

## Village of Shawnee Hills Council Meeting Minutes

April 14, 2025

Mayor Mathews called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

Council in Attendance: Mary Gates, Kathy Isern, Justin LaRosa, Renee Matney, Robert Thatcher and Todd Zimmerman

Also Present: Fiscal Officer Shirley Roskoski and Solicitor Brian Zets

### Minutes

It was moved by Gates, seconded by Zimmerman to approve the minutes of April 24, 2025 with the following amendments: on page 2, add the word *place* between take and sometime; on page 4, Vorys does not have an apostrophe; change residences to residents; on page 11, put an *and* before would; on page 12, change include to *including* and change create to *created*; on page 14, last line, change Hunt to Miller and change 711.07 to 711.17; on page 16, change caliper to caliber. Following vote on the motion is recorded: yea, 5; Gates, Isern, Larosa, Thatcher and Zimmerman. Nay, none. Abstain, one Matney.

### Agenda

It was moved by Zimmerman, seconded by Thatcher to approve the agenda. Following vote on the motion is recorded: yea, 6; Gates Isern, LaRosa. Matney. Thatcher and Zimmerman. Nay, none.

### Public Hearing

Mayor Mathews opened the Public Hearing on Petition to Vacate Unimproved Rights-Of-Way, submitted by Cake Shawnee Hills, LLC.

PF Coffland, 204 Forest Drive – I object to the vacating of the right-of ways. These easements are written into each property owners deeds and I don't see how they should be vacated for the developer when certain individuals have asked for them to be vacated and it was denied by the Council.

Erin Hatcher, 9511 Westview Drive – I object to the vacation of these easements because they are private easements granted to each and every lot owner in Shawnee Hills Addition 4. These easements are written into each and every deed and run with the land. I do not consent to the easement being vacated as there is an ingress, egress and recreational purposes for each and all lots north, east, south and west in my plot. In addition, many other similar requests have been denied by some of the very same council sitting up here and the rules need to be applied equally.

Megan Bello, 205 Forest Drive – I wasn't notified of this meeting and as both my neighbors have mentioned for this reason I disagree with it being an emergency. It should follow the standard procedures and review for this proposal. Additionally, this same council has denied two requests for vacation within this same plat in the last several years.

Giacomo Bello, 205 Forest Drive – As a couple of times before, I objected to some of the procedures within terms of the timing and in terms of the advance notice that we were given. In this particular case, this ordinance that you are going to discuss tonight as an emergency, we did not receive any notification. We should be given proper time to prepare and come to these public hearings.

Mayor Mathews – Since we have heard this a couple of times, Brian, is there a requirement for a public notice.

Brian – No there is not because all the abutting property owners have consented.

Jacob Banker, 180 W. Mohawk Drive – I am a deeded property owner within Plat 4. I welcome the opportunity to have new neighbors in our community. I draw concern to the change of easements within our plat. This was a sign of contention a few years ago within the same plat that would drastically change our way of life. That is greatly concerning as well and it is coming up again. I would ask that you consider how it will affect the people living there. Thank you in advance for your consideration.

Sue Badgley, 227 Ridge Drive – I believe there is still an unresolved issue concerning the plat and every property owner within that plat. Because of that I do not see a need for this issue tonight to be passed as an emergency. I do not believe that I have ever seen in this village an ordinance having a first reading, a public hearing and a vote to pass as an emergency in the same night for property development. This feels like an abuse of emergency legislation.

Brent Drake, 681 South Section Line Road – A developer has asked for the removal of the right-of-ways. The reason he has to do this is because they are legal right-of-ways. The condition of them is not on me to keep up. This was a developed plot that was brought into the village and the roads were never kept up. As the village grew sewers were supposed to be offered to them. As far as I know there are taps available for them. Actually, we are wanting to release you from your liability and I think a little bit of this misunderstanding is that those are legal road right-of-ways. They are not part of your deed. Anybody can come in there and anybody can buy that property.

### **Communications**

Mayor Mathews read the following statement:

Pat Monahan told me years ago that he made his decisions with the idea that he could stand in front of the Village and detail the reasons for that decision. I am not aiming to open an old wound or pour salt in it for that matter, but in the absence of a response from the Village to comments I saw on social media creates the perception that those points are fact. Lots of people get their “news” from social media, so we will have a link posted on social media that will take you to this statement on our website.

I feel the first point we all need to agree on is that there has to be some acknowledgement to the basic facts of the entire situation regardless of your opinion.

