



MINUTES
OXFORD CITY COUNCIL REGULAR MEETING
COURTHOUSE
TUESDAY, AUGUST 18, 2026 AT 7:30 PM

MEETING PROCEDURE: Comments from the Public are welcome at two different times during the course of the meeting: (1) Comments on items not on the Agenda, and Consent Agenda items, will be heard under Public Comments – and (2) Comments on all Resolutions and Ordinances will be heard during Council consideration of said item. Please wait until you are recognized by the Mayor, state your name and address so that your comments may be properly recorded and limit your remarks to a period of five minutes or less.

1. Roll Call.

A regular meeting of the Oxford City Council was called to order by Mayor Smith on Tuesday, August 18, 2026, at 7:30 p.m. Members in attendance were William Snively, Jason Bracken, Roxanne Ornelas, Jim Vinch, Alex French and Amber Franklin.

Staff Members in Attendance

Ms. Jessica Greene, Acting City Manager; Mr. Michael Dreisbach, Service Director; Mr. John Detherage, Fire Chief; Mr. John Jones, Police Chief; Ms. Heidi Ridenour, Finance Director; Mr. Sam Perry, Community Development Director; Mr. Chad Smith, Parks and Recreation Director; Mr. Chris Conard, Law Director; and Ms. Heather Barbour, Clerk of Council.

2. Pledge of Allegiance.

3. Approval of Agenda.

Motion – To Approve the Agenda
(Voice Vote) 1st Ms. French 2nd Ms. Ornelas
AYE # 7
NAY # 0
ABS # 0

4. Public Participation.

A. Oxford Seniors Center Annual Report, Ms. Emily Liechty, Executive Director

Oxford Seniors provided an update to City Council on its programs, services, community impact, and partnerships under the theme “*Supporting Seniors and Strengthening Community.*”

The organization highlighted significant growth and continued investment in transportation services. Using Section 5310 Federal Transportation funds, Oxford Seniors recently purchased two new accessible vehicles, including a 2027 modified minivan with a rear-entry ramp and a 2026 accessible van equipped with an electric lift. Since August 2025, the transportation program has provided 6,869 rides to 230 individuals, while also accommodating a limited number of non-senior riders as capacity allows.

Outreach and insurance counseling services also remain a key area of impact. Since August 2025, staff has provided outreach support to 984 individuals. During the 2025 Open Enrollment period, 401 people received insurance counseling, resulting in more than \$385,000 in savings on co-pays and premiums. Sabrina Jewell was recognized as the Ohio OSHIIP Coordinator of the Year for her outstanding work. Looking ahead, Oxford Seniors will host Open Enrollment information sessions from October 15 through December 7, along with the Oxford Seniors Health Fair on October 16, which will be open to the broader community.

The presentation also emphasized the breadth of programs and activities offered at the senior center. Oxford Seniors provides a wide range of recreational, educational, wellness, and social opportunities, including fitness classes, card and game groups, arts and crafts, clubs, trips, yoga, line dancing, pottery, stained-glass, and more. The organization currently offers 25 different activities each week. In 2025, there were 1,276 active participants, with an average daily attendance of 51 individuals at the facility. Since August 2025, participants have engaged in programs or met with staff more than 15,000 times.

Nutrition services continue to play an essential role in supporting older adults in the community. Since August 2025, Oxford Seniors has delivered 12,819 home-delivered meals to 115 clients through Meals on Wheels and served 2,137 congregate lunches at the senior center, helping ensure both nutrition and social connection.

The Community Adult Day Service was also highlighted as a vital support for families and caregivers. Since August 2025, the program has provided 1,327 days of care, offering supervision, engagement, and companionship to 24 clients and their families.

Oxford Seniors further outlined a wide range of community partnerships that enhance and extend its services. These collaborations include the Butler County Health Department, which distributed 300 free COVID tests; the VA, which provided 75 free gun locks; and AARP, which completed 259 free tax returns. Best Point Behavioral Health continues to offer a bi-monthly support group, and eight free Monday Night Community Meals were hosted, serving

approximately 200 meals each evening. Additional partnerships include the Ohio Department of Aging Community Town Hall and vision screenings provided by the Cincinnati Association for the Blind and Visually Impaired.

