

From: [John McGrail](#)
To: [Carolyn Riggle](#); [Kent Shafer](#); [George Hellinger](#); [Stephen Tackett](#); [Lisa Keller](#); [Cory Hoffman](#); [Drew Farrell](#)
Cc: [R Thomas Homan](#); [Elaine McCloskey](#); [Natalia Harris](#)
Subject: Public comment
Date: Monday, January 10, 2022 12:47:47 PM

Caution! This message was sent from outside your organization.

Dr. John McGrail MD 268 Sylvan Dr. 43015 city 740-815-9120

1. Current raw land development in Delaware City, Ohio is dictated primarily by the Developers Plan and in almost every instance disregards both the past City Plan and the Comprehensive City Plan dated May 2021. What about the Implementation Strategy for Delaware Run-Olentangy River recommendations for serious watershed risk on the Addison Property paid to Civil and Engineering Consultants 6/29/2021?

City Council members need to read this document before approving the Addison plan.

So what is the use of the city plans other than a brag book for bond assessment, industry attraction, grants and various other city marketing?

The money spent needs to be refunded to the tax payers unless there is adherence and enforcement.

We all know that the Multi Use Overlay is a manipulation to subvert existing zoning requirements and accommodates the Developer and consequently the City Plan is neutralized.

When questioned about the high density rentals along Oakhurst subdivision, Mr. Friedman (Addison) said that his plan determines the outcome.

There you have it. The expensive plans have no teeth so don't bother, just refund the taxpayers money.

2. It is UNETHICAL for City Council members to accept funding from developers and the CITY ATTORNEY needs to draft a rule of prohibition,

3. Where is the input from the city attorney in the various city committees such as Planning and Shade Tree responsible for city tree preservation. The real work is done in the committees and they need legal back up when developers show up and are fully represented.

CITY ATTORNEY PLEASE NOTE that the Shade Tree Commission 10/26/2021 has not approved the Addison tree plan as required by city code so the City Council cannot move forward with the Addison plan approval (municipal code 1168.11)

4. There is NO DISCLOSURE from Addison Development regarding the undesignated pods for the property. Nonetheless, the Addison website recently

advertised 2000 units available for development. There are 979 units listed for pods A thru I in the proposed financial agreement between JAF acquisitions llc and City of Delaware dated 7/8/2021

Where are the other 1000 units going?

Respectfully submitted Dr. John W McGrail MD

From: [Diane Mungovan](#)
To: [Stephen Tackett](#); [Cory Hoffman](#); [Carolyn Riggle](#); [Kent Shafer](#); [Lisa Keller](#); [Drew Farrell](#); [Catlin Frazier](#)
Cc: [Elaine McCloskey](#); [CMO](#); [R Thomas Homan](#); [PlanningAndDevelopment](#); [pwcs](#)
Subject: PLEASE move Merrick Parkway further North
Date: Monday, January 10, 2022 1:38:39 PM

Caution! This message was sent from outside your organization.

Dear Delaware City Council Members,

As you take into account the preliminary development plan for the Addison property please give careful consideration to the needs of the adjoining neighborhoods and of the environmental impact to all of Delaware if the proposal stands as is.

Below are my main concerns regarding the Addison Development.

Concerns Regarding Current Placement of Merrick Parkway

If you look at the Shelbourne Forest neighborhood, when it was developed, the stream corridors surrounded by mature trees were preserved. Note specifically the area between Rutherford Ave. and Federal Circle and the Shelbourne Forest Nature Trail between Orchard Canyon and Pinecrest.

While Addison has moved to make a natural park out of the western stream corridor adjacent to Hayes colony (the same stream that flows through Shelbourne Forest Nature Trail) they need to also do so in the area between Executive Blvd. and the Oakhurst neighborhood.

Merrick Parkway needs to be pushed further north of Shelbourne Forrest to fully preserve the southern most portion of the stream corridor and Wetland A. Keep at least 10-30 yards of trees north of the stream before mounding or even a sound barrier wall begins. Keep the bike path directly next to Merrick parkway to provide consistency of path and to make it safer for pedestrians after dark. Leave room to the north of Merrick for future expansion and widening so that the trees and stream to the south will remain protected conservancy areas far into the future.

Move the roundabout connecting Merrick with Woodhaul and Bruce Rd extensions further north and east so that Merrick Parkway will only have to cross the stream in two places versus the three currently proposed. This also moves Merrick away from the neighborhood and homes on Woodhaul. Cause the least harm.

With Merrick and the roundabout being placed further north the proposed Redwood rental units should move to area A & B (this was an original staff recommendation and provides the same acreage) and away from pre-existing single family homes. In Area E place the owner occupied condo units currently proposed for area B and/or single family homes on larger treed lots. This will allow for more preservation of streams and wetlands while also preserving tree canopy. This move also follows city code of like housing by like housing.