- This is undeveloped land that neither the Village nor any resident of the Village owns, and neither purchased it.
- The proposed project is NOT multi-family or high-density housing.

- No matter the number of homes, or type of development that may be built, current residents and their way of life will be altered in some fashion
- The Village must grow its' tax base in order to survive and for services at minimum to remain intact and sustainable, if not improve.
- Council members are residents/neighbors/community members.

This property has seen 3 different developers express some level of interest in development over the last 10-12 years, and all coincided with the inclusion of our legislation to allow for Planned Developments. While quality, price point and product design have been different, the basic concept of a loop has been the same for each. I do not believe this is a random coincidence. The Village has unique characteristics, both good and bad, such as narrow streets, odd shaped lots, and of course lack of proper drainage and storm water management. While some consider this part of the quaintness of the Village, others may not be so fond of their personal drainage system or pulling onto the shoulder to allow another car to pass. Whichever your perspective, both cannot exist. We cannot claim we'd like to keep that quaintness and then complain of the symptoms.

Council's consideration of this PUD dealt with drainage of the site which improves surrounding drainage, road size as mandated by Concord Fire, potential traffic of 55+ community vs. single family home, impact on Dublin Schools and finally Village revenue from both an income tax and infrastructure fee and costs perspective. In addition, while a construction entrance is not physically possible for this project, this PUD would allow a much shorter construction period than if homes were built one at a time under R-2 zoning. The infrastructure, (roads, sewers, utilities and water retention ponds) will all go in at once, avoiding the appearance of heavy equipment repeatedly over a much longer period of time with homes built individually. This also negates the potential of single-family homes, which could impact the Dublin Schools and adversely affect the typical traffic count you would see from multiple drivers in any household. In addition, the developer will be responsible to repair any damage to Village roads caused by construction vehicles/equipment.

No matter what type of development would be built, the road width on site would be required to be 26', as stated in the Concord Township Fire Code. No matter the development, the adjacent intersection of Mohawk and Westview required improvement in order to allow sufficient turning radius for the Township's largest fire truck. This same improvement is needed at other intersections in the Village as well and we will work with Concord Fire to identify and address those intersections that pose the greatest risk for their truck size.

Traffic has always been a concern throughout the Village, but at this site specifically, whether it relates to construction traffic, density, or road size and safety. The proposed Romanelli and Hughes homes will be marketed to the 55+ or downsizing community. Generally, these residents would not do as much commuting, have school aged kids, potentially with teenaged drivers, or as suggested at the hearing, may not be residing in the home full time. Even one additional home on this site adds additional traffic to the area. This specific product from the developer will attract residents most likely not to make as many trips daily. If any additional plan needs to be implemented for traffic control and safety, we will address the matter with recommendations from our Police Dept.

As discussed at the public hearing, the planned development is required to address drainage for the entire development via retention ponds on the west side of the site. Most would assume that any development here would contribute to further runoff going east towards Dublin Rd. In actuality, the runoff heads west somewhere behind current residents of Westview. The collection and rate of release of storm water is designed to control the drainage and actually fix issues for adjacent property owners, including Muirfield. If this were not a planned development, each individual home built is only responsible for its own drainage, and yet again we'd be relying on a ditch system and your neighbor's maintenance of their ditch to achieve adequate run off. This piecemeal system would not address the rate of flow and release for stormwater.

Income tax revenue is the lifeline of the Village. Anyone can relate to the increased costs we all live with just in their household budget. The costs for the Village have also increased over the years, and to sustain the level of services and lifestyle all residents have grown accustomed to, we must also increase our revenue. Successful businesses, additional households and possible expansion are all ways to dilute the cost sharing we all face as a Village. Any development with additional residents would increase our revenue, but as a planned development, we reduce or eliminate the Village's cost responsibility. As a PUD, the developer is responsible for the sewer, lift station, roads and drainage, and the HOA after completion of construction. With any other development, the Village would ultimately be paying for the final paving after it was pieced together, a lift station, and any master drainage improvements. Rough estimates of this would be significant and this money is best spent improving existing infrastructure. We did hear concerns about the maintenance costs of the lift station if the HOA were to dissolve. In that case, the Village would create a permanent special assessment on the homes in that development to cover the costs of maintenance in perpetuity.

