

President of Council
MICHAEL KLINE

Vice President of Council
TANYA TAYLOR DRAPER

Clerk of Council
NICHOLAS AIELLO

City of Willoughby Hills

Council:
JULIE A. BELICH
JOE JARMUSZKIEWICZ
DANIEL KNECHT
VICKI MILLER
KATHLEEN SIVO

Public Hearing Minutes for August 14, 2025, | 6:00 p.m.

PUBLIC HEARING TO DISCUSS PROPOSED ORDINANCE 2025-037-AMENDED AMENDMENT TO REFERENDUM ZONING

The Public Hearing was called to order on Thursday, August 14, 2025 at 6:00 p.m. in Council Chambers. Council President Kline presided.

Call to Order 6:00 p.m. (0:02)

Cell Phone Reminder to Turn off Devices

ROLL CALL (Audio: 0:42)

Members Present: Vice President Tanya Taylor Draper, Councilwoman Julie Belich, Councilman Joe Jarmuszkiewicz, Council President Michael Kline, Councilman Dan Knecht, Councilwoman Vicki Miller, and Councilwoman Kathleen Sivo

Also Present: Finance Director Bruce Scott, and Assistant Law Director Thomas Lobe

Absent: Law Director Michael Lucas and City Engineer Pete DiFranco

- **Council President Kline:** We are here in accordance with the Codified Ordinances of the City and Planning and Zoning Code chapter 11.19 which is titled "Amendments." The Planning and Zoning Commission approved and passed onto Council Ordinance 2025-037-Amended last month for consideration. This is designed to amend the City's Charter related to Referendum Zoning. Following the recommendation from the Planning and Zoning Commission, Council was obligated to hold a public hearing at least 30 days following the actions taken by the Planning and Zoning Commission. This is what brings us here this evening. Following the public hearing, there will be a Special Meeting of Council in which Council shall take action on the proposed amendment. Before opening the public hearing to members of the audience, I have asked Assistant Law Director Tom Lobe to explain to all of us the history of referendum zoning in Willoughby Hills, and how we got to where we are this evening.
- **Assistant Law Director Lobe [Audio 2:45]:** Good evening. I am your Assistant Law Director. I have a long history here and I have the most knowledge of this particular item. I was Law Director in 1996 and continued on under the Gardner administration. I even started as Assistant Law Director and continued through the state. They asked me to come because I am the one that lived with this.

- This started in November 1996. At that time, the City of Willoughby Hills, like a lot of other cities, was a Charter municipality allowed to make its own rules, policies, and procedures of local self-government that are provided for in the Ohio Constitution Article 18.3. Very fancy legal talk, but what it really means is there's power of local self-government. As a local government, we are allowed to make our rules and every city makes its rules separately, distinctly and tailor-made for how that city wants to operate. Prior to that, we operated with the Board of Building and Zoning Appeals and the Planning Commission, but primarily with the Board of Building and Zoning Appeals, who would grant variances or even change land uses from residential to commercial, or commercial to mixed use—something of that nature. There was a certain council person that got upset at that time, and he on his own, without the assistance of then Mayor Mort O’Ryan, made an initiative petition for the charter change. It wasn’t backed by the City. It wasn’t recommended. It wasn’t endorsed, but it did go to the voters, and it did pass. Whether that’s a good thing or bad thing—I think the 30 years of history from 1996 through today will tell us that. That is what this Council is doing. It’s allowing the citizens again to make that determination. I am brought forward because I know the history. Let’s look at what the last thirty years have been under referendum zoning, which allows the people only to make the changes versus people in Willoughby Hills (be it the Planning Commission, and the City Council with the input of the Finance Director, Mayor, Council members, City Engineer, and Law Director). Let’s see landscape for 1996 through 2025.
- [Audio 5:37] The history shows that it has not been very successful in giving us good development. That is just my opinion. We’ve had a lot of developers that have come here and decide not to go forward. For them it was too much expense and too risky. They want to work with the City representatives, but the way we are set up, that can’t happen. I will also state that a lot of cities do have referendum and a lot of cities do not have referendum. So, if you want to pinpoint a city that has it or doesn’t have it, you’re going to get a nice contrast.
- So, what is the best for Willoughby Hills? The last 30 years did show us something. Number one is Judge James Jackson, as currently drafted, declared that the way the Charter is drafted allows anybody, even a developer or owner of a property, to either bring the lawsuit or go to referendum. So, the last 30 years and the history scorecard goes as follows:
- [Audio 6:40] There were three attempts only, and I don’t think there’s been one now in about the last 15 years. The first one, which was endorsed by the City, was the old Eaton property. This is now the Willoughby Hills schools of Innovation. The City was anxious to keep Eaton here. As you face the property to the left next to 271, there was a house, and they wanted to take that residential property and change it to research and development. The City leaders, Council, and seemingly everybody went for it, and it passed. Yet, Eaton left anyway. Everything the City tried to do didn’t work for variety of reasons.
- The second time it was attempted to work was on Miller Road. There was a piece of property that the Osbornes purchased and at that time, they wanted to develop it for a retirement community. Again, the City went for it and helped adopt it, but we didn’t do a development plan. We simply approved the change. The City backed that one and sure enough, they never went through. We got the property at zero through a foreclosure action, but, again, the referendum process did not work.
- The third time, it did work but I don’t think it would have made it through the City. The Osbourne sons

