

THE CITY OF HURON, OHIO
Proceedings of the Huron City Council
Work Session of Tuesday, July 8, 2025 at 5:30pm

Call to Order

The Mayor called the Huron City Council work session to order at 5:30pm.

Roll Call

The Mayor directed the Clerk to call the roll for the meeting. The following members of Council answered present: **William Biddlecombe, Sam Artino, Mark Claus, Monty Tapp, Joe Dike, Matt Grieves and Joel Hagy.**

Old Business

New Business

Discussion of Existing Ordinances Relating to Operation of e-Scooters, e-Bikes and Analysis/Recommendation for Amendments to Same

Handout provided by Attorney Matthew Waters is attached hereto as Exhibit "A" and incorporated herein by reference.

Mayor Tapp had spoken with Chief Graham, Mr. Hamilton and Mr. Schrader in the past relating to complaints he has received. Two of the people who had complaints recently reached out to say they have seen some changes in the way the children are riding. He explained to them that the police officers are talking with them to educate them on the rules of the road/sidewalks.

Mr. Hamilton explained that as issues like this come up, staff want to hear about them. If they don't hear about them either directly or through Council, they cannot address them. They have held several internal meetings and Mr. Waters has done a great job looking at ORC and Huron's Codified Ordinance to try to tie things together to see: (1) where we stand currently; and (2) see if there is anything the City can do. Mr. Waters will run Council through a couple of classification of vehicles and where they are/are not currently allowed to be operated. Mr. Hamilton wants everyone to remember that the City is bound by the Ohio Revised Code. The City can do things that are more restrictive than ORC, but it cannot do anything laxer than ORC. One example is ORC says that no vehicle is allowed on the sidewalk; we cannot say that scooter is now allowed by the sidewalk because it's a vehicle. That precedent must be kept in mind as Council works through this.

Mr. Waters stated that they were asked to look at both the Huron Code and ORC. He provided Exhibit A as a reference to the definitions of various transportation modes. When they are talking about what types of vehicles there are, electric bicycles have 3 classes. These classes cannot be recognized just by looking at them from an enforcement standpoint. The other issue is the bikes can be modified post-purchase, which could change the class of the bike. The classes are broken down into speeds, with Class 3 going to fastest at 28mph. However, there are probably governors on those bikes that can be taken off to go even faster.

The e-scooter is a definition that is only in the Huron Code (not in ORC). That definition does not include a mph restriction. That is important when looking at the definitions for "electric personal assisted mobility

device" which is a Segway-type device and is restricted to 20 mph. The "low speed micromobility device" is also limited to 20 mph, and an example would be a razor scooter or small electric bikes that go less than 20 mph. Mr. Hamilton added that while the ORC does not recognize an e-scooter, it does recognize a vehicle or a low-speed micromobility device, which is less than 20mph. The e-scooter would be considered a motor vehicle. Mr. Waters said mopeds and motorized bicycles are recognized by ORC, and are considered to be motor vehicles.

Mr. Waters said if you look at the allowed use locations, ORC 4511.711(a), which is identical to Huron's Code, vehicles are not allowed on sidewalks, except bicycles or electric bicycles without the motor engages. Other than that, you can't really have anything on the sidewalk. The electric personal assisted mobility device and the low-speed micromobility devices are also allowed on sidewalks because they have specific allowances within Huron's Code and ORC, and they are excluded from the definition of "vehicle." Mayor Tapp clarified the you can be on there if the e-scooter or e-bike is not under power.

Mr. Biddlecombe asked how the pier is defined, as some of the complaints came from kids whipping down the pier. Mr. Hamilton answered that it would be classed as a "shared use path," so they would be allowed. The only thing that is not allowed on a shared use path would be a Class 3 e-bike. Enforcement of the "under power" portion would be difficult, because you can pedal an e-bike while being assisted if it is turned on. There is no way to tell that until they are stopped.