Other notable initiatives include Rock Steady Boxing, which Oxford Seniors now operates and which serves approximately 40 individuals living with Parkinson's disease. The organization also supports City of Oxford energy audits and utility assistance programs, Oxford Reads events, Oxford Winter House, and school-based donations of handmade hats and gloves to Talawanda elementary students. Community engagement further extends to events such as the League of Women Voters Candidate Forum, Cub Scout meetings, Boy Scout service projects, BCRTA Ride and Dine events, Oxford Audubon Society meetings, and Age-Friendly Oxford intergenerational programs.

Oxford Seniors also participates in numerous community-wide events, including the Butler County Fair Senior Day Social, Joy Conference, FRESH Air Fair, Back to School Bash, Redbrick Fridays, OXtoberFest, and Farm and Flea. Through its involvement with the Coalition for a Healthy Community – Oxford Area and Age-Friendly Oxford, the organization supported Older Americans Month programming such as intergenerational yoga and trivia night and was recognized as a PUSH Award winner.

In closing, Oxford Seniors expressed appreciation for the many partners and supporters who make its work possible, including the City of Oxford, Oxford Community Foundation, McCullough Hyde Foundation, Oxford Kiwanis, Oxford Rotary, Oxford Masons, Council on Aging of Southwestern Ohio, Molyneaux Foundation, United Way of Butler County, and the citizens of Oxford and surrounding communities.

Ms. Liechty offered to answer any questions. Mayor Smith thanked Ms. Liechty for her presentation. (Slides included in minutes)

B. Public Comments

The purpose of the public comments section is for members of the public to speak to the City Council on any subject not scheduled on the Agenda, except consent agenda items. To speak, you may approach the podium and wait to be addressed by the Mayor. You will need to state your name and address for the public record. City Council values your comments, and Council rules limit public comments to five minutes for each person. Presentations are not to be in the form of public debate, personal attacks on Council, City staff, or other members of the public, and Council shall not act except to direct the City Manager to take action or schedule the matter for discussion at a later date.

Public Comment - Mr. Allan Winkler, 925 Cedar Drive - Mr. Winkler spoke on behalf of the Oxford Community Arts Center. Mr. Winkler addressed Council regarding the organization's efforts to renovate and preserve its facility. Mr. Winkler explained that the Arts Center has been pursuing historic tax credits and has already received \$100,000 from the State of Ohio, but a revision to its lease with Miami University is necessary for the organization to qualify for additional tax-credit financing. The potential value of those credits was described as approximately \$3.5 million. Mr. Winkler said Miami University's Board of Trustees had

previously declined the requested lease change, despite discussions with university administrators and attorneys. The Arts Center planned to approach the Board again at its September meeting and asked City Council to provide a written statement supporting both the Arts Center and its effort to revise the lease. The statement would then be presented to the Board as part of the Arts Center's renewed request.

Public Comment - Ms. LaTricia Hillman, 820 Clover Circle - Wished to speak about the PCRRC Flock Camera Discussion. Mayor Smith asked that she speak during that agenda item.

Public Comment - Mr. Woods Hayes, 614 S. Locust St. - Mr. Woods Hayes also wished to speak about the Flock Camera Resolution. Mayor Smith asked that he wait until that agenda item.

Public Comment - Ms. Ann Fuehrer, Dana Dr. - Ms. Fuehrer spoke about the importance of City boards and commissions as a bridge between residents, staff, and elected officials. Ms. Fuehrer specifically credited the Police Community Relations and Review Commission (PCRRC) with slowing the Flock-camera decision-making process enough to allow additional public education and participation. Ms. Fuehrer argued that commissions can play an important role when complicated community issues emerge that may not have been fully anticipated when an initial decision was made. Ms. Fuehrer then shifted to affordable housing and homelessness, noting their service on the Housing Advisory Commission. Ms. Fuehrer stated that dozens of people in the community are unhoused and that more than half of Oxford renters are financially burdened by housing costs. Ms. Fuehrer also discussed the long-term consequences of eviction, particularly the difficulty of securing another rental after an eviction. As a current example of housing pressures, Ms. Fuehrer cited a recent \$100-per-month rent increase at the Miami Mobile Home Park, compared with a previous increase of approximately \$50 per month. Because Ohio law restricts municipalities from imposing local rent-control measures, Ms. Fuehrer said local governing bodies need to think creatively about other ways to address housing affordability. Ms. Fuehrer encouraged the PCRRC and Housing Advisory Commission to consider public education and community conversations with the local nonprofit Sheltering Oxford concerning the development of emergency shelter in Oxford. The goal would be to give the City's social-services liaison more local options when assisting unhoused individuals who are vulnerable to criminalization but cannot or do not want to leave their support systems in Oxford. Ms. Fuehrer also urged the community to address systemic barriers to emergency shelter and affordable rental housing, including neighborhood opposition to such facilities.