As previously presented, our sewer costs increase annually from the City of Columbus, currently at a rate of 6%. We also have additional inspections from the EPA that are mandated every 10yrs. Most recently, that inspection and repairs required on our 20yr old system was over \$200k. Without additional households, our sewer fund would be in a deficit come 2029. That number come 2030 is a negative \$192,091.00. With these additional households and frontage fees associated with growth, our sewer fund will always be solvent. We will continue to see rising costs from Columbus, and we need to anticipate that an aging sewer system will require additional repair with each EPA inspection. With no development, each current household would have to shoulder all of the costs we will assuredly face.

I'd like to respond to the social media comments, concerns and claims starting with the emergency legislation. For all of the reasons I've detailed, not only do we need this site to develop, but we need it to develop in the most advantageous way possible for the Village. This includes lowest costs, reasonable density, potentially least amount of traffic impact, best infrastructure and best product. This proposal from R&H provides the best fit for the Village vs. any alternative that has been proposed. This adopted emergency legislation protected the Village from any delay that could jeopardize our ability to capitalize on this specific plan. This plan was reviewed both on its own merits, but also with the benefit of previous iterations by other builders. As I mentioned, each proposed concept was similar in layout, but the price point, target audience, overall quality and density were all items that previous plans failed to finalize. It was even mentioned at a past presentation for a different builder that "if this were Romanelli and Hughes, we wouldn't have a problem".

It was posted that any emergency legislation must have the reason for the emergency stated. The ordinance does contain the emergency legislation language that states it “would be BENEFICIAL, promote public health, safety and economic interests of the community. This does all of those things. Residents did have the opportunity to voice concerns, those concerns were heard, and also discussed as to why this option was superior. While I would not discount anyone’s concerns, some were misplaced or information was misunderstood, for example, concerning drainage and right of way.

I also saw a long discussion and misunderstanding of the benefits development would have to our sewer fund. We have different costs to our sewer: Usage, debt service for the sewer loan, operating costs, and maintenance. Usage fees from Columbus will continue to be on an individual basis, and someday the \$18.90 bill we pay towards the sewer loan will go away. But the Columbus costs will continue to rise, the maintenance costs will continue to rise due to age and condition of the system, and inflation and the cost of materials and service will increase. It is not realistic to expect the current number of households to cover these costs. Development tap fees and additional households will keep our sewer fund solvent and help shoulder the costs we all pay.

Another economic related post referenced an idea that the Village should not expect any income tax revenue because all these homeowners would have second homes in Florida and use that as their primary residence and pay no income tax here. That may occasionally happen, but that is an extraordinary assumption I view as less likely than a downsizing couple staying close to where they’ve lived and raised a family in their familiar bubble.

Finally, I’d like to address the inference there was anything nefarious or corrupt going on with Council’s vote, or that they do not care since none live in close proximity to this site and just expect those residents to bear the brunt of this development. This Council has accomplished great amounts of improvement and progress for the Village. I commend them for their thorough approach to not only this decision but all the topics that have come before them over the last few years. Many decisions, big and small, have to be made and every one has been thoughtfully reviewed for the best interests of the Village and all of its residents. These are not members of the federal government making decisions far from home where they do not have to live with the impact of their decisions every day. Ultimately, we all want what is best for the Village, and I’m proud that there is so much passion for our community, but ultimately if we fail to plan, we are planning to fail. If we fail to grow, we will be consumed. It benefits all of us to maintain as much control as possible in what the Village becomes and improve on areas that were not controlled previously. The Village has quirks no other community in Central Ohio does, some good or bad depending on your perspective.

Dan Mathews, Mayor

I will open the floor to comment on this.

Carol Kender – You said that this might be increasing income tax to the village. If these people are empty nesters or 65 and older and on retirement, they are not going to pay any RITA income tax. If they are 65 and older they will probably get an abatement from property tax from the County.

Mayor Mathews – We get a small amount of property tax as it stands now.

Carol Kender - Let's say 10 of the 24 spend their winters in Florida, you will not get any income tax from them if they are more than 180 days out of the state. Those are the assumptions that you are making.

Mayor Mathews – Romanelli & Hughes gave a price point of \$900,000 to over one million dollars. Is it your contention that 24 homes are paying cash for these properties?

Carol- They may be. That property has a lot of overgrowth trees and you guys are not thinking of this I'm sure. The west side of Shawnee Hills does not have a mosquito problem because there are all sorts of bat nests in those trees. You take those trees down and then we will have a mosquito problem.

Mayor Mathews – There is a tree plan in the proposal from R & H. The best plan would be a planned development where there is a tree plan involved. An R-2 plan would be clear cut. We have no say in the trees.

Carol – R& H will only be leaving a corpus of trees on the north side.

