

**Council for the Village of Yellow Springs
Regular Session Minutes**

In Council Chambers @6:00 P.M.

Monday, July 7, 2025

CALL TO ORDER

President of Council Kevin Stokes called the meeting to order at 6:04pm.

ROLL CALL

Present were President Kevin Stokes, Vice President Gavin DeVore Leonard and Council members Brian Housh, Trish Gustafson and Carmen Brown. Solicitor Amy Blankenship, Project Lead Elyse Giardullo, Planning and Economic Development Coordinator Meg Leatherman, Planning and ED Coordinator Aaron Arillano and Village Manager Johnnie Burns were present.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

Marianne MacQueen announced an informational meeting regarding local governance and running for office to be held Tuesday, July 8th.

Housh acknowledged Juneteenth, the Council session on Village growth and the Senior Center annual meeting as significant events. He expressed support for the new pedestrian area on Short Street.

CONSENT AGENDA

1. Minutes of June 16, 2025 Regular Meeting
2. Minutes of June 23, 2025 Special Meeting Work Session: Village Growth

Stokes asked for a vote of all those in favor of approving the Minutes of June 16, 2025. Approval of minutes was informally passed on a 5-0 vote.

Stokes asked for a vote of all those in favor of approving the Minutes of June 23, 2025. Approval of minutes was informally passed on a 5-0 vote.

REVIEW OF AGENDA

Resolution 2025-39 was added to the agenda.

PETITIONS/COMMUNICATIONS

Thomas Kellar re: Support for Windsor Union Project
Timothy Barton re: Opposition to Windsor Union Project/Request Traffic Study
Jean Barton re: Opposition to Windsor Union Project/Request Traffic Study
Tom Degenhart re: Opposition to Windsor Union Project
Desiree Nickel re: Opposition to Windsor Union Project
Jerry Papania re: Opposition to Windsor Union Project (2)
Ellis Jacobs re: Opposition to Windsor Union Project/Fair Housing Information
Finance Director re: Proposed Budget Calendar for 2025
Kevin Stokes re: Letter Regarding HB 335
Jim McCarthy, Miami Valley Fair Housing re: Windsor Union Project Comments
Dorothee Bouquet re: Active Transportation and Safety
Lisa Abel re: Support for Windsor Union Project
Shelby Chestnut re: Support for Windsor Union Project
Steve Conn re: Support for Windsor Union Project
John Herbold re: Opposition to Windsor Union Project/Suggestions
Moira Laughlin re: Opposition to Windsor Union Project/Suggestions

Erin Rodgers re: Opposition to Windsor Union Project/Suggestions
Sheila Dunphy re: Support for Windsor Union Project

Stokes reviewed communications.

PUBLIC HEARINGS/LEGISLATION

Stokes recused from consideration of ordinances 2025-10; 2025-11; 2025-12 and 2025-13 for reasons of potential conflict of interest and left Council Chambers, passing the gavel to DeVore Leonard.

Brown MOVED THAT SECOND READINGS BE READ IN BY TITLE ONLY. Gustafson SECONDED, and the MOTION PASSED 4-0 ON A VOICE VOTE.

Second Reading and Public Hearing of Ordinance 2025-10 Rezoning 1 Parcel Totaling 2.169 Acres of Property Located at 275 East North College Street to Planned Unit Development (PUD) and Amending the Zoning Map Accordingly. Housh MOVED and Brown SECONDED a MOTION TO APPROVE.

Leatherman introduced the legislation as follows: Following a public hearing held on June 10, 2025, Planning Commission recommended approval of a request to rezone property located at 275 East North College Street from E-1 to PUD. They then recommended approval of a Preliminary Development Plan for the same property. Both recommendations passed on a 5-0 vote and included five conditions of approval with modifications to the findings.

Per Village Code 1254.05(c)(5) the Village Council should review the preliminary development plan, the record of the Planning Commission proceedings (documented in this memo and the attached report), the standards of 1254.06 and the recommendation of the Planning Commission, and shall approve, disapprove, or approve with modifications to the preliminary development plan and rezoning request.

Leatherman noted providing Council and the public with all materials provided to PC for their hearing. She referenced a memo she had provided outlining the five conditions of approval attached to the recommendation from PC to Council.