5. Consent Agenda.

All matters under the Consent Agenda are considered by the City Council to be routine and will be enacted by one motion. Any City Council member may, however, remove an item from consent by request. Items removed for separate discussion will be considered after the motion to approve the Consent Agenda.

Motion – To Approve the Consent Agenda.

(Voice Vote) 1st Ms. French 2nd Mr. Snively

AYE # 7

NAY # 0

ABS # 0

- A. Minutes of the August 4, 2026, City Council Meeting. (Heather Barbour, Clerk of Council)
- B. A Report Regarding the August 5th, 2026, Environmental Commission Meeting (Reena Murphy, Sustainability Coordinator)
- C. A Resolution Declaring Certain Property In The Police Division's Possession As Surplus And Not Needed For Any Municipal Purpose And Authorizing Its Advertisement And Sale To The Highest Bidder At Public Auction Or Internet Auction. (John Jones, Police Chief)
- D. A Resolution Authorizing The Oxford Division Of Police To Retain For Use By The Municipality Certain Unclaimed Property In Its Possession. (John Jones, Police Chief)
- E. A Resolution Authorizing The Police Chief And The Finance Director Or Their Designees To Dispose Of Contraband No Longer Needed As Evidence. (John Jones, Police Chief)
- F. A Resolution Authorizing The Police Chief And The Finance Director Or Their Designees To Dispose Of Firearms, Ammunition And Related Items. (John Jones, Police Chief)

6. Resolutions.

- A. A Resolution Maintaining The Flock Group, Inc., Agreement With Amendments To Procedures. (Jessica Greene, Assistant City Manager)

Motion – To Amend Resolution No. 7849 by Changing the title: A Resolution To Terminate The Flock Group, Inc., Agreement. And to strike the second and third Whereas statements, and to amend Section 1 to read: The current agreement with Flock Group, Inc. will be terminated.

(Voice Vote) 1st Mr. Snavelly 2nd Ms. Franklin

AYE # 5

NAY # 2

ABS # 0

Motion – To Adopt Resolution No. 7849 as Amended.

(Voice Vote) 1st Ms. French 2nd Mr. Vinch

AYE # 6

NAY # 1

ABS # 0

Ms. Greene presented her staff report. Ms. Greene and Chief Jones addressed questions and comments from the Council.

Public Comment - Ms. LaTricia Hillman, 820 Clover Circle - Ms. Hillman, chair of the PCRRC, summarized the Commission's August 6 discussion. The PCRRC had voted 5-1 to recommend continued use of automated license plate recognition technology with additional safeguards. Hillman stressed that the recommendation was not a blanket endorsement of Flock, but an attempt to balance potential investigative value with stronger policies, transparency, training, oversight, and accountability. She also emphasized the importance of legal review of the contract and understanding precisely how the City's data is stored, accessed, shared, and used.

Public Comment - Mr. Woods Hayes, 614 S. Locust St. - Mr. Woods Hayes identified himself as an Oxford resident, parent, and researcher working at the intersection of artificial intelligence and social systems. He argued that the central concern was not simply the physical license-plate cameras, but the larger nationwide database created by the technology. He said the system records vehicle characteristics and location information for drivers regardless of whether they are suspected of wrongdoing, potentially creating records of trips to places such as doctors' offices, churches, and private residences. Mr. Woods Hayes argued that local restrictions cannot fully address the problem because information entered into a national network can potentially be accessed outside Oxford. He cited reported examples involving federal access to Flock data and argued that the architecture of the system itself prevents Oxford from guaranteeing that its locally adopted restrictions will control every subsequent use of the information. He also raised concerns about accuracy, citing incidents in which license plates were allegedly misidentified and innocent motorists were treated as suspects. He referenced litigation involving Flock and constitutional challenges to persistent warrantless vehicle tracking. While acknowledging that the technology has produced legitimate investigative successes, he argued that individual successful cases do not justify indiscriminate collection of location information about the broader population. His requested action was unequivocal: terminate the contract rather than amend it. He argued that every additional month of operation adds more residents' movements to a