Mayor Mathews – There will also be more green space than you would have in R-2. The bat situation, the wetland situation, those all have procedures, not mandated by us. They are mandated by the EPA and the Army Corp. of Engineers.

Carol – When I moved in on W. Mohawk I didn't even know Sue lived there because of all the trees. A developer came along and cut down all the trees and now my garage floods. Every mature tree absorbs 250,000 gallons of water a year.

Mayor Mathews – You are safe here because the flood waters go west. What happens if it goes R-2. Who takes care of the drainage?

Carol – I was told an R-2 was more expensive than a PUD. Please explain the difference.

Mayor Mathews – If that development were to go R-2, each developer would do the road individually for the home. At the end of that development guess who is paving it. The village. Do you know how much it costs to pave from Dublin Rd. to Shawnee Trail on Glick? It was over \$200,000.00.

Carol – I suggested to R & H and I still think it's a good idea. When PJ built her house, it was built to live in the woods. Why can't they do that over there and put in bigger houses.

Mayor Mathews – That is not the plan that was submitted. I hear about traffic. Mrs. Badgley had a problem with traffic and safety. If you build a single-family home and they have teenage drivers. We can't complain that we can't have more traffic and then develop single-family homes that will promote more traffic.

Erin – I don't understand that logic. I have a teenage driver and she is just as good as any adult driver that is out there.

Mayor Mathews – I am not saying they are bad drivers. I am talking about the number that we complain about.

Erin – The 55 and over community has college students coming home. These are silly assumptions.

Mayor Mathews – If I am making silly assumptions, then these are also silly assumptions. We can't make the assumption that everyone is going to pay cash for a million-dollar home. We can't make the assumption that people are going to live in Florida six months of the year, make it their primary residence and claim no income tax here.

Erin – We can't make the assumption it is going to be a 55 and over community because it is not a restriction to live there. We have requested several times for the dedication that was done to dedicate these right-of-ways to the village. She said to Brian you received another written request either last night or today asking for that information.

Brian Zets – The request I got today from attorney Brian Hunt asked for public documents related to the rezoning application.

Erin – It also asked for anything that indicates that the easements back there are public in Shawnee Hills and not private easements to the plat.

Brian – I will let you look at the letter. I don't believe it says that.

Erin – Read the section of the letter to Brian that she was referencing.

Brian – There is a plat map that shows the right-of-ways.

Erin – I would like you to supply that as your argument as requested per Brian.

Mayor Mathews – The vacation that we have currently doesn't affect those easements anyway. It only affects Drake's.

Erin – It affects mine because it is written into my deed that I have the right for ingress and egress for driveway and recreational purposes.

Brent Drake – I don't understand the logic that 24 additional homes will make the village solvent.

Council member Thatcher – This is not looking at the entire village finances. It will make us whole on the sewer and sewer long term maintenance that we have not been collecting enough money for, which we are correcting. Everyone will feel the pinch because everyone's bill goes up, including ours. This gives us a faster chance at a bigger chunk of tap fees in the long run. It

won't be \$250,000.00 the day they do it. We do have a better chance or recouping, timely, on the tap fees for the long term of the sewers. That is the main facet of it and we don't incur the extra cost of a potential for a lift station. I have been on UST for almost 8 years. I know how much that lift station on Shawnee Trail has cost us. We put hundreds of thousands of dollars in it in the last 10 years. Here we have the potential for a lift station that would be needed whether R-2 or PUD. This way someone else foots the bill and creates a long-term plan for that. That is a big part on the financial side. It's not going to solve our problems. We are not going to get rich from the income tax, we are not going to get rich from the property tax. We all know costs are going to go up. This should add walkability for these people. They should have a nice development back there. It should be relatively quiet. I can't guarantee it, I don't know. It is nice overall and a lot of benefits for us. Yes, it is negative for people who live by there. There are negatives in many parts of the village where who lives behind them, beside them or around them whether it's Shawnee Hills, the Township, Tartan or Muirfield.

Carol – Isn't there someplace else to get that money than putting all your eggs into a 24-house basket of tap fees.

Mayor Mathews – Yes, you would pay from the General Fund.

Carol – Why is this whole thing hinging on the tap fees pulling us out of a deficit. If you need money just pull it out of the general fund.

Mayor Mathews - It is not a one-time occurrence. That inspection happens every ten years.