E-bikes (Classes 1 and 2) are allowed on bike paths and shared use paths. Class 3 is not allowed unless it is within or adjacent to a highway. Mr. Hamilton said that is something they are going to dig a little deeper into, because a lot of shared use pathways and bike pathways are physically separated from the highway. It definitely wouldn't be allowed there. Are they classifying a white line or chevrons as a space between the highway and the shared use path? That's one thing they still need to get clarification on. Staff see it as if the bike path or shared use path is next to the road, it is adjacent. Adjacent is a generalized term, is it adjacent if it is 3' away, or does it have to be touching? Are they going to make someone with a Class 3 e-bike ride outside the bike lane on the road? It doesn't make sense – there is no physical divide. The physical divide is there for safety, to stop someone from drifting into the bike lane. Mr. Hamilton stated that they would class their bike lane as adjacent to the highway.

Mayor Tapp said their biggest issue is illegal riding, such as riding the wrong direction in the bike lane, going through a stop sign, flying through the intersection, etc. Mr. Hagy agreed, saying that what they are really focusing on is how the children are using the e-bikes and e-scooters, not what they are using. They are doing the same things he was doing on his bike, but now they are going 25 mph.

Mr. Waters said that a lot of the Huron Code mirrors the ORC, especially where these are allowed and how you define them. The bike paths and shared use paths have the same allowable vehicles on them.

When it comes to enforcement, Mr. Ebert has been working with Avon Lake and they have a proposal (see last page of Exhibit A). Mr. Hamilton said the whole point of the first couple of pages of Exhibit A is, technically, apart from the e-scooters being on the sidewalk and people using the battery on e-bikes, most of the problem people are just exhibiting bad behavior. That's where the last page comes from and where Chief Graham and his guys come in to try and fix this. He doesn't think there are a whole lot of code changes that they can really make to change how people behave.

Mr. Hagy asked what the current helmet law is for e-bikes and e-scooters. Chief Graham answered that there is no current law. At all age levels, there is no helmet law for motorized vehicles. Even a motorcycle

rider does not have to wear a helmet in the State of Ohio, other than for the first year. Mr. Hagy asked if they could require a helmet for ages 14 and below, for example. Mr. Hamilton said that would be allowed because it is more restrictive. Mr. Artino said the problem then becomes enforcement and trying to verify their age.

Chief Graham said they can all see some of the difficulties in enforcement. Some of the terms are interchangeable – they use the term “e-scooter,” if it looks like an e-scooter but does under 20 mph it’s a low-speed mobility device, which is allowed to be on the sidewalk. If it’s an e-scooter that does above that, they are restricted from using the sidewalk. It’s not what they are doing, necessarily, it is what the vehicle is rated for. You can’t operate a 30-mph e-scooter at 5 mph and be okay to be on the sidewalk. It is very hard to tell the difference between the two. The same goes with the e-bikes (Types 1, 2 and 3). They all look the same, and some Class 2’s can be changed to a Class 3 and they would never know. If they had one exclusive path for every type of vehicle that we have, that would be great. They don’t have that, so they must share the pathways with everything. He believes this is going to be a very difficult issue for the police to micromanage. He thinks that education has been a huge component in turning this around a little bit. They have been making contact with younger people on these that are violating some obvious laws (going the wrong way in traffic, going through a red light or stop sign, driving down the middle of the road, etc.). They haven’t yet developed a program, and he hasn’t even talked to the schools yet, but he believes that the Police Department should have a program on rules of the road for bicycles, e-bikes, e-scooter, etc., and safety issues such as recommending a helmet. They can’t currently mandate a helmet, but they can recommend it. The same goes for elbow pads or knee pads and other safety equipment. If our Student Resource Officer this fall could teach this class in the schools, they can really get in front of a lot of the people that are riding these. However, they must remember that they have a lot of people on vacation here with the AIRBNB’s where all these devices are made readily available for their use. It’s not going to be perfect, and they are not going to get everybody, but he thinks they can really touch a lot of students with this program. If they did a program at the Library on a Saturday morning, they are going to get 3 kids that show up. If they can incorporate this and get some cooperation from the school... does a 9-year-old know the rules of the road? They can start teaching that along with safety issues. He thinks a helmet is a good place to start.