Leatherman then instructed Council that per Village Code 1254.05(c)(5), Council should review the preliminary development plan, the record of the Planning Commission proceedings as provided, the standards of 1254.06 and the recommendation of Planning Commission, and shall approve, disapprove, or approve with modifications to the preliminary development plan and rezoning request.

Leatherman stated that Windsor proposes to demolish the existing 73,000-square-foot structure on the property as it is significantly deteriorated and poses health and safety concerns. The building will undergo abatement and be fully demolished, to be replaced with two newly constructed residential buildings.

Windsor Companies have requested modifications to off-street parking, height, and rear yard setbacks, and have committed to four of the possible qualifying criteria from the Village code in justifying those requests.

Windsor also requested a density of 44.26 dwelling units per acre, based on 96 units situated on approximately 2.169 acres. To justify the requested increase in density, Windsor Companies will provide three of qualifying public benefits from the Village's incentive criteria.

Leatherman stated that Planning Commission had reviewed the requested modifications and density bonus and had concluded that the required number of criteria for modification of minimum requirements and for density bonus were met. These, she stated, are outlined in the provided staff report.

Leatherman referenced the Comprehensive Land Use Plan (CLUP), which prioritizes infill and discourages development outside of the urban service boundary. She stated that the provided plan aligns with the tenets of the CLUP.

Leatherman outlined next steps required by code should Council vote to accept the recommendations of Planning Commission. A final development plan accompanied by a site plan—in compliance with code section 1248-- would be submitted to the Village. That plan would provide detail as to parking, noise levels, landscaping, etc.

One condition of approval, Leatherman noted, is submission of a traffic impact study. Any recommendations of such a study, she said, would need to be implemented at the cost of the developer.

Architectural plans would also need to be submitted for the final development plan. The Village's contracted building compliance entity, NIC, would review those plans and would issue permits. NIC would also inspect construction, ensuring Ohio Building Code compliance at all stages, Leatherman stated.

Leatherman stated that all survey documents and legal descriptions submitted as part of the rezoning and preliminary plan processes have been reviewed by the Greene County Engineer's office and have been approved.

Leatherman then read the five conditions recommended by PC in their recommendation to Council as follows:

1. Prior to final development plan approval, a traffic impact study must be conducted. Any identified mitigation measures shall be incorporated into the final development plan by the applicant.
2. A minimum of fifteen percent (15%) of the dwelling units shall be permanently affordable, defined as housing for households earning 80% or less of the Area Median Income (AMI).
3. A 5-foot-wide sidewalk shall be constructed along the property's frontage on both President and Livermore Streets.
4. The development shall provide 48 bicycle parking spaces, per specifications identified in VC 1264.02.
5. A stormwater management plan must be completed prior to final development plan approval, in accordance with the requirements of VC 1226.06.

At the suggestion of the Solicitor, Council determined that it would be best to first consider the preliminary plan, since the two ordinances needed to be separately deliberated, and the preliminary plan presented greater complexity.

To that end, DeVore Leonard MOVED and Gustafson SECONDED a MOTION TO TABLE ORDINANCE 2025-10. The MOTION PASSED 4-0 ON A VOICE VOTE.

DeVore Leonard MOVED TO TABLE ORDINANCE 2025-10. Gustafson SECONDED, and the MOTION PASSED 4-0.

Second Reading and Public Hearing of Ordinance 2025-11 Approving the Preliminary Development Plan for a PUD Located at 275 East North College Street. Housh MOVED and Gustafson SECONDED a MOTION TO APPROVE.

DeVore Leonard inquired as to how the developer would assure that in fact 15% of the units would be made permanently affordable.

Leatherman responded that Windsor International Realty, Windsor's affiliated asset management company, has experience with varied forms of affordable housing including Section 8 and voucher-based housing, and that the affordability component here would be similarly managed.

DeVore Leonard received assurance that the required traffic study would include parking and bike/pedestrian considerations.

Leatherman noted that a condition of approval is construction of bike storage and added sidewalks for this connectivity.

Housh iterated that he was pleased that the traffic impact study will incorporate biking and pedestrian access. He noted that Planning Commission had asked that the number of affordable units be specified as "15" rather than 15% of the total units, and asked that this be reflected in a final decision.

DeVore Leonard SWORE IN ALL PRESENT INTENDING TO SPEAK.