Council member Thatcher – We are working on a plan to make the sewer system and the village financially viable for the next 30 years when many of us won't be here. We are only interested in that for the long term of the village. It wasn't that long ago the village was in the red. We can't guarantee income tax or certain things like that. We do have to pay Columbus for our sewer flow and we have to pay for everything that goes with having a sewer. We are required to have a sewer. The 24 houses are not a magic cure all for anything. This is a good plan for the village. Someone else owns the property and they want to do something with it. Does it fit the needs? Yes, it does. There are positives and negatives about it for both sides.

Carol – Why is this the best move for the village?

Council member Isern – We didn't seek this proposal. They came to us with it. This is a realistic, in my mind, positive use for that property. No matter what was built back there, no matter when, the same people would be affected and the same complaints would be issued.

Council member Gates – I made a statement after Maronda left they you guys could do a Go Fund Me account and you could actually purchase the land, maintain it and set up some kind of trust on it. It has been done in other places. It was done in Jerome where the old school is. I also have to say that I live on W. Mohawk. I am Carol's neighbor. One thing that happened recently, one of my neighbors asked me about something that happened in one of our planning and zoning meeting. I knew it was erroneous but it had been floating around on Facebook. I proved that it wasn't what they said. It was not correct on Facebook, yet they are still believing

the stuff on Facebook. For someone like myself who is going to be just as impacted by everybody else in here except for those on Westview. I will see the construction traffic, and I will hear it. You have to understand, I took an oath, I took an oath to do the best job I can, not only abiding by the laws, in case we were breaking them or for the future of the village. That is what I have to do. An oath is a very serious thing. It is not something like getting on Facebook and just saying whatever you want. It is very sad, it really is because I walk all the time and everybody has all kind of nerve to write things and even intimate about me. People that I thought I was friends with intimated things about me and what my motivations must be. I live on the freaking street. A little grace would be nice. A little feeling that maybe somebody would actually say to themselves, Mary fought against that first development, but she is all for this, why is that.

Carol – Why is that?

Council member Gates – Because it is the right thing to do. Once it is done, it will be done. The village will benefit from it, long term. That is what I have to look at. I don't have to look at anything if I don't want to but I took an oath. That means I have to look at everything. The future. I don't know how many people that are in this room will still be here in the future. I hope I am.

Jacob Banker - There is an underlying principal that I want to make sure that we can convey peacefully. Part of the concern referenced is not the traffic, at least from my perspective, it feels like an infringement of an ownership right that we need help defining. That's where we are learning a bit more as far as what is listed within our plat, within our deeds of ownership and those have been impeded a few times and having navigated through those, there are certain rights that we have to say it does infringe on those things that is part of our ownership within that plat. There are a group of us in that plat that is recorded with Delaware County that those are effectively changing with this development. That is the part that is concerning from my perspective, not the neighbors, not the traffic, it's the taking away of that. That's the concern where the navigation of that conversation feels like it is taking from us and placed with all of you to vote on. I am not sure that is the right procedure or decision and frankly, I don't have that answer either. That's the principal of concern and if we are taxed on that and paying money to the County and other things, yet we are losing those things so that the plat can be developed. As a group of about 12 owners within the plat, there is a grouping within our State that there are some grantors rights that I think we are afforded. That is what feels intrusive and why we are expressing the level of concern. I do love the look of the community and I do love additional neighbors and we knew it was going to happen. There was no way it could not have been developed because we chose to live here too. It feels like we are helpless and we have no way to defend ourselves. There is a lot of conflict because there is a feeling of taking away that feels like we are losing things that we have rightfully paid for and owned specifically designated with dimensions across multiple parcels within the plat where all of this is part of.

Mayor Mathews – Brian can you respond. Ultimately it comes down to a legal definition, right. From the village's perspective, the engineer's perspective, and from the County's perspective are those in fact public right-of-ways.

Brian – Yes.

Mayor Mathews – First of all, I will say while there is a precedence that may be set by any given council, generally, we are going with recommendations from whatever Brian or Chris are recommending. Those are the experts in these areas.

I would like to read a statement from Chris Tebbe.

I will not be at the meeting tonight but I wanted to provide you my opinion on the vacation of the right-of-ways for this project. When people request the vacation of a right-of-way, I apply the same thought process to deciding whether to support vacating it. These are the questions I ask myself.

Would the vacation prevent the village from accessing other parcels that could be developed in the future? In this case. no.

Does the vacation limit or change the access to other unrelated properties? No.

Is there any benefit for the village to keep the right-of-way, i.e. for future utility or road connections? No.

Is more than one property owner affected by the vacation? No.

