

November 8, 2021

Dear members of Council:

Thank you for your careful consideration of development in our city. It is through this process that the citizens of Delaware achieve some assurances of responsible land use, especially as you give equal weight to the concerns of the developer, the city, and the residents. To that end, I ask that during your consideration of Ordinances No. 21-63, -64, -65, and -66 regarding the requested approvals for the Glen Cannich Village development, that you please consider the following questions and concerns:

1. As highlighted by the public during the Planning Commission hearing for this development, there are many concerns related to **traffic**. Given these concerns, should the developer provide a traffic impact study?
2. Relatedly, does this development meet the **conditional use criteria** established in 1148.02(i): "That adequate measures have been or will be taken to provide ingress and egress designed to minimize traffic congestion on the surrounding public streets and to maximize public safety"? What documentation has been provided by the applicant in this regard?
3. The application as found on pages 173-174 of tonight's agenda packet indicates that the development may proceed with "6 du/ac [dwelling units per an acre] by right" as an R5 zoned property, as shown in the third row from the excerpt below. Is this correct? (Is the developer rezoning to R5, and therefore permitted that density by right? If not, what establishes the *R5 density by right*, rather than some other level of density?)

SITE DATA - 40 units

TOTAL ACRES w/ vacated	±9.746 ACRES	
NET ACREAGE w/ vacated	±8.965 ACRES	
R-5 RESIDENCES (6 du/ac permitted by right)		
# of DWELLINGS	GROSS DENSITY	NET DENSITY
40 UNITS	±4.10 du/acre	±4.46 du/acre
DWELLING TYPE	BUILDINGS	UNITS
Single-Family	16	16
Two-Family	3	6
Three-Family	6	18

4. Out of all the possible residential densities (R1-R8), how did the developer conclude that a relatively high-density of R5 was **appropriate for this land**?
5. The chart above indicates that there is acreage that has been **vacated**. What is the amount of vacated land? Where is it? And how will it be used?
6. Please address the differences between the **tree preservation policy** found in the Glen Cannich Village development text versus that found in Chapter 1168. The main differences in the two in regards to loss of trees (of the required 6"+ dbh size) are:

- a. Accounting for trees removed by net difference, rather than overall loss.
- b. Accounting for trees removed based on condition, rather than overall loss of *all* good-fair trees.

What benefit does the City and its residents gain from the reduced accountability in the Glen Cannich Village version of "tree preservation"? What justification is given for allowing less trees to be preserved, replaced, or paid for into the tree fund?

Also, please respond to the Shade Tree Commission's advice to reject the tree preservation policy in the Glen Cannich Village development text. As the City's expert advisory board on trees, also given the power to review any flexibility from Chapter 1168 ([see section 11](#)), what weight should be given to the Shade Tree Commission's recommendation?

Through the city's communication with the applicant and a transparent process, I believe the public can get answers to our questions and concerns that will result in a more responsible development. We are caretakers of our land, not consumers. Your careful attention to these matters is greatly appreciated.

Regards,
Stacy Chaney-Blankenship,
943 Executive Blvd, Delaware, Oh 43015

Elaine McCloskey

From: Jennifer Jenkins <jlphillips83@hotmail.com>
Sent: Monday, November 8, 2021 1:56 PM
To: Elaine McCloskey
Subject: Public comment for City Council tonight

Caution! This message was sent from outside your organization.

Dear Members of City Council,

Regarding Glen Cannich and any future PMU request:

Natural resources cannot be used as a negotiation tool. Chapter 1168 needs to be followed. The City has been using PMUs to waive fees that go to the tree fund; this practice must stop. Trees provide numerous benefits to our Community including energy conservation, improved air quality, reduced noise pollution and light glare, enhanced habitat for birds and other desirable wildlife, improved control of soil erosion and moderation of water runoff, enhanced visual and aesthetic qualities, and increased property value. If trees must be removed, the City and the Developer need to be held accountable for the trees that they are destroying. As large trees provide the most benefit to our Community, all trees of a significant age and size need to be preserved. The City does not currently have the space or the resources needed to plant replacement trees on behalf of the developer. More trees need to remain within the proposed development.

Thank you for considering these concerns.

Jennifer Jenkins
544 Rutherford Ave.