database beyond Council's complete control and that procedural restrictions cannot fundamentally change the structure of the network.

Public Comment - Ms. Lisa Biales, 6317 Buckley Rd. - Ms. Biales challenged several statements that had been made publicly in defense of Flock. She questioned claims concerning the significance of alerts associated with registered sex offenders and raised concerns about unauthorized or improper access to surveillance systems. She also cited examples in which law-enforcement personnel elsewhere had allegedly used surveillance tools to track spouses, former partners, or other individuals for personal purposes. She discussed Oxford's reported restrictions on searches involving immigration enforcement and reproductive care but argued that local restrictions could not guarantee that information would never be used for those purposes elsewhere. She specifically raised concerns about the possibility of surveillance information being used against people seeking reproductive healthcare. Ms. Biales also questioned descriptions of Flock's Condor cameras as comparable to ordinary business security cameras, emphasizing their automated pan, tilt, zoom, and AI-related capabilities. She argued that the system could be used to track people rather than merely vehicles and expressed particular concern about potential impacts on immigrants, people of color, women, and girls. She concluded by arguing that many residents who might share these concerns are unable to attend Council meetings because of work and other responsibilities. She asked Council to end Oxford's relationship with Flock.

Public Comment - Mr. Timothy Ritze, 6563 Stillwell Becket Rd. - Mr. Ritze said the issue was fundamentally constitutional rather than a question of budgets, staffing efficiencies, or police "force multipliers." He characterized indiscriminate collection of vehicle-location information as a warrantless dragnet and argued that catching offenders cannot justify creating a system that compromises the constitutional rights of people who are not suspected of crimes. He framed his objections as four questions for the public record, focused broadly on whether government has constitutional authority to continuously collect location information about people without individualized suspicion; whether a network of cameras on public roads constitutes the type of general surveillance the Fourth Amendment was intended to prevent; whether successful arrests can retroactively justify surveillance of thousands of innocent people; and whether government can use a contract with a private company to do something that would otherwise violate constitutional protections. Mr. Ritze urged Council to terminate the Flock contract using its exit provisions and go further by adopting an ordinance prohibiting similar tracking networks in the future, so termination of Flock would not simply result in adoption of another vendor's equivalent technology. He framed the issue as one involving Council members' responsibility to uphold constitutional limits on government authority.

Public Comment - Ms. Elizabeth Wardle, 22 Lantern Ridge Rd. - Ms. Wardle used examples of more intrusive surveillance technologies to illustrate what she viewed as the risks of gradually normalizing government monitoring. Her central concern was that Flock is a private, for-profit technology company rather than the local police department itself, raising questions about who ultimately controls the information collected through the system. She argued that even if Oxford police use the information responsibly, they cannot necessarily control every subsequent use of information placed into the broader system. She cited reports that federal agencies had accessed another community's Flock data without the local police department's knowledge. She described the cumulative effect of multiple cameras as a surveillance network capable of reconstructing people's routines and movements. Ms. Wardle also questioned whether the public-safety benefits

justify the privacy costs. She argued that the evidence demonstrating significant crime reductions from Flock cameras is less conclusive than the company's marketing suggests and raised concerns about false alerts and license-plate misreads potentially causing innocent people to be investigated or detained. She additionally connected increased surveillance to the physical infrastructure required to store and process growing quantities of data, including electricity, water, servers, and data centers. She characterized Oxford's camera network as effectively creating a "geofence" around the community by recording vehicles entering and leaving the city. She concluded by reminding Council that she had voted for its members with the expectation that they would protect civil liberties and asked them to terminate the contract.