Every other vacation that has been requested answered yes to one or more of these questions. For these reasons I do not have an issue with the vacation of the requested right-of-ways.

Mayor Mathews – Again, it comes down to what we are being relayed to, our information to make the decision on, Brian’s definition of this is a public right-of-way, Chris’ definition of this is a public right-of-way. That is all we can make a decision on, what has been proposed. No other application, no other format, nothing was proposed other than what Romanelli & Hughes just proposed.

Megan Bello – Would Bakers property be impacted and they wouldn’t be able to access with the vacation of this.

Council member Thatcher – Their property is outside of the village. They have access on Logan.

Sue Badgley – What is the plan for the section of Westview from the entrance of this development going all the way out to Mohawk. Two cars cannot pass on Westview without damaging people’s properties.

Mayor Mathews – There are some improvements at the intersection and then up Westview where the truck would turn right and then turn left into the development.

Council member Gates – I asked Jim at the last meeting if there would be a project manager on site. I think the project manager will have to make sure the road is not blocked. He will have to manage the traffic.

Council member Zimmerman – I think that when this development starts, they will be stacking in the loop. They will make a loop to get out.

Sue – You were talking about this is going to resolve or help with financial issues within the village. We are in a finite situation here. We are not going to grow land wise. What is the long

term plan to learn to live within our means, as much as we can. I honestly don't feel that we necessarily do that. That is just my personal opinion but I think it is something that really needs to be emphasized and directed and you have to start trying to deal with that.

Mayor Mathews – With the return to work we may see a decrease in our income tax money. My question is, where would you start to cut costs.

Sue – Unless you can sit down and look at, and I am talking about going detail by detail by looking at all the expenditures that you have made. We are spending \$24,000.00 at Frambes Pond. Is this just to make it pretty or is it something that is absolutely necessary that has to be done. This seems petty when people mention it but do we track how much the expenses are on the vehicles. Do we need all the vehicles that we have? There's a vehicle that sits out here in the parking lot that has an emblem on it. Why do we have that? I'm sure we are paying maintenance and insurance on it. What do we use that car for?

Mayor Mathews – Mark uses that car. If Mark uses his own car there is a liability issue if Mark were to run into a telephone pole in a non-village vehicle.

Sue – You have the Kubota that is running around here also. Why do we have that on top of the car?

Mayor Mathews – Again, honest conversation, you are suggesting that we cut out some of the equipment that we have in the village.

Sue- This is just a conversation. We need to be looking at that. Do we need everything that we have? Are we running as efficient as we need to run? That is something that everybody questions sometimes. It is a matter of going down through detail by detail by detail and it takes a long time to do it.

Mayor Mathews – I would say every single one of the expenditures either go through Finance and/or UST. Everyone's eyes at some point are on there other than the day to day operations that maybe Shirley and Russ have expenses. We actually review those at each council meeting. I would say that is the first thing on costs. The other comment I have on costs and I have been around 16 years now, the creativity that we have had to show with our finances over the years has been mind boggling. We have a Chief of Police who is also our Administrator because of a financial thought that this might work out for us. We had to be creative in how we are spending our money. You go somewhere else, Powell doesn't have that.

Sue – You are also providing the Chief a car that he drives back and forth to work.

Council member Gates- I am on Finance. Periodically we turn over the vehicles. The vehicle he drives now will be put into the fleet and it will be outfitted like the other cruisers. Prior to COVID or right around COVID, we did not authorize another vehicle and when we finally did, one of the cruisers was on its last leg. When you have police vehicles, it's not the mileage so much as it is the running. They have to always be on. You never want to get in the vehicle for an

emergency call and the car won't start. That is what wears out a car in a police fleet. When you are talking about different expenses, it is not one big giant pot.

Mayor Mathews – Just to understand, on expenditures, this isn't a household budget. The job of a village is to spend your income tax money. It is not to see how much we can save and hold back, it's not. In a State audit we were cited for saving too much at one point. It's the job of the village, it's the decisions that they are making to spend the money on, if we want to look at that.

Sue – You also have to make sure that you live within your means. If that money doesn't come in as you appropriated, you will have to make some tough decisions.

Council member Larosa – I talked a lot earlier on Facebook. If you think about, conversationally, over the winter we lost one of the trucks during a snow/ice storm. If we wouldn't have had that other truck and the Kubota and they were both running 16 hours a day for three days. We could not have provided any clearance for anybody. If you really think about it the complaint would be at that point, what are you guys doing. It is all kind of time specific. Right now, spring is starting, not a huge amount going on and you have two vehicles sitting. If you come back in May. You have a part-timer on the Kubota, Richard over here fixing something, and the other person doing something else. It just depends on when you are looking at it. That is municipality work in general. There are highs and lows.