Erik Alfieri, Windsor Companies Partner, acknowledged having sworn in, and presented a brief overview of the Union project. He noted that the plan is conceptual at this point, but will contain detail at the final development plan phase. He emphasized that Windsor is Ohio-based, and has a history of providing affordable and unique properties.

Dan Mayer, Architect of record for the project, acknowledged having sworn in. Mayer spoke to the issue of accessibility, stating that his firm has an accessibility professional on staff to assure consistent compliance. He added that the Ohio Building Code regulates accessibility and energy compliance standards through a life safety code. Mayer asserted that the State of Ohio requires standards in line with the Fair Housing Act which, he said, exceed those of the Americans with Disabilities Act.

Mayer stated that the requirement for accessible "Type A" units for the proposed project was two, but that Windsor would be providing four. Type B units, he said, are designed for easy conversion to Type A.

Mayer said that the builder is required to submit to a "com check" which assures that the construction meets requirements for sound, energy efficiency, sustainability, etc. These specifications are administered by NIC, with whom the Village contracts for building inspection.

Gustafson stated that she sees only the minimum being met in terms of accessibility, and asked whether Windsor would consider adding more than four fully accessible units.

Mayer responded to Gustafson's concerns, stating that all units which are not type A are type B, and are not, therefore, all on the first level.

Alfieri responded to Gustafson, stating that the Kettering building project is meant as the project targeted to older residents and will have an elevator and wider hallways. He commented that Windsor considers the PUDs as a "package deal".

Alfieri addressed the traffic and parking study, stating that Windsor would be hiring a third party to conduct that study.

Housh referenced concerns that a study undertaken through Windsor would not be objective and asked Alfieri to address that concern.

Alfieri responded that objectivity was the reason a third party was engaged for this purpose. He stated that this firm could be engaged to present to Council if needed.

Leatherman asked Alfieri to address how the affordability issue would be administered and monitored.

DeVore Leonard asked that those aspects of affordability component be provided as the process moves forward.

DeVore Leonard OPENED THE PUBLIC HEARING.

The following persons each stated that they had been sworn in or were sworn in just prior to speaking as noted:

Pan Reich, 131 W.S. College Street, spoke in opposition to the proposed development, citing excessive density.

Bill Mitchell, 1360 Rice Road, spoke in opposition to the proposed development.

Louisa Bieri, 270 King Street, spoke in favor of the proposed development, citing the need to remove a blighted structure and the shortage of housing stock and sharing her own difficulty in finding an affordable home in the village.

Franklin Halley, 985 South High Street, spoke in favor of the project, citing the high need for additional housing. He commented that Antioch used to house upwards of 2000 students plus faculty and staff, and has become “a dead zone” in recent years. He asked that Council find a way to move the project forward.

Susan Abendroth, Rice Road, spoke in opposition to any tax abatement for the project, stating that these were neither fair nor necessary. She spoke in opposition to the project, stating that more people want to reside here than the community can accommodate.

Asa Leventhal, 1100 Grinnell Drive, spoke in favor of the proposed development. He urged that the village’s values be upheld in acting as a welcoming place.

Truth Garrett, Kenneth Hamilton Way, spoke in favor of the project. He stated that people who work in town cannot afford to live in town in arguing for more housing.

Desiree Nickel, 131 East Davis Street, asked that Council approve “with modifications”, listing those as reduction of units to 64 in two-story units; extension of East North College Street; provide eligibility requirements for affordable units; publicly discuss any tax abatement; conduct “real” noise study.

Jane Fernandes identified herself as the President of Antioch College and spoke in favor of the project as part of Antioch’s plan to sell off unneeded property for the benefit of the College and to meet village needs. She stated that she would be willing to partner with the Village in reopening East North College Street.

Brian Norman, non-resident Antioch employee, spoke in favor of the proposed development.

Anita Brown identified herself as living proximate to the proposed development and spoke in favor. She cited the advantages of the community and asked that these be available to more people.

Ellis Jacobs, 131 East Davis Street, stated his approval of more housing and the removal of the blighted Union building, but stated that the proposal does not meet the PUD requirements and should therefore be modified.

Housh asked that Jacobs cite which PUD requirements are not met, noting that five Planning Commission members have indicated otherwise.

Jacobs stated that they “just can’t” check all the boxes needed to attain the density bonus or other variances.

Brown called Point of Order, stating that the information Housh sought had been provided in readily available letters from Jacobs.

