

City of Trotwood

3035 Olive Road
Trotwood, Ohio 45426
937.837.7771
www.trotwood.org



Meeting Minutes - Draft

Monday, April 28, 2025

6:30 PM

Special Meeting

**Trotwood Community and Cultural Arts Center
4000 Lake Center Drive, Trotwood, Ohio 45426**

City Council

*Mayor Yvette F. Page
Vice Mayor Tyna R. Brown, Ward 4
Council Member Bettye L. Gales, Ward 1
Council Member Martha H. Clark, Ward 2
Council Member Milton J. Pearson, Ward 3
Council Member Rhonda C. Finley, At Large
Council Member Denise Moore, At Large
Clerk of Council Kara B. Landis*

I. Call to Order

Mayor Page called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m.

II. Pledge of Allegiance

Mayor Page led the Pledge of Allegiance.

III. Roll Call

Clerk Landis took Roll Call.

Present: 7 - Council Member Gales, Council Member Moore, Council Member Clark, Council Member Finley, Council Member Pearson, Vice Mayor Brown and Mayor Page

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT: City Manager Quincy Pope, Clerk of Council Kara Landis, Assistant Law Director Steve McHugh, Deputy City Manager Stephanie Kellum, Fire Chief Richard Haacke, Police Chief Erik Wilson, Deputy Police Chief Mark Ecton, Planning and Zoning Administrator Tyler Hauck, and HR Generalist Portia Hill.

GUESTS PRESENT: Marcus Rutherford.

IV. Approve the Agenda

Mayor Page requested a Motion to approve the Agenda. A Motion was made by Vice Mayor Brown, seconded by Council Member Gales, and the Motion **CARRIED** by the following vote:

Aye: 7 - Council Member Gales, Council Member Moore, Council Member Clark, Council Member Finley, Council Member Pearson, Vice Mayor Brown and Mayor Page

V. First Reading

[25-09](#)

A Motion by the Trotwood City Council to schedule a Public Hearing and to authorize the law director to draft an ordinance accepting the recommendation of the Compensation Board.

Attachments: [25-09 2025 Compensation Board Report](#)

Mayor Page opened the floor for discussion regarding the Compensation Board's Report.

Council Member Finley asked if there would be another opportunity to ask questions as she would like to compare what was recommended by the Board to the City Charter. She shared that she was confused about the recommendation in relation to how the Charter reads.

Vice Mayor Brown stated that she would like to better understand how the Board determined their recommendation for the Mayor's salary, which reflects an increase of \$3,000 to the base amount, but an overall decrease of \$3,000 after terminating the per diem option.

Council Member Moore expressed that she has similar questions.

Mayor Page shared that she understood the information that was reviewed by the Board, then asked Assistant Law Director Steve McHugh for some direction.

Law Director McHugh advised that the Motion on the Agenda is the first step in the legislative process. He went on to explain that per the Charter, Council has 30 days from when they receive the report from the Board, to either approve the recommendation by ordinance, or reject it; and, if they choose to reject it, they can do nothing more and the current compensation will prevail, or they can request the Board reconvene and submit a revised report to Council. Assistant Law Director McHugh pointed out that should Council consider tabling the issue or taking no action during this meeting, they will then be out of compliance with the Charter and the current compensation will be in place until the next Compensation Board is appointed in five (5) years.

Mayor Page asked if the current recommendation can be sent back to the Board. Assistant Law Director McHugh stated that there would need to be a motion rejecting the recommendation and asking the Board to reconvene.

Clerk Landis reminded Council that the motion on the Agenda is not approving the ordinance accepting the recommendation of the Board. It is a motion to schedule the public hearing for May 5th and for legislation to be drafted. She added that discussions could continue on May 5th, at which time Council would then vote to either adopt or reject the ordinance, and if they reject the recommendation, they would still have the option to reconvene the Board as they would be within the 30 days.