Council member Zimmerman – Sue you had a comment and I didn't know the answer until I asked it one time. You were talking about our insurance per vehicle. We get a blanket through the State and I think it is 0-15 vehicles is one fee. It is not per vehicle.

Council member Thatcher – It's about the service that we provide. It looks like it would be fun to rip around town in, but, as someone who uses the sidewalks, that's the only vehicle we have that can plow the sidewalks. There are other considerations. It's just not as set as it looks.

Council member LaRosa – You think about, we have all these plants and Blooms. Blooms supports some of the planters around the businesses. Those businesses are here in a sense because we provide a service to them to bring customers in. We make beautiful, customers come in and spend money and we get tax revenue. Everybody wins. If we didn't provide that service you can nitpick and say, do we need to, no. Does it help, yes.

Sue – It goes back to like to have and do we need to.

Shirley – The pots that are close to the businesses are provided to them for a fee each year by Blooms. The pots on the street lights and along the sidewalks are the villages and Blooms will keep them planted and decorated based on the season. The village buys the plants.

Sue – Those are the conversations I think that people need to have and listen to and know what is going on. Again, when you are talking about having a finite area to deal with, you are not going to develop yourself out of this. At some point you are going to have to live with what you have.

Council member Gates – I think a lot of people don't take advantage of the services we provide in providing information. Before I even ran for office I spent three years sitting at every council meeting. I never missed a council meeting for three years just so that I could learn about everything. If people were really interested and they only had those things instead of going to Facebook, we are here.

Sue – People tried to talk to everyone about multi-family in the meetings and quite honestly the pushback that was given as far as the surveys being sent out asking about multi-family and the majority came in that they wanted more information or that they did not want multi-family. When we came to the meetings regarding multi-family, all we got was the survey wasn't official and people cheated, this kind of stuff. It was insulting to the residents. You had an individual that said why don't you just put it on the ballot and everybody got upset with that suggestion. After it was over and done with, people said let's put it on the ballot and see what happens.

Council member LaRosa – I was told that Council could not put that on the ballot.

Brian – The village could not put something on the ballot. The residents could as a referendum. There are only certain things, by statute, the Council could put on the ballot.

Council member Gates – I had conversations with people and the premise that they used of the information that they got, not from us, but from the people putting it on the ballot, the referendum, was erroneous, yet they wouldn't believe what I was telling them.

Council member La Rosa – This brings up memories of going through that. This isn't to point fingers at anybody but there were definitely things that were put out there, and I don't know if it was partially our fault in how we communicated or how it was received but there was a notion that there were going to be 72 apartments built. That we were going to do high rises. There was basically almost an idea that we are giving developers a blank check to build whatever they want to build. From my understanding the legislation was, hey you can come talk to us. We are going to do it as a PUD. That was not what was presented to my neighbors because I talked to them specifically. What are you hearing, what are you reading? They said I don't want high rise apartment buildings. I don't want this to look like Bridge Park. There was never, ever, ever a submission to us that we could of even looked at because it wasn't in our code.

Mayor Mathews – I think part of it was, that architect came with a concept drawing and it was three stories high and there were 70 some units. That compared to what the legislation actually allowed, what are building standards were, it couldn't have existed.

Sue- I think the concern was, you folks are in charge at this point, but once that legislation gets in, if this whole council changes or the whole zoning board changes, everybody is at the mercy of the individuals that are in at that time. We have been told in the past that if someone comes in and presents a proposal and it's in the code, you couldn't stop them. If they came in and wanted to do multi-family back on Westview, you would have to approve it.

Mayor Mathews – They would have to apply for that under the PUD. There has to be a leap of faith. Our commercial definition is the country look and feel and we have stuck to that for over

30 years. All of the decisions that we have made and maybe people disagree with the black street signs or maybe people disagree that Blooms even exist because we want to beautify Dublin Road and the village in general. You can disagree with all those things but that's what these people decided up here. Todd, Kathy and Mary are retired. Russ sees them almost every single day. They put more time and effort into this job than maybe what their regular jobs were. We cannot discount the time and effort that these people put into it and the thought that they put into it. Nobody is just throwing out a decision based on, well, this seems the easiest thing to do. I think they have made the harder decisions than to take the easy ones. The overall success and the progress of the village is what everybody up here has thought about. Going back to the roads and the legislation on the agenda tonight and it is written as an emergency. There is a discrepancy. One side thinks that it is private and the information that we get is it is public.