Housh responded that he had read the letters Jacobs had submitted for both Planning Commission and Council packets, but that he desired an explanation of the arguments presented.

Brown repeated her point of order, and the matter was dropped.

Barbara Tuss, 126 Marshall Street, spoke against the density proposed, alleging that this would set a precedent that would ruin the community as it now exists.

Ralita Hilderbrand Chambers, 716 South College, spoke in favor of the proposal and in favor of tax abatement, citing appropriate infill and a high need for apartment units.

Kevin McGruder, 622 Omar Circle, advocated for the proposal, stating a need for higher density if rents are to be kept moderate. He added that the perceived threat to “quiet enjoyment” could be mitigated with screening and good property management.

Toni Dosik, 315 Kingsfield Court, stated support for the proposal, citing four reasons: Windsor’s high reputation; survey results indicating that local apartments are not well managed, safe and affordable; need for a diverse population to keep the village “unique”, and influx of tax income to the village even if there are abatements, since the college does not pay property tax.

Len Kramer identified himself as a long-time resident who lived in the Livermore neighborhood for many years. Kramer asserted that if the apartment site is approached from the south, the scale is in keeping with adjacent college structures such as Spalt and North Halls. He expressed support for the project and for the affordable component.

Emily Seibel, 128 Kenneth Hamilton Way, identified herself as a member of the Antioch College Board of Trustees. She stated that the sale of property is strategic for the College and that the village is lucky to have found a developer interested in Yellow Springs. She stressed the need for more housing in the village.

Tim Barton, 610 Livermore, spoke in opposition to the development, asserting that the developer is out for profit and has to be made to do the right thing.

Caroline Mullin stated that she is not a resident, but is the Senior Center Director. She asked for a traffic study that takes future use of the Senior Center into account, including pedestrian traffic from older and/or disabled individuals. She expressed concern that the reopening of East North College is not a known quantity but would have significant impact on a traffic study.

Jerry Papania, property neighbor, stated that the parking required by code is not met by the project. He asked that a traffic study be obtained prior to any approval from Council on the basis that it could impact the final plan. He asserted that potential infrastructure costs associated with traffic study results are being avoided. He spoke against any tax abatement, and against the requested density, and offered an alternate plan for Windsor.

Tom Degenhart, 215 East Whiteman, stated that the PUD does not meet requirements for a PUD on less than 5 acres. He stated that there is inadequate parking provision and pointed out inaccuracies in a prior report provided to Planning Commission which gave parking data for village apartments, commenting that these inaccuracies were either “sloppy” or purposeful. He offered several quotes and scenarios out of context.

Malta Von Mathieson, 1234 Livermore Street, was sworn in at the podium. He identified as an Antioch College graduate and former member of the Board of Trustees, and spoke in favor of the project primarily as a way of assisting Antioch in downsizing.

Patti Dallas, 507 South High Street, was sworn in at the podium. She asked for a reduction in density.

Stephanie Pierce, 1605 Spillan Road, was sworn in at the podium. She alleged prior experience with Windsor, characterizing them as “aggressively for profit” in speaking against any tax abatement.

Jacineta Williams, 248 Whitehall Drive, stated that the project lacks character and individuality.

DeVore Leonard CLOSED THE PUBLIC HEARING.

Alfieri stated that each project would be evaluated on its merit such that setting a precedent is not a concern. He stressed that Windsor would be unable to obtain building permits for structures that did not meet code, including accessibility code.

Housh specified some changes he wanted to make to the conditions recommended by Planning Commission as follows: Specify that “15 units” will be permanently affordable; specify that the traffic study is a

“traffic/bike/pedestrian” study. He added that he would like the possible reopening of East North College Street included in the study.

Alfieri responded that neither Windsor nor the Village own East North College Street, making inclusion of that factor prohibitive.

DeVore Leonard commented that Council has not yet held a discussion regarding tax abatement for either Windsor project. He reiterated that this decision is not the final step in the process, and that a number of key concerns are addressed in the final development plan, which is yet to come.

DeVore Leonard acknowledged that the scale of the project is a core consideration and opined that raising concerns regarding scale and density is not necessarily NIMBY-ism. He expressed some frustration in being unable to respond in the moment to what he characterized as a number of comments that engaged in hyperbole or inaccuracies, stating that these make measured conversation difficult.