The Wickam property design proposal illustrates how the area could still be developed with single family homes or owner occupied condos while preserving the wetlands, streams, and mature tree canopy. Preserving these corridors will benefit current residents and future residents of Delaware in so many ways. Refer to past email on why we need trees.

The city, in its comments regarding the placement of Merrick, often sites how there are other roads (ex. Houk) within the city that are closer to homes. This is a fact, however, in those instances the road was built before the houses. So the homeowner, before they bought their home, was aware of the road. In Shelbourne

Forrest we bought our homes with the belief and trust that Merrick would be placed further north as drawn on Delaware city planning maps.

Misleading Measurements

In providing measurements between homes on Executive Blvd. and Pinecrest that border Merrick please give accurate numbers that are a true reflection of how close the road still is to our homes.

The current measurements as presented inflate the distance between our homes and the road. The larger numbers are from the backs of our houses onto the roadway, and the smaller numbers are from the back of our property to the roadway. While better than 20 feet the road is still way to close.

The road needs to be pushed further north to fully preserve the stream that runs behind the homes on Executive as well as Wetland A. Maintain the trees surrounding the stream corridor at least 20 - 30 yards to the north of the stream. As it is currently presented Merrick runs directly next to the stream (at one point it appears to almost be on top of the stream) and crosses the stream in three places. Less than ten yards of tree are preserved in some areas.

Leave room to the north of Merrick for future expansion and widening so that the trees and stream to the south will remain protected conservancy areas far into the future.

The farmers access road is about ten yards wide, with no trees, and often remains soggy and wet in the lower portion. The idea of planting native evergreens in the farmer's access road is appreciated - with the bike path being placed next to Merrick as originally proposed. This is more convenient and safer for pedestrians using the path after dark.

If Merrick remains where it is drawn there is also the risk of greater flooding. As it stands now the stream, after heavy rains, generally triples (often more) in size. While not marked I would even guess some areas to be vernal pools in the spring when the area is especially wet. The proximity of large swaths of impervious surfaces next to an already wet area will not help. Pollution of the groundwater will increase. Maintaining a broad swath of mature trees will aid in cleaning the pollutants before they reach the Olentangy River. I could go on and on.

If Merrick's current placement is allowed to remain - the homes on Executive and Pinecrest will suffer greatly from increased air, noise and light pollution - not to mention the harm to the wildlife that live in the area. Preserve enough of the tree canopy surrounding the stream to give them a fighting chance and to help offset the increase in carbon emissions from the increase in traffic.

Side Notes

The high density housing units staff mentioned in their report referencing calls to police, were not built between long established single-family housing. This is one more reason why the Redwood Rental Units should be placed in area A and B - no current neighbors - with condos or single family homes in area E - built in harmony with the stream corridor while maintaining wide mature tree borders.

Strange that a sign advertising available retail space was posted by Addison along Route 23 prior to their request being approved!

We do NOT need another gas station or Sheetz along the corridor - there are three already. This site is also too close to the Olentangy and its watershed.

In Conclusion

While I understand Addison wants Merrick Parkway placed as far south as possible to give them larger

areas to develop - the city needs to be cognizant of the needs of its current residents as well as the need to preserve our natural resources. There is nearly a mile between Shelbourne Forest and Oakhurst - plenty of room to move the road and to build a more environmentally responsible development. Once the stream corridor and wetlands are disrupted, and once the mature tree canopy is cut down - there is no return.

Enacting these changes while still in the planning stage will satisfy the surrounding long established neighborhoods and go a long way in proving that both the City of Delaware and Addison truly care about the environment as well as the needs of current residents.

The area can be developed ethically with protecting the environment as a key component of the development design. If this happens then everyone wins. Addison will gain a reputation for truly caring about the environment and the communities they choose to do business in versus a company only concerned with their own bottom line. Addison will still make a hefty profit if Merrick is moved further north.

I have so many other thoughts and concerns, but my most pressing is moving Merrick Parkway further north, preserving the southern portion of the stream, wetland A and the mature tree canopy surrounding it.

Thank you for your time and your service to our city.

Sincerely,

Diane and Michael Mungovan
937 Executive Blvd.
Delaware, Ohio 43015

From: [Heather Bulwinkle](#)
To: [Elaine McCloskey](#)
Subject: Addison Farms Discussion
Date: Monday, January 10, 2022 1:51:05 PM

Caution! This message was sent from outside your organization.

January 10, 2022

Dear Councilmembers and Commissioners,

The following are basic requests for the proposed Addition development, particularly as it relates to rezoning the parcel. We expect and deserve nothing less than responsible development - responsible to current city residents and to the natural environment.

