Motion approved 5–0.

Mr. Schigel advised the applicant that a decision letter will be signed and mailed within 30 days.

ADDITIONAL BUSINESS

Mr. Schigel noted that the August 5, 2026 meeting has no new variance applications filed. He proposed that the board use the August meeting to sign minutes, the decision letter, and to review a prior case for the purpose of board member development and continuing education. The board agreed. Mr. DeCastras noted that OTA (Ohio Township Association) membership enrollment materials had been submitted the prior day and that he would provide board members with links to OTA training webinars and the BZA training module once enrollment is confirmed.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

Brunswick Hills Township Board of Zoning Appeals Regular Meeting Minutes – July 1, 2026

Mr. Schigel opened the floor for any additional public comment. No additional public comment was received.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF NEXT MEETING:

The next regular Board of Zoning Appeals meeting is scheduled for Wednesday, August 5, 2026 at 7:00 PM.

MOTION TO ADJOURN

Mr. Timura made a motion to adjourn the July 1, 2026 Board of Zoning Appeals meeting. Mr. Radesic seconded.

Vote: All in favor – Aye unanimously.

Adjourned at 8:19 PM

Respectfully Submitted,

Dalith Beck, Secretary

Chris Schigel

Chris Schigel, Chair

8/5/26

Date