DeVore Leonard commented that the most immediate impact will be upon the neighboring properties, but that there is a less visible impact in failure to address the needs of the community regarding housing. He expressed a desire that there be more rather than less communication around development and housing proposals.

Brown called Point of Order.

DeVore Leonard expressed some confusion, stating that he simply wanted to make his thoughts and position clear, but indicated willingness to move on.

Housh MOVED to amend the first condition to add the words “a traffic/parking/bike/ped” impact study. Gustafson SECONDED.

DeVore Leonard proposed a Friendly Amendment adding the words “that factors in the Senior Center and other known developments” after the word “study”.

Blankenship advised that Leatherman weigh in on the feasibility of the amendment to convert the traffic study to include parking.

Leatherman responded that this had already been contemplated by the applicant and would not be an issue.

DeVore Leonard CALLED A VOTE ON THE AMENDMENT, and the MOTION PASSED 4-0 ON A VOICE VOTE.

Housh MOVED TO CHANGE THE TERM “15%” in the second condition to “15 units”. DeVore Leonard SECONDED and CALLED THE VOTE. The MOTION PASSED 4-0 ON A VOICE VOTE.

Housh asked for a condition regarding the opening of East North College Street.

Burns cautioned that while he is working with Jane Fernandes towards that possibility, the property is owned by Antioch, and Windsor has no ability to control that property.

Housh expressed confidence that East North College Street will be reopened.

DeVore Leonard expressed similar optimism, but asked that if there was a holdup that Council be informed.

DeVore Leonard received confirmation that no changes were desired to conditions 3, 4 or 5.

DeVore Leonard received confirmation that no further amendments to the conditions of approval were desired.

The Clerk received direction from Blankenship that the ordinance could be modified to read “Village Council accepts the Planning Commission recommendation with modifications” and that the specific modifications would not need to be referenced specifically in the ordinance.

The conditions of approval as modified by Council, as amended, read as follows:

1. Prior to final development plan approval, a traffic/parking/bike/pedestrian impact study must be conducted. Any identified mitigation measures shall be incorporated into the final development plan by the applicant.
2. A minimum of fifteen (15) of the dwelling units shall be permanently affordable, defined as housing for households earning 80% or less of the Area Median Income (AMI).
3. A 5-foot-wide sidewalk shall be constructed along the property's frontage on both President and Livermore Streets.
4. The development shall provide 48 bicycle parking spaces, per specifications identified in VC 1264.02.
5. A stormwater management plan must be completed prior to final development plan approval, in accordance with the requirements of VC 1226.06.

Housh MOVED TO APPROVE Ordinance 2025-11 AS AMENDED. Gustafson SECONDED. DeVore Leonard CALLED THE VOTE, and the MOTION PASSED 4-0 ON A ROLL CALL VOTE.

Second Reading and Public Hearing of Ordinance 2025-10 Rezoning 1 Parcel Totaling 2.169 Acres of Property Located at 275 East North College Street to Planned Unit Development (PUD) and Amending the Zoning Map Accordingly. DeVore Leonard MOVED and Housh SECONDED a MOTION TO UNTABLE ORDINANCE 2025-10. The MOTION PASSED 4-0 on a VOICE VOTE.

DeVore Leonard OPENED THE PUBLIC HEARING. There being no comment, DeVore Leonard CLOSED THE PUBLIC HEARING.

Housh MOVED TO APPROVE Ordinance 2025-10. Gustafson SECONDED. DeVore Leonard CALLED THE VOTE, and the MOTION PASSED 4-0 ON A ROLL CALL VOTE.

Second Reading and Public Hearing Ordinance 2025-13 Approving the Preliminary Development Plan for a PUD Located at 150 East South College Street. Gustafson MOVED and Brown SECONDED a MOTION TO APPROVE.

Leatherman introduced the hearing, first stating that per Village Code 1254.05(c)(5), Village Council should review the preliminary development plan, the record of the Planning Commission proceeding, the standards of 1254.06 and the recommendation of the Planning Commission, and shall approve, disapprove, or approve with modifications the preliminary development plan and rezoning request.

The development footprint, Leatherman explained, will remain the same since the Kettering building will be renovated into multi-family apartments for those over the age of 55. The existing open space and common areas will remain the same and the off-street parking location will remain the same.