tried to develop off of 174. They tried to change something to significantly smaller than one acre lots, such as one quarter acre lots and condos. The City went against it, and it failed. Because of how 5.01 is currently written, we had about 18 losses. The good news is that a lot of people chose not to go to referendum and chose the legal way, which really helped the City.

- I can pinpoint a few times that it did and I'm going to give you one example. The Volkswagen dealership on Chardon Road wanted to expand, but they were not going to go through referendum because they didn't want to take the time and expense. There was a little strip mall right next to it, and they were going to buy that off and not only keep their property, but also expand. This was about 10-15 years ago. Through a lawsuit, the City was allowed to change it. We had a development agreement with them. We knew exactly what was in. It was going to be Volkswagen and Audi dealership. It could not turn into be a big box store, grocery store, etc. It was only limited to that, and the City, through the litigation, got it done. Today, it is a nice, clean operation with a Volkswagen dealership.
- [Audio 10:07] We had a similar situation with a Lexus dealership when it came in. They too brought it forward because there was about an acre of property that they wanted to expand. Because of this, everyone today is familiar with the Lexus BMW dealership near intersection of I-91. That too was saved. There's been a few other ones that we have allowed through the litigation and some that we haven't, but it has worked better than referendum. From my perspective, I think it's better to have these decisions made by Willoughby Hills residents because when we go to court, there isn't one judge on the bench that is a Willoughby Hills resident. You only have one judge who makes that decision based on whether he likes or dislikes it. The way this ordinance is written provides that this goes to the Planning Commission and then the Council. This is going to have more eyes on it than some lawsuit in court. This is going to have more public scrutiny than if you went to court. Before, this only went to the Board of Building and Zoning Appeals which had five members. Now, it's going to go to the Planning Commission and then the Council. There's going to be twelve people looking at it. They further put in some cushions and protections where Council can't pass it on the first night and rush it through. There's a three reading rule that Council will not be allowed to waive. No executive session, no back door deals. It's got to be on the record taped and opened to the public. Then, it goes to Council where you have seven people review it. Even if the Mayor doesn't like it, he can veto it, and it can come back to Council.
- There is going to be more public scrutiny on these land use changes than ever before. They can't do it in one night, and there will be a public portion at every meeting, such as what is required tonight. Some other cities and counties now don't even allow public portion. We still allow it. There's going to be a lot of governmental look on it and it is going to be in development longer. It will all be done by Willoughby Hills residents. We will also be able to get into development agreements with developers, where we will be able to control lighting, parking hours of operation etc. In contrast, if it's only referendum, developers can change the zoning, leaving you stuck with it. So, I think that this is a good idea. I think history will prove it, at least for Willoughby Hills. This council doesn't have the authority to do it on its own. In 1996 they let the voters choose. In 2025, they have to get it back to the voters and they will decide to either keep it or go back.
- I think it is important to see how much input Willoughby Hills residents will have and how many public hearings there will be versus if somebody simply goes to referendum, there is no requirement for any of that to occur. That is why I am in favor of it. I think it'll cut down on the lawsuits. I think

we're going to have developers come, but we will have control of the development. That is why I think that it will be good for Willoughby Hills. In this case, the electors will decide whether to reverse something that was done almost 30 years ago and I want you to think about how much good development came from changing it back to the way it was. We have 30 years of history to look at. I'm open to any questions from anybody on the dais. Thank you. [Audio 14:25]