Public Comment - Mr. Steve Sullivan, 104 Marti Ct. - Mr. Sullivan broadened the discussion beyond the Flock brand itself. He argued that "Flock" had effectively become shorthand for a larger class of AI-powered surveillance technologies and the databases those devices create. He said the underlying concern should therefore be the long-term collection and correlation of information, not simply one particular vendor or contract. Mr. Sullivan distinguished ALPR systems from conventional traffic-enforcement cameras. A red-light camera, he argued, is activated in response to a possible violation, whereas an ALPR network collects information continuously, including information about people who have committed no offense. He cited examples in which vehicle-location information was allegedly used to infer activities such as marijuana purchases or reproductive healthcare. He argued that American privacy protections often depend upon keeping different databases separate, whereas large surveillance networks make it easier to combine or infer sensitive information from people's movements. He also raised concerns about misuse by authorized users, questioned whether technical safeguards such as two-factor authentication are sufficient, and questioned the trustworthiness of private companies responsible for storing and managing the data. Mr. Sullivan further argued that surveillance technology can collect information about ordinary, lawful activities unrelated to crime and that the scale of the technology distinguishes it from conventional cameras. He rejected the argument that people who are doing nothing wrong have nothing to fear, contending that the country has not yet established adequate legal guardrails for privately maintained surveillance databases.

Public Comment - Ms. Jordan Gresham, 6095 Contreras Rd. - Ms. Gresham, a 21-year-old longtime Oxford resident, opposed the cameras and focused on several common arguments made in their defense. Gresham first questioned Flock's accuracy claims, citing an outside police-department analysis and an incident involving an allegedly incorrect stolen-vehicle alert. Ms. Gresham argued that even a system marketed as highly accurate can create serious consequences when an incorrect reading prompts a police response. Ms. Gresham then argued that opposition to surveillance should not be understood as a conventional left-versus-right political issue. Ms. Gresham cited conservative criticism of Flock and connected privacy concerns to the same constitutional-rights principles often invoked in debates over the Second Amendment. The core argument was that people concerned about preserving constitutional rights should also take Fourth Amendment privacy protections seriously. Ms. Gresham also responded to the argument that people are already recorded by cameras in stores, schools, and other businesses. Ms. Gresham distinguished those cameras from a networked system operated by a venture-backed technology company, arguing that a conventional store camera generally remains within the business while Flock information becomes part of a much larger data system. Finally, Ms. Gresham cited reports of law-enforcement personnel using surveillance databases for personal searches and stalking. Ms. Gresham argued that increasingly powerful video analytics make surveillance databases qualitatively different from older camera systems because large quantities

of information can now be searched for characteristics such as clothing, tattoos, and bumper stickers. Ms. Gresham concluded that Flock constitutes mass surveillance and should not be used in Oxford.

Public Comment - Ms. Janis Dutton, 302 W. Vine St. - Ms. Dutton began by citing an example of a Texas law-enforcement official reportedly shutting down Flock cameras because of concerns about warrantless tracking. She used the example to argue that opposition to the technology is not limited to civil-liberties organizations or one political faction; law-enforcement officials themselves have also raised objections. Ms. Dutton then focused on what she saw as a contradiction between Council members' stated support for immigrants and civil liberties and continued participation in a surveillance network. She argued that Oxford's cameras could record political demonstrations and other First Amendment activity and said information previously shared with large numbers of outside law-enforcement agencies could potentially reach entities whose priorities differ from Oxford's. She rejected the proposed local safeguards as inadequate because Oxford loses control over information after it has been shared. She argued that protecting vulnerable populations requires not only participating in demonstrations or making public statements but also refusing, through local policy decisions, to participate in surveillance infrastructure that could later be used against those populations.

Public Comment - Mr. Juan, Oxford Commons - Mr. Juan spoke briefly without prepared remarks. Mr. Juan said they shared the concerns expressed by the preceding speakers and believed the cameras violated civil liberties. He said they did not want to feel as though they were living under a surveillance state or being treated as a potential terrorist in their own community. Mr. Juan characterized removal of the cameras as a reasonable request from citizens to their local government.