Council Member Finley asked Assistant Law Director McHugh about the Charter as she understands it to indicate that all of Council's pay is equal, and the mayor's is double, then asked if a Charter revision is required in order to accept the current recommendation. Assistant Law Director McHugh asked what section of the Charter she is referring to. Clerk Landis then gave Council Member Finley a copy of the Charter for her to review and locate the section she is referencing. Assistant Law Director McHugh stated that to his knowledge the mayor's salary being twice the amount of a council member's salary has been the practice, but it is not required by the Charter.

Mayor Page stated the when she started in 2018, council member's received \$4,000 and the mayor received \$8,000. She added that during her time on Council, council members received an increase from \$4,000 to \$6,000 and the mayor's salary went from \$8,000 to \$12,000, which maintained the same disparity. Mayor Page wanted to be sure when considering the salaries, one considers the position, not the people.

Mayor Page believes the Compensation Board did an outstanding job with the information they were given. She also believes the Board was appointed properly and that no Board member was given any information from Council.

Mayor Page turned back to Council Member Finley, who was not able to find in the Charter, the information she was referring to stating the mayor's salary is to be double that of a council member's salary.

Council Member Finley stated that she believes at that time the mayor's salary was double that of a council member's salary. Further, she stated that all council members made the same amount. She explained that the way she understands the Board's recommendation, the pay would be staggered, but it should be same job, same pay.

Clerk Landis reiterated that the reason for the staggered pay increases is because the law prohibits officials from taking in-term pay increases, and since the ward representatives run on one cycle and the at-large representatives and the mayor run on a different cycle, the different start dates will cause this to always be an issue. Assistant Law Director McHugh confirmed the information provided by Clerk Landis.

Council Member Moore asked for clarification from Assistant Law Director McHugh on the options. Assistant Law Director McHugh explained that Council can reject the report and ask the Board to reconvene and submit a revised report. He added that by only rejecting the report, that would keep in place the current compensation. Council Member Moore asked if Council rejects the current recommendation and asks the Board to reconvene, is the current proposal off the table. Assistant Law Director McHugh stated that the Board will be required to submit a revised report; however, they have the option, after studying the issue further, to submit the same recommendation as their first report.

Council Member Moore asked Clerk Landis for clarification on what would occur on May 5th. Clerk Landis explained that procedurally, the first step is for Council to vote tonight on the motion to schedule the public hearing and draft the ordinance, as stated on the Agenda. She went on to explain that if Council passes the motion this evening, then on May 5th, the public hearing would be held and Council would vote on the ordinance. She stated that if Council were to reject the report on May 5th, they would still have the option to ask the Board to reconvene and submit a revised report. Clerk Landis went on to explain that should Council not pass the motion on this Agenda, they would then have the option to make a motion to reject the report and to reconvene the Board for them to submit a revised report. She clarified that it would be two separate motions, one motion to hold the public hearing and draft the ordinance, then one motion to reject the report and to reconvene the Board to submit a revised report. Assistant Law Director McHugh clarified that should the motion go forward, they would still have the option on May 5th to reject the report and reconvene the Board, if the ordinance failed.

Council Member Moore asked if the Board could decline to reconvene. Assistant Law Director McHugh advised that per the Charter they are charged with the duty to do so. Council Member Moore asked if the 30 days starts over should Council ask the Board to reconvene. Assistant Law Director McHugh stated that the time does not start over. Council Member Moore asked if there was a window of time as to when they have to present their revised report. Assistant Law Director McHugh explained that the Charter advises that the report must be presented by June 1st, which they have done. He added that he would simply argue that they need to reconvene and resubmit a report forthwith, and stated that the Board does not have to write a new report, they will simply address the issues raised such as what was their rationale, did they consider certain other factors, etc. Council Member Moore asked if that would then be a new motion. Assistant Law Director McHugh agreed that Council

would then need to make a motion to either approve the new recommendation, or accept the status quo.

Clerk Landis shared with Council that she attended all three (3) of the Board's meetings and she feels certain if the Board is asked to reconvene they will do so in a timely manner. She explained that if the Board is asked to resubmit their report, they will get a copy of the minutes from this meeting, and the May 5th meeting if the matter is discussed at that time, in order to understand the questions and concerns from Council.

Council Member Gales asked if the Board reconvenes, would Council have the opportunity to provide their input. Assistant Law Director McHugh stated that the intent by not accepting the report is for Council to have the opportunity to provide statements as to why they are not accepting the report, which will be part of the public record provided to the Board.