Only one modification pertaining to this code requirement is requested and that is for the total off street parking spaces provided. Per code section 1264.02 a multi-family use is required to provide 2 parking spaces per dwelling unit or 86 total parking spaces for 43 dwelling units. The project proposes a total of 52 off-street parking spaces. This is a reduction to 34 parking spaces.

Windsor Companies commits to maintaining open space for the residents by providing community garden spaces on the property, providing 15% of the units as affordable (residents making 80% or less than the Area Median Income), employing best practices to manage stormwater, and renovating the building in way that reduces energy consumption.

The proposed PUD does include a request for a density bonus. The proposed density is 34.40 dwelling units per acre based on a total unit count of 43 dwelling units on 1.25 acres of land. The R-C zone allows for a total density of 14 du/acre. To offset the increase in density the following amenities (three are required) will be provided: **Cool roof technology will be used, Low impact development practices will be implemented, and a minimum of 25% open space will be dedicated within the development.**

Leatherman noted the conditions of approval recommended by Planning Commission as follows:

1. A traffic impact study shall be completed prior to Final PUD approval for the general vicinity, with implementation of any recommended mitigation measures incorporated into the final development plan;
2. At least 15% of the units shall be designated as permanently affordable for households earning 80% or less of the Area Median Income;
3. Provide 43 on-site bicycle parking spaces per specifications in VC 1264.02;
4. Prior to final development plan approval, obtain Village approval of a stormwater management plan in accordance with the requirements of VC 1226.06.
5. Provide landscaped screening along the alley that runs on the southern border of the property.

Alfieri presented a brief powerpoint, stating that Windsor is an expert in adaptive reuse, which is the approach they intend to take for this project. He noted that a derelict garage at the rear of the property will be demolished as part of the project.

DeVore Leonard OPENED THE PUBLIC HEARING.

Molly Burke affirmed having been sworn in and identified herself as a neighboring resident. She stated that removal of the existing garage will result in potential light intrusion from vehicles, and expressed gratitude for the condition regarding screening. Burke asked for assurance that adjoining properties would continue to be able to access the municipal alleys. Finally, Burke asked for a noise study to assure that the multiple mini-split units would not negatively impact the area.

DeVore Leonard CLOSED THE PUBLIC HEARING.

Housh received confirmation from Alfieri that the “6.45 units” determined by the 15% condition would be rounded up to 7 units of permanently affordable housing.

Housh MOVED TO AMEND Condition 1 to read “1. Prior to final development plan approval, a traffic/parking/bike/pedestrian impact study must be conducted. Any identified mitigation measures shall be incorporated into the final development plan by the applicant.” Gustafson SECONDED, and the MOTION PASSED 4-0 ON A VOICE VOTE.

Housh MOVED TO AMEND Condition 2 to change the words “15% of the units” to “7 units” to read as follows: 2. At least 7 of the units shall be designated as permanently affordable for households earning 80% or less of the Area Median Income. Gustafson SECONDED, and the MOTION PASSED 4-0 ON A VOICE VOTE.

DeVore Leonard received information from Leatherman that Planning Commission will receive the information regarding decibel levels in the noise study attached to the final development plan.

DeVore Leonard received assurance from Burns that the alleys will remain open, since they are public rights of way and contain utilities.

DeVore Leonard received affirmation from Blankenship that the ordinance could be modified to read “Village Council accepts the Planning Commission recommendation with modifications” and that the specific modifications would not need to be referenced specifically in the ordinance.

DeVore Leonard CALLED THE VOTE ON THE ORDINANCE AS AMENDED, and the MOTION PASSED 4-0 ON A ROLL CALL VOTE.

Second Reading and Public Hearing of Ordinance 2025-12 Rezoning 11 Parcels Totaling 1.256 Acres of Property Located at 150 East South College Street to Planned Unit Development (PUD) and Amending the Zoning Map Accordingly. Housh MOVED and Gustafson SECONDED a MOTION TO APPROVE.

DeVore Leonard OPENED THE PUBLIC HEARING. There being no comment, DeVore Leonard CLOSED THE PUBLIC HEARING AND CALLED THE VOTE. The MOTION PASSED 4-0 ON A ROLL CALL VOTE.

Stokes returned to the dias and resumed the role of Chair.

Reading of Resolution 2025-38 Amending a Contract with Village Manager Johnnie Burns to Allow for a Vehicle Allowance. Gustafson MOVED and Housh SECONDED a MOTION TO APPROVE.