Public Comment - Mr. Evan Pitts, 305 Ericson Dr. - Mr. Pitts said he agreed with much of the preceding testimony but wanted to organize the concerns into four broad categories: constitutional privacy concerns; Flock's ability and willingness to protect data; potential misconduct by company employees or authorized users; and technological/security failures. Drawing on his professional experience in IT, modeling, simulation, and AI, Mr. Pitts questioned the assertion that Oxford truly "owns" the information generated by the cameras. He argued that because the information is physically stored on infrastructure controlled by a private company and accessible outside the City's systems, Oxford's ownership is limited in a practical sense. He also cited reported security vulnerabilities involving camera systems and raised concerns about the usefulness of audit logs if user identities or search justifications are insufficiently specific. In his view, auditing cannot provide meaningful accountability if a search can be justified with a vague description such as "investigation." Mr. Pitts concluded that the problem could not be solved simply by adding local safeguards because the architecture itself places data outside complete local control. He argued that the technology is fundamentally not reformable through the proposed restrictions and that once information is collected and distributed digitally, the City cannot guarantee its future disposition.

Public Comment - Ms. Linda Musmeci-Kimball, 724 Melinda Dr. - Ms. Musmeci-Kimball referenced City Council Resolution No. 3935, adopted in August 2003, affirming the civil rights of Oxford residents. Ms. Musmeci-Kimball highlighted the resolution's statements regarding Oxford's history of protecting civil rights and liberties and constitutional protections including speech, religion, assembly, privacy, equality before the law, due process, and protection from

unreasonable searches and seizures. Ms. Musmeci-Kimball argued that neither the Police Department's proposed procedural safeguards nor the PCRRC recommendation addressed the fundamental issue: in her view, indiscriminate collection of vehicle-location information makes Flock and similar technologies part of a nationwide mass-surveillance system. She characterized proposed safeguards as insufficient because they do not change the underlying nature of the technology. Ms. Musmeci-Kimball emphasized personal opposition to having their movements recorded, stored, and shared and said she did not want Oxford participating in a national surveillance network. She also expressed concern about incentives for municipalities to expand surveillance infrastructure through federal funding programs. Ms. Musmeci-Kimball's ultimate request was for Oxford to end its participation in the Flock system.

- B. A Resolution Authorizing The Rental Of Seventy-Seven (77) City Parking Spaces On The East Side Of South Campus Avenue, Between East Spring Street And East Chestnut Street, To Miami University, As Described In The Parking Agreement In Exhibit A. (John Jones, Police Chief)

Motion – To Adopt Resolution No. 7850
(Voice Vote) 1st Mr. Snavelly 2nd Ms. Ornelas
AYE # 3
NAY # 0
ABS # 0

Mayor Smith, Ms. Franklin, Mr. Bracken, and Mr. Vinch all recused themselves from the discussion and vote due to a conflict of interest. Mr. Conard confirmed that Ms. Ornelas has no conflict of interest and can therefore sit and vote on the matter.

Chief Jones presented his staff report and addressed questions and comments from the Council.

Public Comment - None.

- C. A Resolution Authorizing The City Manager To Apply For And Accept A Capital Improvement Grant For The Community Parks, Recreation, And Conservation Project: "Synthetic Play Field Oxford Community Park" In The Amount Of \$250,000 To Be Administered By The Ohio Department Of Natural Resources (ODNR). (Chad Smith, Parks and Recreation Director)

Motion – To Adopt Resolution No. 7851
(Voice Vote) 1st Mr. Snavelly 2nd Ms. French
AYE # 7
NAY # 0
ABS # 0

Mr. Smith presented his staff report and addressed questions and comments from the Council.

Public Comment - None.

- D. A Resolution Accepting The Recommendation Of The Public Arts Commission For A Mural As Described In Exhibit A, For Installation At 909 S. Main Street (Jessica Greene, Assistant City Manager)

Motion – To Adopt Resolution No. 7852
(Voice Vote) 1st Ms. Franklin 2nd Mr. Snively
AYE # 7
NAY # 0
ABS # 0

Ms. Greene presented her staff report and addressed questions and comments from the Council.

Public Comment - Mr. Steve Sullivan, 104 Marti Ct. - Mr. Sullivan praised the City's public-art efforts generally, including the content of the murals and the deliberative process used by the Public Arts Commission. Mr. Sullivan said the Amtrak-related mural would provide a positive introduction to Oxford for people arriving in the community and expressed appreciation for both this specific project and the City's broader public-art work.