Impoundment is another means of enforcement available to them with a code change. He believes this is a good thing to have as a tool for extreme repeat violators, like what Avon Lake is doing. If the “vehicle” is impounded, the parents must come to the police station to talk with the officers, which will get them involved. That’s really their job with everything – they are trying to be proactive, preventive and educational with people so they can get compliance. We still have adults that drive vehicles that don’t stop at stop signs, and we have adults that speed. Let’s not forget about the people that are so-called “responsible.” There needs to be some reasonableness on our shared pathways. If a pedestrian is on the sidewalk that sees a bicycle coming at them, they should move out of the way and let the bicycle go. If they see a jogger coming at them, they should move out of the way. Someone must be the bigger adult. They need reasonableness in the operation of these devices and reasonableness on the part of the pedestrians. He thinks that these pathways can be shared. Mayor Tapp said if there is a 10-year-old and they have a little scooter, do you want them riding on the road? You don’t – you want them riding on the sidewalk. Adults are just as guilty as the kids are because they look at their phone and they go off the side of the road, etc. Chief Graham again stressed that scooter with max speeds under 20 mph, they can be on the sidewalk. Mr. Hamilton said the devices that are allowed on the sidewalk will fall under the impounding if they are being abusive on the sidewalk and are not being considerate. This includes speeding on the sidewalk. The same rules of the road apply; they have to have some courtesy. That’s why availability of the impoundment is necessary. They can lecture the kids all day long and some are going to

ignore the advice, but when their parents find out, it might be a different story. Mr. Ebert said in Avon Lake, the schools and churches are where they are going to get some impact. Chief Graham thinks they can get buy-in with the schools because so many kids are riding these devices to school. He thinks they can come up with a really good program to educate our kids on laws and safety issues.

They do the same thing with boat inspections. They try to educate people so they don't have violations. Mayor Tapp thought that if there was a way to get the education piece to the parents, as well, that would be helpful.

Asked by Mr. Artino about multiple passengers on a bike or scooter, Chief Graham answered that this is already covered in existing ordinances. If it is a tandem bike, it can have 2 riders. If not, only 1 rider is allowed (no riders on handlebars, etc.).

Mr. Grieves asked how the police department would keep tabs on the repeat offenders. Chief Graham answered that this would be primarily through work of mouth among the officers. Mr. Hamilton stressed that the impoundment won't be only for multiple offenses. If someone is carrying out egregious acts, they will get the device pulled right away. The repeat offenders they are talking about are lower-scale offenders. Chief Graham explained that they have already made contact with several juveniles, and whether they are being honest or not, they all seem to be receptive and say they will make sure they won't do that in the future. It's a great way to have a positive contact with a juvenile and he thinks it is working.

Mr. Hamilton thinks they should write up some code for the impounding and have the police start their education program. They can then monitor this over the summer. If we already have positive feedback, this will only improve it a little more. Council further discussed the possibility of mandating helmets under a certain age. Chief Graham believes that they can strongly recommend helmet usage in their education program and encourage it. Mr. Hamilton believes that if they pushed mandatory helmets, people would ask how many accidents have occurred that caused injury. While we don't currently have any this year, as soon as there is one, people will ask why there isn't a helmet law. This is the difference between following and leading. Mr. Claus believes they should just push it hard in all the literature and instructional classes. Chief Graham agreed, saying they would push that pretty hard in their classes. Mr. Grieves added that this is a parent's responsibility. Mr. Hagy asked if this Council had any interest in mandating helmets. Mr. Ebert said Avon Lake talked about helmets, but they also thought that is a parent's responsibility. Once it is codified, you have an automatic violation to be enforced. Mayor Tapp believes they should go with the education path first and see how it goes. They can always address this matter later. It is unlikely that they will see definitive results of the police department's education program until next summer because by the time they get kids back in school it's fall. In the meantime, they will continue to stop juveniles to talk to them and educate them. Mr. Artino said kids usually have a pretty good way of communicating, especially when it can get them in trouble. He has been thinking about how over the last 2-3 years just how much more we have asked of our police department. Here is one more thing. Chief Graham answered that it is important – he doesn't want to see a crash and understands the complaints. If Council receives complaints, please get them to him or the City Manager so they can direct some patrols to that area. This may thwart a potential accident. Mr. Artino thinks our citizens need to recognize that there is always more that our police officers need to do, and Mayor Tapp agreed, adding that the parents have to take some responsibility, too. Chief Graham said these transportation devices have taken them by storm – it is new to everyone.