Blankenship explained that the resolution adds an addendum to the Village Manager's existing contract to allow a monthly car allowance, which has become necessary since Burns has given his Village vehicle to the Police Chief to replace an inoperable PD vehicle.

Stokes CALLED THE VOTE, and the MOTION PASSED 5-0 ON A VOICE VOTE.

Reading of Resolution 2025-39 Celebrating the Miami Township Fire and Rescue Team. DeVore Leonard MOVED and Stokes SECONDED a MOTION TO APPROVE.

Housh read the resolution in in full.

Stokes presented Miami Township Fire Chief Jim Cannell and citizen Kelly Ann Tracey, who was instrumental in working for recognition for fire/EMS workers, with village pins.

Stokes CALLED THE VOTE AND THE MOTION PASSED 5-0 ON A VOICE VOTE.

CITIZEN CONCERNS

Emily Seibel, Executive Director of Home, Inc., thanked Council for their support of the restoration of the Ohio Housing Trust Fund, stating that it has now been fully restored with additional funds.

Desiree Nickel spoke to development and growth in Yellow Springs, stating that she has been researching the issue of Village design. She referenced a process developed in England which is a "Village Design Statement". This statement is created collaboratively and locally, and is self-directed. Nickels urged Council to consider adopting such an approach to growth-management.

Rick Sanders, East Enon Road, commented that the construction noise for Spring Meadows should be limited to specific hours.

Ralita Hilderbrand Chambers thanked Council for looking carefully at the issue of growth. She stated that part of her support for the Windsor developments is based upon their location. She related a personal experience with a villager who required transportation for a job and location and lack of vehicle access made this very challenging. She urged Council to consider walkability/accessibility as key to larger-scale developments. Chambers added that she does not support development of the Jones property.

SPECIAL REPORTS

There were no Special Reports.

MANAGER'S REPORT

Burns noted that he will be absent at the next meeting while working at Light Up Navajo Nation, and that Project Lead Giardullo will serve in his stead.

Burns asked that Council hold a work session to discuss the possibility for CRA and/or TIF financing options for both the Windsor projects and for other potential business and development opportunities. The Clerk will follow up with Council regarding dates.

OLD BUSINESS

Report Out re: Work Session on Village Growth. DeVore Leonard noted that the work session had been productive. He reminded Council that the issue of formation of a subcommittee on growth had been raised, and asked for responses from those interested in serving in that capacity.

DeVore Leonard and Brown volunteered and met with no objection to serving on a subcommittee to explore village growth.

Stokes received clarification that the “folder of documents related to growth” referenced during the work session was meant to be made publicly available. Specifics will be addressed at a later point.

NEW BUSINESS

There was no New Business.

FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS

X. FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS* (7:55)

- July 21: **Resolution 2025-39** Authorizing the Village Manager to Renew Health Insurance for Village Employees
Emergency Reading of Ordinance 2025-14 Approving a Supplemental Appropriation for the Third Quarter of 2025 and Declaring an Emergency
Review of Council Rules and Procedures Ordinance
- Aug. 4: NO MEETING
- Aug. 18: Greene County Department of Health Levy (Announcements)
Quarterly Financials
Treasurer Report
Resolution 2025-xx Certifying Delinquent Water, Sewer, Trash, and Electric Bills to the Auditor of Greene County, State of Ohio, for Placement on the Greene County Tax Duplicate
Resolution 2025-xx Authorizing the Removal of Defunct and Uncollectible Utility Account Balances from the Utility Billing System of the Village of Yellow Springs for the Years 2023 and 2024
- Sept. 2: Council Special Events Budget Requests Due
- Sept. 15:
- Oct. 1: Council Work Session: Budget-1
- Oct. 6:
- Oct. 15: Council Work Session: Budget-2
- Oct. 20:
- Oct. 22: Council Work Session: Budget-3
- Nov. 3: 2026 Budget Ordinance and Council Motions for Amendment
- Nov. 17: Second Reading of 2026 Budget Ordinance

*Future Agenda items are noted for planning purposes only and are subject to change.

ADJOURNMENT

At 9:27pm, Housh MOVED TO ADJOURN. DeVore Leonard SECONDED, and the MOTION PASSED 5-0 ON A VOICE VOTE.

Signed: _____
Kevin Stokes, Council President

Attest: _____
Judy Kintner, Clerk of Council