Jacob Banker – I was searching for the word that I had read when I was looking up Ohio law and the word was a dedication of the land within the plat for public use. Landowners dedicate the land for public use as indicated on the plat. There's some shared contribution in that decision and that's what feels like it's taking away.

Brian – When you are talking about dedicating a public roadway, that is when the road is actually constructed and you are giving the road to the city or village and dedicate the public road to them. This is not a dedication. It is still an unimproved right-of-way. This is a vacation. The village in the past has looked at vacating unimproved right-of-ways and some have been granted and some have not.

### **Pro Tem Report**

Pro tem Thatcher said he talked to the State Auditor's office and told them that some of us were having email issues and I filled out the questionnaire and did an interview with them about fraud, waste and abuse in the village and discussed any conflicts of interest or anything else. Waiting to hear back if there are any follow up questions from them.

### **Legislative Actions**

Second Reading – Ordinance 09-2025 – An Ordinance amending Section 921.03 (A) (Potable Water User Charge) and Section 921.03 (B) (Well Water User Charge) of the Codified Ordinances of the Village of Shawnee Hills.

Second Reading – Ordinance 10-2025 – An Ordinance to reappropriate funds for current expenses and other expenditures of the Village of Shawnee Hills, State of Ohio, during the fiscal year ending December 31, 2025 and declaring an emergency.

It was moved by Gates, seconded by Zimmerman to suspend with the third reading and declare Ordinance 10-2025 an emergency. Following vote on the motion is recorded: yea, 6; Gates Isern, LaRosa. Matney. Thatcher and Zimmerman. Nay, none.

It was moved by Matney, seconded by Zimmerman to adopt Ordinance 10-2025 as an emergency. Following vote on the motion is recorded: yea, 6; Gates Isern, LaRosa. Matney. Thatcher and Zimmerman. Nay, none.

First Reading – Ordinance 11-2025 – An Ordinance authorizing the payment of the invoice received from Buckeye Home and Land Services LLC and declaring an emergency. It was moved by Gates, seconded by Zimmerman to suspend with the second and third readings and declare Ordinance 11-2025 an emergency. Following vote on the motion is recorded: yea, 6; Gates Isern, LaRosa. Matney. Thatcher and Zimmerman. Nay, none. It was moved by Matney, seconded by LaRosa to adopt Ordinance 11-2025 as an emergency. Following vote on the motion is recorded: yea, 6; Gates Isern, LaRosa. Matney. Thatcher and Zimmerman. Nay, none.

First Reading – Ordinance 12-2025 – An Ordinance vacating the unimproved rights-of-way running on, over, and through certain parcels numbers / lots and declaring an emergency.

**Bills**

It was moved by Zimmerman, seconded by Isern to pay the bills in the amount of \$92,380.88. Following vote on the motion is recorded: yea, 6; Gates Isern, LaRosa. Matney. Thatcher and Zimmerman. Nay, none.

**Treasurer’s Report**

It was moved by Gates, seconded by Zimmerman to approve the following treasurer’s report:

General Fund	553,229.66	Enfct. and Education	1,795.98
Street Fund	56,168.06	Fire Fund	194,221.61
State Highway	49,096.49	TIF Fund	109,720.40
PD Body Armor	0.00	TIF 2 Fund	53,268.70
Cont. Pro. Training	13,295.80	Police District Fund	167,066.47
Evans Farm JEDD	5,965.06	Veteran’s Memorial	298.97
Drug Law Enfct.	534.41	Sewer Operating	77,690.04
Indigent Drivers	385.84	Sewer Replacement	7,506.08
Law Enfct. Trust	3,852.20	Storm Sewer Fund	33,517.79
Am Rescue Plan	10,410.14	Debt Service Fund	125,054.60
Weed Fund	648.38	Enterprise Improvement	23,419.00

For a total of \$1,487,145.68.

Following vote on the motion is recorded: yea, 6; Gates Isern, LaRosa. Matney. Thatcher and Zimmerman. Nay, none.

**Adjournment**

There being no further business, it was moved by Thatcher, seconded by Zimmerman to adjourn. Following vote on the motion is recorded: yea, 6; Gates Isern, LaRosa. Matney. Thatcher and Zimmerman. Nay, none. Meeting adjourned at 8:57 p.m.