- **Council President Kline:** Does anyone on the dais have questions or comments for Mr. Lobe?
- **Councilman Jarmuszkiewicz:** People that I talk to express that their biggest fear with this Ordinance is the loss of one-acre zoning and the residential part of it. Can the Council and Zoning Board arbitrarily change something if they have the wrong group of people in there? I trust the people we have in here now, but I am talking about 10-15 years in the future. If this is changed, could a group decide to change one-acre zoning to quarter-acre zoning?
- **Assistant Law Director Lobe:** Yes, it can happen. A judge can do that too. Don't think that because you are not giving it to this Council and this Planning Commission, it can't be done. It *can* be done. The biggest proof of that was when a judge did it with the condominium association across from LaVera. Before my time, they brought a lawsuit and a judge granted it. At that time, they probably would never have allowed it. That answer goes both ways. I am not saying anything bad about that development. The point is, it was less than one-acre development and it was done through court litigation prior to my time. It is still there today. That is how that got up.
- **Councilman Jarmuszkiewicz:** Is there anyway something could have been put into this ordinance to protect that, or is it always up to the court?
- **Assistant Law Director Lobe:** It is either up the court, or up to the Planning Commission and this Council with the potential of a veto by the mayor. If the public doesn't agree with the Planning Commission or the Council, everybody has a right to take it to court anyway. This system has internal safeguards. Just because they make a decision doesn't mean you can't do anything about it. Any interested party can challenge their opinion and take this to court. To answer your question, yes it can be done, however, it can be done every which way.
- **Councilman Jarmuszkiewicz:** I hope people look and see what you said, do their own research, and see what is involved in it and how many cases have been lost. Putting it on the ballot at least gives all the residents a chance to make a decision.
- **Assistant Law Director Lobe:** Correct.
- **Councilwoman Belich:** Thank you for being here and giving us that history. There have been some questions about changing this ordinance based on residential properties versus business properties whereby we could potentially look at it and determine referendum zoning for the business side rather than the other. In other words, what are the pros and cons if we were to allow the City to make decisions based on a business industry versus residential and still allow our community to vote on residential concerns because of the fear of losing one-acre zoning? Could you weigh the two and tell us why one would be better than the other?

- **Assistant Law Director Lobe:** Reiterating the history, one was for a research office, one was a new development for a retirement home, and one was for residential. It is just *who* wants to make the decision. I don't think there is a difference. I think it is a matter of what is best for this city, and all cities are different. I think we have done a good job with our Planning Commission. Yes, you can get rogue council members, mayors, etc. but when you have more people, I think that is more democratic. It protects from one person, like a judge, going rogue. That is why I like the law of large numbers. There is more than just one person looking at this. This provides that there are a lot of eyes on it and public input on it. If you are going to have it done right, I think it should be across the board for commercial. I think the City is a bit behind on its zoning laws. I think we should have mixed uses. It gives the City flexibility; more control and more time for residents' input. My answer is still to bring it home to the residents through these administrative bodies. It does not make a difference based upon my historical viewpoint and experience as a law director.
- **Councilwoman Miller [Audio 20:53]:** I would like to thank Mr. Lobe for being here and presenting us with this history. I know the biggest fear for most residents is the loss of one-acre zoning and having to deal with developments where we don't think they should be. It sounds like you are saying this process can work better for the residents with allowing more eyes on it and giving more people the opportunity to give input on that. Have any of the lawsuits been presented to the residents? Did they even know about it?
- **Assistant Law Director Lobe:** No. They know about it only because I may have reported on it, but nobody really had input on it. These judges do criminal cases and civil cases. They handle foreclosures, malpractices, murders, etc. I do not think they have a great interest to put their eyes on zoning in Willoughby Hills. I am by no means demeaning the judges on the Common Pleas Court. I know them and I like them. But who is going to give us the most input? Do you think they will, or do you think our administrative boards and the City Council will? I find it better when more people look at it and there is discussion with the residents rather than a single judge in Painesville.
- **Councilwoman Miller:** Our vote basically is going to be whether or not to send this to the electors. We are not ultimately deciding whether this is right or wrong, rather, that we think it should go to the ballot to the people.
- **Council Vice President Taylor Draper [Audio 23:25]:** Thank you Mr. Lobe, your input is valuable. One of the things I have heard from the residents is the fear that they are giving up their rights, their vote, and their ability to decide what happens in the City they pay taxes to. My question to them is, in the last 30 years, where have you used that? Where have you used your vote, words, or any input at all on what is going on in the City? When these cases go to Painesville, are the residents able to get up in court and give their concerns and objections like we would provide for them here in this body before us?
- **Assistant Law Director Lobe:** Historically, not one time has that been allowed. Everything judge can allow anything on any case. I can say for the last 15-16 cases, it never occurred. A judge can do it, but I do not anticipate that happening.
- **Council Vice President Taylor Draper:** So, there is a stronger and greater opportunity to say what you want here than in court?