Mr. Hamilton said one of the complaints they have heard several times is that these devices are scooting around parking lots and getting themselves in trouble. The City does not have any jurisdiction on private property. The police can stop them and advise them to stop, but they cannot force them to do it. Mr. Claus said that's no different than doing doughnuts in the Drug Mart parking lot. Chief Graham said that it is different; there are some violations they can enforce on public property open to the public. You must have a driver's license, you can't be intoxicated, and you can't be reckless. There are some avenues to enforce. If Drug Mart calls them to say kids are operating recklessly in the parking lot, they are going to go out there to prevent a problem. If they are operating recklessly in the parking lot, they are also going to be operating recklessly on sidewalks and roadways. Maybe they can head off a potential problem.

Motion**Motion by Mr. Biddlecombe to adjourn the work session.**

Mayor Tapp asked if there were any further questions. There being none, the Mayor directed the Clerk to call the roll on the motion. Members of Council voted as follows:

YEAS: Dike, Biddlecombe, Artino, Claus, Tapp, Dike, Grieves, Hagy (7)

NAYS: None (0)

There being a majority in favor, the motion passed, and the work session was adjourned at 6:04pm.



Terri S. Welkener, Clerk of Council

Adopted: 22 JUL 2025

	Huron	Lakewood	Mount Vernon	Bowling Green	Yellow Springs	Westerville	Cincinnati
R1-R1A	X	X	✓	✓	? - only conditionally permitted	? - only conditionally permitted, except allowed in Olde Westerville Special Overlay District	✓
R2	✓ - attached - as "two-family dwelling" ? - detached - conditionally permitted as "Dwelling Group" (detached ADU)	? - only conditionally permitted - attached and detached ADU	✓	conditionally permitted	? - conditionally permitted	? - conditionally permitted	✓
R3	✓ - attached - as "two-family dwelling" ? - detached - conditionally permitted as "Dwelling Group" (detached ADU)	? - not specifically allowed; might be allowed as "cluster house development"	✓	x	? - conditionally permitted	? - conditionally permitted	✓
Owner Occupied – civil offenses	-	✓	-	✓	-	✓ - Covenant required	✓ - owner or designee, covenant required, civil offense
Off Street Parking	-	✓ - at least one	-	-	✓ - at least one	✓ - at least one	x
Separate Entrance	-	-	-	-	-	x	✓
Separate Kitchen/Bath	-	✓	-	-	✓ - not more than one bedroom and limited to 2 adults	✓ - conditionally allowed without separate kitchen	✓
Maximum Number	-	-	1	1	-	1	2
Minimum Lot Size	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Minimum Size	-	-	200 sq.ft.	-	-	-	-
Maximum Size	-	Floor area - 50% of primary residence Height – less than primary residence	Floor area – less than primary residence Height – less than primary residence	1200 sq.ft. 25 ft. high	Floor area – 66% of primary residence or less than 800 sq.ft.	720 sq.ft. Less than 25ft high	Smaller than primary residence 25 ft. high
Maximum Lot Coverage with primary residence	-	35%	As generally applicable in the district	-	-	-	15% or 66% of Lot or 800 sq.ft.
Transient Rentals Prohibited	-	✓ - not less than 60 days	-	-	x	-	x
Separate Address	-	✓	-	-	-	-	-
Separate Utilities	-	-	-	-	X – not allowed	✓	-

NOTES - Dashes represent no specific regulations for ADU; general building and zoning code applies
- Cleveland Heights, Dayton, Columbus have not adopted ADU legislation despite consideration

Accessory Dwelling Units – Proposals and Issues

ADU LEGISLATIVE CONSIDERATIONS AND PROPOSALS**I. Proposed New Code Sections****§1121.04 DEFINITIONS.**

"Accessory dwelling unit" means a single-family dwelling that provides complete independent living facilities, including its own exterior entrance, kitchen, bathroom, and sleeping area; that is located on the same lot as a larger single-family dwelling that functions as the principal building on such lot; and whose use is subordinate and incidental to the principal building; and which is regulated under Section xx[1126.20]xx.