Mayor Page asked about the motion to reject the report, as motions are to be made in the affirmative. Assistant Law Director McHugh explained that it would still be an affirmative motion; a motion to reject - not a motion to "not reject." Assistant Law Director McHugh stated that the motion would be to reject the Board's report and recommendation and if Council would like the Board to reconvene, they would state that in the motion. He reiterated that a motion to reject alone would then be to accept the compensation that is currently in place. Mayor Page wanted to be sure that all minds were clear on this matter.

Clerk Landis clarified for Council Member Gales that when Assistant Law Director McHugh stated Council's comments would be part of the public record, he is saying that comments made by Council on the dais during the public meeting would be captured in the minutes, that is the public record that will be provided to the Board. Law Director McHugh confirmed that to be correct.

Council Member Clark shared that she would like to understand the Board's reasoning for cutting the Mayor's salary by \$3,000.

Council Member Moore wanted to add that she also would like to know from the Board if they feel there should be a distinction between the council members at large and the ward council members. She pointed out that the at-large council members run like the mayor, inclusive of the entire City.

Clerk Landis explained that the Board was given information straight from the Charter and the Charter does not make a distinction between the duties of at-large council members and the ward representatives.

Council Member Finley asked for clarification that if it is equal work, it should be equal pay, and the way it is staggered in the Board's recommendation would not provide for equal pay. Clerk Landis reiterated that the timing is because no in-term increases are allowed. Assistant Law Director McHugh confirmed that to be true, and stated that by law, this issue cannot be addressed as the State takes a very hard position that pay increases can only be received when a person starts a new term, regardless if they serve at-large, as a ward representative, or as the mayor.

Mayor Page suggested that the Board could review the compensation for the time period between boards, or five (5) years, so 2026 - 2031. So if in 2026,

ward representatives received an increase, could the at-large council members in 2028, receive the increase, plus an additional amount to make up for the amount not received in 2026 and 2027. She believes this would be a fair way to calculate increases for all members of council. Mayor Page then used real figures to convey her suggestion. Assistant Law Director Steve McHugh said he would need to study the suggestion. Mayor Page reiterated that she is asking if it is permissible so long as the Board recommends such a pay structure. Assistant Law Director Steve McHugh stated that he believes the State would frown on any lump sum increase in 2028. Mayor Page commented that she is simply trying to find a way that the same people doing the same job are making the same amount, she just wants everyone to be comfortable.

Council Member Finley asked how other communities address pay increases for their elected officials. Assistant Law Director McHugh stated that elected officials across the state follow this model, it is very common. Clerk Landis added that when gathering salary information for other jurisdictions, there were at least two cities, Riverside and Englewood, that were dealing with the same issue due to recently approved increases. Council Member Clark asked if that practice is state law. Assistant Law Director McHugh confirmed state law does not not allow in-term increases. He explained that common practice shows that Council's who have to vote on their own increase typically do so no later than June or July of an election year, with the theory that if a resident is upset because Council approved a big pay raise for themselves, the resident would have time to be placed on the upcoming ballot for election.

Council Member Moore asked for clarification on the motion on the Agenda. Assistant Law Director McHugh explained that Council has 30 days to vote to accept or reject the report, which was provided on April 7th. Clerk Landis clarified for Council Member Moore that all ordinances in the City start as a motion to schedule a public hearing and authorizes legislation to be drafted. She stated that these motions always appear on the consent agenda; however, this is slightly different because this is a special meeting so there is no consent agenda, meaning the subject is its own item which is why Council is allowed to discuss and debate the issue.

Mayor Page added that she requested the motion not be on a Consent Agenda because she wanted to be sure Council had the opportunity to discuss the issue at length, in addition to being transparent about salaries.

Mayor Page then reviewed the current options for Council. Clerk Landis clarified that the motion on the Agenda must be voted on, and if the motion fails, Council then has two options, they can reject the report with no further action, keeping the current salaries in place until the next compensation board meets in five (5) years; or, they can reject the report and reconvene the Board and ask them to submit a revised report.