- **Assistant Law Director Lobe:** That is correct. I would challenge everybody here to name one of the four judges on the Common Pleas Court that are going to decide your case. At least you know the people up here and know how to contact them. You may not like them, but you know them, and you know how to contact them. When something goes to court, you are not allowed to contact the judge. You are putting more faith into judges you don't know.
- **Council President Kline:** In addition to that, there really is a failsafe in the Ohio Revised Code under section 731.29 "Petition for Referendum." Let's look at the example of one acre-lots. If at some point the Planning Commission wanted to reduce it and Council agreed along with the mayor, there is this failsafe. A petition can be filed that would stop any further action. The petition would put that change on the next ballot. If the attempt is to reduce one acre zoning, the petition for referendum will put this on the ballot. In that worst case scenario, it still would go back to the people.

PUBLIC PORTION #1 (Audio: 28:18)

An opportunity for the public to address Council concerning anything pertaining to tonight's agenda.

Public Portion #1 opened at 7:28 p.m.

- **Jenna Bing 36951 Beech Hills Drive:** I am one of the ones who feel this is a little overreaching. I appreciate the history that Mr. Lobe gave. The problem that we have experienced is on the business side. We didn't have in there that you could have a car wash, so they had to sue us to get the car wash in. It was in a business district. My impression is that our zoning does not account for what might be more modern businesses now that should be and could be assets to our business district. If this was written strictly to give this approval to Planning and Zoning and then to the Council in regard to business districts and strictly what things could be allowed in business districts, I would have no problem with this. I have to vote no on this because it covers residential. I believe the Master Plan talked about extending South from Cleveland Clinic and having more of a business district down S.O.M. Center Road. That is something I think the City should decide. That is because it would involve changing it from business up there in residential to making more of those residential places business. I am not ready to give that over to Council. That is a big decision. The things that the Master Plan has brought forward such as mixed use development, should be referendums on the ballot for people to determine if they want that in the area or not. I think this goes too far, so I have to vote no. For those nervous, it doesn't mean they can't bring back a smaller referendum for the next election. If you are having concerns on this, vote no this time, and maybe they will condense it to something that is more reasonable for everyone to grasp and be able to take charge of which would be what kinds of businesses are in the business district at this point. Thank you.
- **Mayor Hallum [Audio 31:15]:** Basically, what I heard from Jenna is that she is okay with a judge in Lake County making a decision as to how big our lot sizes are and would like to keep them making those decisions but let all of you have a say as to what goes into our business districts. I would think it would be more important to you all that it's not a judge who doesn't live here deciding as to whether your lots are going to stay one acre or be one-quarter acre. I'd rather have it discussed in Planning and Zoning with people who live here. They will hold hearings on them and ultimately pass it to Council. If there is a discussion on having quarter-acre lots, that would then come before this body, made up of

people who are elected by you to act on your behalf, and a hearing will be held. While Planning and Zoning may not be reliant on an election, this body is. If they don't listen to you, this body will, or else they will no longer have their seats. If you are going to do it, you want all the control to be here with people who live in the City and have to face you. We want our kids to grow up here and have a family here. We care more about this than a judge in Lake County. We are going to listen to you, and if we don't I'm sure we will hear that at the polls. I just want to be clear, that is what this means. If you split it, whatever you leave at the county will be up to the judge. Thank you.

– **Council President Kline:** Ms. Bing mentioned the Master Plan. Our last Master Plan, which was completed a couple years ago...the group supported repealing referendum zoning. That was one of their points.

– **Elaine Bereit 2695 River Road [Audio 34:30]:** I spoke in front of the Planning and Zoning Commission. I want to thank Mr. Lobe for explaining and going through the history. It is very helpful. I attended the Planning and Zoning Commission meeting last month. My perception was that there was a lot of confusion and concern that this was just a power grab. When explained, it's clearly not. It is being put in the hands that it should be, where a decision should be made. If there is any way that you could get this information out to the general public, that would be so beneficial. I think that would give the residents a better understanding of what they are voting for and what they are trying to accomplish. Hearing everybody speak is giving me a lot of confidence in the people that we have elected. I want to thank you. If there is any way that you could get this information out, please do. Thank you.