- *We recommend ADU's being defined only as a single-family dwelling (which, by definition in 1121.04 (27) is **detached**), whereas an **attached** ADU would instead fit the definition of a two-family dwelling in 1121.04 (28).*

§xx[1126.20]xx ACCESSORY DWELLING UNITS

- *This section would be included to establish regulations for the location, development, and operation of all accessory dwelling units. The following are some considerations that must be determined for legislation to be drafted.*

(a) General.

1. Recommend only one ADU per lot.
2. The lot must first include a principal single-family dwelling.
 - *This is a technical requirement that would preclude someone from building only an ADU on an empty lot as the principal building, which might be done to avoid meeting building requirements for single-family dwellings (size, setbacks, parking requirements, etc.).*
3. **Recommend only in an R-2 One and Two-Family Residence District.**
 - *Recommended only in R-2 because if allowed in R-1, then R-1 districts would, in effect, become R-2. This means that all R-1's would be multi-family arrangements and would dispose of the R-1 designation.*
 - *However, these ADUs could conflict with the zoning regulations for R-2 (size, setbacks, lot size, parking requirements), and thus these need to be addressed.*
 - *Note - There are existing parcels in R-2 that have two homes on them already, and some are registered as Transient Rentals.*

Accessory Dwelling Units – Proposals and Issues

(b) Exterior Entrance.

1. Since ADU are detached, they necessarily must include a separate exterior entrance independent of the exterior entrance of the principal building.

(c) Lot Size.

1. What is minimum lot size requirements?

(d) Setbacks.

1. Recommend to be permitted only in the rear of the principal dwelling.
 - *We recommend allowing only in rear yard of principal building, not in front or side yards, so street view and neighborhood aesthetics are not changed and to keep consistent with requirements in 1121.06(g) for accessory buildings to be only in rear yard.*
2. What rear and side yard setbacks apply?
 - i. Recommend creating specific setbacks that apply only to ADUs.
 - ii. Similar to regular accessory structures but propose 5 ft. from rear property line and 7 ft. from side property line.
 - *We envision substantial and repeated variance requests for ADU's that don't fit with established setbacks.*

(e) Lot Coverage.

1. Recommend ADU, together with any other accessory structure, cover a total of 35% or less of rear yard area.
 - *This is an easy calculation for staff.*

(f) Maximum and Minimum Floor Area.

1. Recommend maximum floor area for ADU be less than principal dwelling and less than 800 sq.ft.
 - *Less than that required for One-Story Dwelling - 850 square feet of ground floor*
 - *Need to consult with Building Department.*

Accessory Dwelling Units – Proposals and Issues

2. Recommend no minimum floor area but otherwise must comply with Residential Building Code, which requires 70 sq.ft. per room.

(g) Maximum Height.

1. Recommend one story and 15 ft. maximum height.
 - *This keeps height restrictions consistent for regular accessory structures in R-2 (see §1123.03(d)) and to prevent huge two- or three-story structures that block neighbor's views.*
 - *This would not allow for ADUs on top of existing garages.*

(h) Permanent Foundation.

1. Recommend ADUs be of permanent construction and must contain permanent utility hookups and a permanent foundation. **We recommend explicit restrictions against using mobile homes, container homes, boxcars, and recreational vehicles as accessory dwelling units.**

(i) Parking.

1. Recommend three total off-street parking spaces (with at least one being covered as already required for primary dwelling), unless existing non-confirming, then require one additional off-street parking spot.

(j) Transient Rentals.

- **Recommend absolutely no transient rentals.**

II. Application/Permitting Process

- a. Recommend using the regular zoning and building permit process only.

III. **Other Considerations**

- (a) Recommend separate address for safety services.
- (b) Recommend no separate PPN because this would require a lot split.
- (c) Separate utilities need to be looked at internally
 - a. Garbage goes on taxes

Accessory Dwelling Units – Proposals and Issues

- b. Metering for water, electrical
- c. Erie County for sewer
- (d) Because no separate PPN, an owner cannot sell ADU separately from principal dwelling.

IV. **Additional work required**

- (a) Work Sessions - required for issue spotting
- (b) Committee work - needed to determine specifics of legislation, involve HOA's
- (c) Planning commission meeting
- (d) Public hearings