Council Member Moore clarified that the motion on the agenda would need to fail tonight, in order to reject the report and ask the Board to reconvene. Clerk Landis confirmed that to be correct. Clerk Landis reminded Council that should they approve the motion on the Agenda, they would still have the opportunity to not adopt the ordinance on May 5th and have the same two options at that time. Council Member Moore questioned the motion language as it reads they would be accepting the recommendation. Clerk Landis explained that the ordinance would be drafted to accept the recommendation as the motion

would be in the affirmative. Assistant Law Director McHugh confirmed that to be correct, then Clerk Landis reminded Council that this motion is only to schedule the public hearing and draft the legislation. Council Member Moore explained that she just wants to be certain she understands the action to be taken, which then determines the outcome.

Council Member Pearson asked for clarification that the Board did nothing wrong, it is simply the issue that increases would be staggered until the Charter is changed. Assistant Law Director McHugh stated that the Charter cannot be changed to that regard because it is state law that in-term increases are not allowed.

Council Member Gales shared that she was here when the last board met and to her recollection, past increases were only received at the start of a new term, except for the last time, everyone received an increase at the same time. She stated that the State was not happy and that she does not want to go through that again; the Charter says the positions are staggered and that's the bottom line. She added that she doesn't know how to achieve equal pay but feels all things need to be considered.

Mayor Page asked Assistant Law Director McHugh about what the Compensation Board could do regarding her suggestion to stagger the salaries. Assistant Law Director McHugh said he was just reading the Charter and does not believe it would work. He explained that increases recommended by the Board and approved by Council have to go into affect, in this instance on January 1, 2026. He added that it could even out over five (5) years as the next time the Board convenes, the at-large council members may receive the increase before the ward representatives.

Council Member Gales suggested that the mayor's salary is supposed to be doubled, and because it is not, that is a problem. Clerk Landis reminded Council that this has only been the practice, it is not documented as a requirement. Further, she added that in reading the Charter with the Board and Law Director Conard, that theory never came up. Assistant Law Director McHugh commented that the issue is one that can be shared with the Board.

Council Member Clark asked if this motion was to pass, would the mayor lose the opportunity for per diem on January 1, 2026. Clerk Landis advised that the per diem would not be terminated until the start of a new term for the mayor, which would be January 1, 2028.

Council Member Finley asked if in 2026, council members would be making more than the mayor. Assistant Law Director McHugh said that is not correct and explained that the mayor's current salary will continue until the end of her term. Mayor Page clarified that if Council accepted this recommendation, in 2026 the base salary for the mayor would be \$12,000, and the base salary for council members would be \$10,000.

Mayor Page requested a Motion to schedule the public hearing for May 5th and authorize the law director to draft an ordinance accepting the recommendation of the Compensation Board as presented on April 7, 2025. Further clarification ensued, then Mayor Page again requested a Motion.

A Motion was made by Council Member Moore, seconded by Council Member Gales, and the Motion FAILED by the following vote:

Nay: 7 - Council Member Gales, Council Member Moore, Council Member Clark, Council Member Finley, Council Member Pearson, Vice Mayor Brown and Mayor Page

Council Member Moore then made a Motion to reject the Report of the Compensation Board and to reconvene the Board to submit a revised report as soon as possible. The Motion was seconded by Vice Mayor Brown, and the Motion CARRIED by the following vote:

Aye: 6 - Council Member Moore, Council Member Clark, Council Member Finley, Council Member Pearson, Vice Mayor Brown and Mayor Page

Abstain: 1 - Council Member Gales

VI. Special Presentation

[PR08-25](#)

Appendix B "Schedule of Permitted and Conditional Uses by District" and
Section 1123.02 "Definitions" of the Trotwood Codes of Ordinances
Presented by Tyler Hauck, Planning and Zoning Administrator

Attachments: [PR08-25 Staff Report](#)
 [PR08-25 1. New Uses and Definitions](#)
 [PR08-25 2. New Appendix B](#)
 [PR08-25 3. Redlined Definitions](#)
 [PR08-25 4. Existing Appendix B](#)

Planning and Zoning Administrator Tyler Hauck presented revisions, as recommended by the Planning Commission, to Appendix B, the "Schedule of Permitted and Conditional Uses by District", as well as to the Definitions contained in the Zoning Code.