– **Councilwoman Miller:** Thank you for coming up and speaking your opinion. I know you have had a lot of concerns regarding zoning because of where you live in proximity to places that may look at being developed in the future. I think that speaks well to your confidence in us. Thank you for expressing that and thank you for coming and listening. I agree with you that we need to get this information out there so the public can understand what referendum zoning was, how it occurred in the first place, and what happened in the years since it has been in place.

– **Mayor Hallum:** I agree with you. We need to find a simple way to get this out there. This is not an easy subject to understand. This is being recorded so I would certainly encourage all of you to share it on Facebook. We will continue to talk about this in the district meetings that are coming up prior to the election. The attendance of our district meetings has been growing since we started. One of the things that make me really proud of this group is their devotion to being more transparent in the City. This is just another step in trying to make sure that happens.

– **Council Vice President Taylor Draper:** I feel the same way you do from the comments I heard. People aren't nervous about this. They are confused. They need more things answered. It's not that nobody is considering it, it's just that we want to know more. That is what we are doing here tonight. We will continue to educate and answer questions for when you go to the polls. Thank you for coming here tonight.

– **Council President Kline:** Since this involves a Charter Amendment, the City is required to put out a publication on this. Every time there has been a Charter Amendment in the past, this has gone out. We are also planning, in addition to district meetings, to have a Town Hall meeting on this topic.

Council President Kline opened the public hearing for further public comments. No comments were made.

Council President Kline closed the Public Hearing closed at 6:40 p.m.

The Special Council Meeting was called to order on Thursday, August 14, 2025 at 6:43 p.m. in Council Chambers. **Council President Kline** presided.

Cell Phone Reminder to Turn off Devices

Pledge of Allegiance (Audio: 0:19)

ROLL CALL (Audio: 0:42)

Members Present: Vice President Tanya Taylor Draper, Councilwoman Julie Belich, Councilman Joe Jarmuszkiewicz, Council President Michael Kline, Councilman Dan Knecht, Councilwoman Vicki Miller, and Councilwoman Kathleen Sivo

Also Present: Finance Director Bruce Scott and Mayor Hallum

Absent: Law Director Michael C. Lucas and City Engineer Pete DiFranco

PUBLIC PORTION (Audio: 1:05)

An opportunity for the public to address Council concerning anything pertaining to tonight's agenda.

Public Portion opened at 6:44 p.m.

- **Jen Varro 2890 S.O.M. Center Road:** Good evening council members. I came here prepared for discussion on an ordinance, but I was surprised to see that buried in tonight's agenda is a resolution objecting to the renewal of a liquor license for a long-standing woman-owned business in our city. A business that has served our community for over 40 years and has built success through hard work, integrity, and dedication. This sudden move raises serious questions. Why is this being introduced now in this way without open transparent discussion? What is the true motive here? This process feels like less good governance and more like an attempt to ambush a respected business owner without giving them or the public fair notice. Our community values fairness, due process, and supporting local businesses, especially those that have proven themselves for decades. To see this council take steps that look like targeted harassment undermines public trust and makes residents wonder if personal agendas are being prioritized over the City's best interests. If there are genuine concerns about a license renewal, those concerns should've been addressed openly with facts, evidence, and a fair process, not buried in a special meeting and rushed through. Anything less looks like bullying, and our city deserves better than that. I urge you to step back, act transparently, and remember that your role is to serve the public, not target successful small businesses that help make this city what it is. I'm sure you were all aware that there are some hardship issues with this business, personally. If this council can quietly target one respected

business tonight, then no business in the City is truly safe tomorrow. Thank you.

- **Jenna Bing 36951 Beach Hills Dr:** So, this is the kind of thing that gives me pause. I don't know all the backstory behind it. I'm not sure what's going on. I know it's a successful business. It's a martini bar and a great place and now you just want to get rid of their liquor license which means that shuts that business down. Now, I think that's something where people should take pause and think about this. You all are asking us to give authority to you all about our businesses, and this just shows up on the agenda. I doubt it will get three readings because it has to be done in a certain timeframe, which means tonight. You want to say you are looking out for businesses and want good businesses and now I see a long-standing well-loved business is at risk. I'm confused.

Public Portion closed at 6:48 p.m.