7. Ordinances.

Ordinances are adopted using a two-step procedure. First reading introduces the Ordinance and provides an opportunity for public input on the subject as well as allowing Council to request more information as needed. Second reading is to provide Council with the opportunity to consider new information and to deliberate.

A. First Reading

1. An Ordinance Authorizing The City Manager To Enter Into A Utility Easement Agreement With Duke Energy Ohio, Inc., To Facilitate The Installation Of Level 3 Electric Vehicle Fast Chargers At The City-Owned Surface Parking Lot At Main Street & Church Street (Michael Dreisbach, Service Director)

Mr. Dreisbach presented his staff report and addressed questions and comments from the Council.

Public Comment - None.

2. An Ordinance Accepting The Recommendation Of The Planning Commission To Repeal And Replace Zoning Code Section 1143.10, Uptown District, To Allow For Retail Services Up To 20,000 Square Feet As A Permitted Use (Sam Perry, Community Development Director)

Mr. Perry presented his staff report and addressed questions and comments from the Council.

Public Comment - None.

B. Second Reading

1. An Ordinance Accepting The Annexation Petition From Ambassadors' Pointe Community Church (West), Inc. For 6.753 Acres Of Land More Or Less In The Township Of Oxford, Butler County Ohio, And Accepting Said Territory To Be Annexed. (Douglas R. Elliott, Jr., City Manager)

Motion – To Adopt Ordinance No. 3878
(Roll Call Vote) 1st Ms. French 2nd Mr. Snavelly

AYE # 7

Mr. Bracken, Ms. Franklin, Ms. French, Ms. Ornelas, Mr. Snavelly, Mr. Vinch, and Mayor Smith

NAY # 0

ABS # 0

Ms. Greene reported no changes since the first reading and offered to answer any questions.

Public Comment - None.

2. An Ordinance Amending Ordinance No. 3844 Supplemental Budget Ordinance Number 5 To Make Supplemental Appropriations For Fiscal Year 2026. (Heidi Ridenour, Finance Director)

Motion – To Adopt Ordinance No. 3879
(Roll Call Vote) 1st Ms. French 2nd Mr. Snavelly

AYE # 7

Ms. Franklin, Ms. French, Ms. Ornelas, Mr. Snavelly, Mr. Vinch, Mr. Bracken, and Mayor Smith

NAY # 0

ABS # 0

Ms. Ridenour reviewed the changes since the first reading and offered to answer any questions.

Public Comment - None.

8. Announcements & Communications.

A. Remarks from City Council and City staff.

The comments expressed by individual members of Council or City staff during this portion of a City Council meeting do not necessarily reflect the views of the City of Oxford, The Oxford City Council, or the City staff.

B. Future Meetings.

(Note: Meetings are held at the Court House unless otherwise indicated.)

DATE	Meeting		
1. Aug 19	Board of Building Appeals - CANCELED	Courthouse	5:30 p.m.
Aug 25	Board of Zoning Appeals	Courthouse	6:30 p.m.
Sep 1	City Council	Courthouse	7:30 p.m.
Sep 2	Environmental Commission	Municipal Building	7:00 p.m.
Sep 3	Housing Advisory Commission	Courthouse	5:00 p.m.
Sep 7	City Offices - CLOSED		
Sep 8	Planning Commission	Courthouse	7:00 p.m.
Sep 10	Historic & Architectural Preservation Commission	Courthouse	5:00 p.m.
Sep 10	Historic & Architectural Preservation Commission Work Session	Courthouse	6:00 p.m.
Sep 14	Oxford Recreation Board	Municipal Building	12:30 p.m.
Sep 14	Public Arts Commission of Oxford	Courthouse	5:30 p.m.

Sep 14	2027 Capital Improvement Plan City Council Work Session	Courthouse	6:30 p.m.
Sep 15	City Council	Courthouse	7:30 p.m.

9. Adjourn.

Motion – To Adjourn at 10:08 p.m.
(Voice Vote) 1st Ms. French 2nd Mr. Snively
AYE # 7
NAY # 0
ABS # 0