Mr. Hauck explained that the City is divided into 19 different zoning districts. Further, within each district, there is a list of uses that are allowed. He explained that there are three different types of uses - permitted, conditional, and not permitted, and discussed the meaning of each one. Mr. Hauck then reviewed the current Appendix B and explained to Council how to read the columns and rows on the spreadsheet.

Mr. Hauck shared that the current Appendix B has several duplicate or similar, and hyper-specific, uses listed, and several terms used are not defined. He then shared the proposed Appendix B, which contains 102 uses compared to the current Appendix B having 186 uses. He added that the use definitions are now more generalized and one definition should cover almost any type of requested use, providing increased clarity and a simplified zoning process. He shared that currently only 37% of the uses listed in Appendix B are defined; therefore, the proposed definitions define all of the uses on Appendix B and in the Zoning Code in order to reduce confusion.

Mr. Hauck confirmed that these changes won't change the zoning districts

where these uses are currently permitted, although there are two exceptions due to the moratoriums on multi-family housing and mini-warehouse self-storage facilities.

Mr. Hauck shared that the current Zoning Code permits multi-family housing in the zoning districts of Residential Multi-Family Low Density and High Density, and it is also a conditional use in the Olde Town Business District. He explained that the Planning Commission discussed this matter and after receiving Council's feedback from their Workshops, the Commission did not feel that multi-family housing is appropriate in the Olde Town Business District, so they removed it as a conditional use in that district. He added that there is a clerical error on the proposed Appendix B as it still shows a C, indicating it is a conditional use in that district.

Mayor Page asked for clarification on the proposed Appendix B, asking if the C for conditional use should be removed from the OT-B District. Mr. Hauck confirmed that the C should be removed from that line as it is a clerical error and there should be nothing listed.

Mr. Hauck went on to explain that under Industrial Uses, the line for Mini-Self Storage Facility has neither a P or a C in any district; therefore, such use would no longer be a permitted use or a conditional use in any district.

Council Member Finley asked about Cultivation and Dispensaries as there are no districts reflecting such uses as permitted or conditional on the proposed Appendix B. Mr. Hauck explained that in regards to such uses, the proposed Appendix B reflects the current Zoning Code because there is currently a moratorium on marijuana; therefore, staff decided it would be best to address those uses as a separate discussion. He added that the same theory is true for Group Homes. Council Member Finley asked if that should then be the same for multi-family housing in Olde Town. Mr. Hauck explained that the moratoriums on multi-family housing and mini-self storage facilities expire at the end of June, so it is necessary to address those uses now. He reminded Council that permitted and conditional uses granted prior to adopting any changes will be grandfathered, or still allowed, but no new multi-family dwellings would be allowed in Olde Town should the proposed Appendix B be adopted.

Mayor Page asked what is a Waste Disposal Facility. Mr. Hauck read the definition of such use and commented that something that would most likely be from the City. City Manager Pope confirmed that to be true.

Mr. Hauck stated that just because a use is defined and listed on Appendix B doesn't necessarily mean that it has to be allowed.

Mayor Page thanked Mr. Hauck for providing this information to Council and commented that she now understands how it works in conjunction with the newly adopted Land Use Plan. She did comment that the list should address a spa as she is aware of people wanting to open such a business in the City. Mr. Hauck suggested a spa might be considered a personal care service and reiterated that typically he engages in discussion with new business owners to obtain as much information as he can to determine the best use category.

Council Member Finley gave an example of a business with more than one use

and asked Mr. Hauck how such an issue would be addressed. Mr. Hauck explained that in cases when a business is conducting services with more than one defined use, he applies the most restrictive use category for guidance.

Mr. Hauck explained that the Zoning Administrator is who makes the use determinations and if a business owner disagrees with the Zoning Administrator's decision, the owner has the right to appeal to the Planning Commission.

VII. Adjourn

Mayor Page confirmed all minds were clear and adjourned the meeting at 8:00 p.m.