- **Council President Kline:** The agenda has been amended from what you may be looking at. That resolution has been removed from the agenda and is not for consideration. If you were to check the website, you will not find that resolution on there. You may see the resolution on the website, but it is not on the agenda.
- **Mayor Hallum:** When this came up, we had our attorney reach out to them so that we could work through some issues that are preexisting there. We do understand they have some issues, but I have assured the owner that we want to work with them. We don't want to hurt their business, but we do need to have some information on how they are going to proceed once they clear some issues. They do have to come into compliance. We do care about our businesses. That is why I reached out to them right away and set up a meeting, which we already have scheduled, to work all those things out.
- **Councilwoman Belich:** Thank you to both of you for coming here and speaking. You are absolutely right. It's on us as a community and as a council to look out for our businesses and do the best we possibly can to help them overcome whatever their violations are. We want them in our community. We appreciate having them here without a doubt and we don't want to run businesses out of here off of a one reading circumstance. We do want to work with them. Thank you both for coming and speaking on up.

LEGISLATION: (Audio 7:42)

ORDINANCE 2025-037-AMENDED

AN ORDINANCE PROVIDING FOR THE SUBMISSION TO THE ELECTORS OF THE CITY OF WILLOUGHBY HILLS PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO ARTICLE V OF THE CHARTER TITLED BOARDS AND COMMISSIONS, (SECTION 5.15, TITLED MANDATORY PUBLIC VOTE ON LAND USE CHANGES), AND ARTICLE VI OF THE CHARTER TITLED LEGISLATION, (SECTION 6.2, TITLED EFFECTIVE DATES OF ORDINANCES), AND DECLARING AN EMERGENCY.

Motion made by **Council Vice President Taylor Draper**, seconded by **Councilwoman Belich** to adopt Ordinance 2025-037-Amended.

Discussion of Motion:

- **Councilman Jarmuszkiewicz:** Whether you are for or against this amendment, This is the opportunity to put this to the ballot for all the people so that the residents have their choice to vote for or against it. I urge everyone to look at the information that is out there and make a reasonable choice.
- **Council Vice President Taylor Draper:** I hope there are a lot of residents tuning in tonight. I hope there is an opportunity to come to a meeting and find out what this is really about. I am all for making sure that we hear our residents' voices. I have been on Planning and Zoning now for 6 years. I have heard from more residents during my tenure there than I have ever heard from any court case or any situation. There is more of an opportunity for you to speak then there ever will be the other way. Please read about this and find out more information because there is a little bit more to the story than believed. I appreciate the opportunity to address our residents. Thank you.
- **Councilwoman Belich:** I intend to vote on this. There has clearly been something identified in our Charter with the way that it has been written whereby we would like the residents to go back and take another look. Things have changed over 30 years. I am always for giving our residents the opportunity to have a voice in what it is our Charter says and what it is we are doing within our city.

AYES: Taylor Draper, Belich, Jarmuszkiewicz, Kline, Knecht, Miller, Sivo

NAYS: None

Vote: 7/0

Ordinance 2025-037-Amended has been adopted.

NEW BUSINESS (Audio: 11:05)

- Motion made by **Councilwoman Miller**, seconded by **Councilwoman Belich**, authorizing the Clerk of Council to confirm with the Ohio Department of Commerce, Division of Liquor Control, that no objection and need for hearing is requested by the City regarding **Chipotle Mexican Grill of Colorado LLC Chipotle 5320 28151 Chardon Road's** Liquor Permit Application under transaction number **OCT NEW 01437415-234**.

Discussion of Motion:

AYES: Taylor Draper, Belich, Jarmuszkiewicz, Kline, Knecht, Miller, Sivo

NAYS: None

Vote: 7/0

The motion has passed.

FOR THE GOOD OF THE ORDER/FOR THE GOOD OF THE COMMUNITY (Audio: 12:52)

- **Councilman Jarmuszkiewicz:** This Saturday will be our Music Fest at the Community Center. We have 5 bands, food trucks, and entertainment planned from 1:00 p.m. to 9:00 p.m. We welcome everyone to come.

- **Councilwoman Miller:** This is a community event put on by a lot of volunteers. We still need a few volunteers to come out and help, especially with parking issues. Please reach out to the mayor's office and we will get you signed up to help us out on Saturday. We are looking forward to everyone being there.

ADJOURNMENT (Audio: 14:40)

Motion made by **Councilwoman Belich**, seconded by **Councilman Miller** to adjourn the meeting.

AYES: Taylor Draper, Belich, Jarmuszkiewicz, Kline, Knecht, Miller, Sivo

NAYS: None

Vote: 7/0

The meeting was adjourned at 6:58 p.m.

APPROVED: SEPT 11, 2025
Date

Michael Kline
Michael Kline
President of Council

ATTEST: Nick Aiello
Nicholas Aiello
Clerk of Council