I still stand by:

Do Not rezone the area as a PMU.

The proposed PMU, as written, basically lays aside the city's code and provides the developer with free reign. There is no accountability for the damage done to the environment, for the loss in property value for some of Delaware's well established (25 - 40 years plus) neighborhoods, and for the added strain on Delaware's already stretched resources - schools, police, fire, and road maintenance. This is no okay!

If you research the purpose of PMU zoning, it was to create walkable neighborhoods - like Evans farm in the Powell area. PMU's were not intended to simply make it easier for developers to skirt city codes and do whatever they want.

No TIF.

Leave existing code in place.

The developer knew what they were buying and they need to work within the confines set by the city's code when developing the land. They need to be responsible to the residents and do what is best for the city - not what will make Addison the largest profit. I would imagine the city would support the existing city.

Delaware has development and building codes for a reason, but allowing out of town developers to invoke a PMU basically nullifies all the rules set forth to protect residents and the city we all call home.

Currently the parcel is zoned R3 and A1 with a very small northern portion being B4. If the A1

needs to be changed, then because the majority of that parcel lies between two well established neighborhoods, change it to an R1, which the neighboring subdivision is zoned. Develop the land in such a way as to build in harmony with the existing topography and tree cover. Protect the watershed and as many trees as possible. Include a natural resource park or in the least a conservation/preservation zone. There needs to be less land covered with impervious surfaces. A home built on land with mature trees or with woods in the neighborhood are far more valuable to everyone involved.

Addison seems to be mainly in the apartment and high density business, but high density should not be placed between or next to existing single family homes, especially when there is plenty of land in sub areas A and B for those developments. Follow city codes.

Protect the natural environment.

Be forward thinking in this development. As illustrated by the Wickham development proposal for the same area - the land can be developed in harmony with the existing landscape and neighborhoods. With the current climate issues facing the world, we need to be doing everything within our powers to protect the mature tree canopy and the natural watershed within all of Delaware. As I stated in my other letter - Sir David Attenborough recently said at the COP26 in Glasgow, "Is this how our story is due to end, a tale of the smartest species doomed by that all-too-human characteristic of failing to see the bigger picture in pursuit of short-term goals?"

Addison's current proposal, if the PMU zoning is passed, basically allows them to clear cut the acres of mature trees and interrupt the natural watershed with no consequence to them - but with plenty of consequences for those living near the area. Allowing the PMU and the verbiage of how they plan to deal with the trees is wrong for so many reasons.

It is proven that mature trees help reduce carbon emissions in a given area. This is especially important since a major road is to be built among residential neighborhoods. It also does not take into account how mature trees greatly reduce noise pollution nor the large number of wildlife that live within the area. Where do we expect the wildlife to go when we take and destroy their homes??

Trees also provide shade (as we all know). With rising temperatures, wouldn't we all want a natural way be cool? As per the EPA- "Trees and vegetation lower surface and air temperatures by providing shade and through evapotranspiration."

<https://www.epa.gov/heatislands/using-trees-and-vegetation-reduce-heat-islands>. The quality of life and the environment are improved by trees. Why would we voluntarily kill them to put in pavement? Should we rename Shelbourne Forest to um, Shelbourne Streets? Shelbourne-Used-to-be-Forest? Sheldeade Forest? Shelbourne Clear-cut Forest? I was actually sad to learn

much of this area used to be forest. There's not much left.

The area is also home to natural wetlands and streams that are part of the Olentangy watershed. The topography provides natural drainage and flooding protections for the surrounding neighborhoods and the neighborhoods to the east of Route 23. I cannot understand the audacity of taking all that away.

Perhaps, in the small B4 business district, look towards medical or business offices, Not big box or retail with operating hours beyond reasonable (light pollution). And NO gas station along 23 - we don't need it (3 already in that short corridor) and it's in the watershed. Why build more gas stations with massive underground storage tanks?

Move Merrick Parkway further north, towards center.

Follow city code and Delaware's original placement of Merrick Parkway which was closer to the center of the property. Do Not allow a Major road to be built so close to existing homes along Executive Blvd. and Pinecrest Dr. It will negatively impact the health of our families both with increased air and noise pollution as well as lead to a decrease in our property values. Not to mention the air, ground, and noise pollution produced in the creation of said road.

Addison, in their submitted proposal, states there will be 100 feet of trees between the backyards of over 30 plus existing homes and the parkway. This is false. In so many spots their proposal is unclear. Some areas may have 100 feet between their backyards and the road, others clearly do not. Do the Addison measurements extend to the right of way or the road itself? This is also unclear and does make a difference. Also, several homes now have a roundabout in their backyard in their proposal.

As far as 100 feet of trees goes - there is over 30 feet (10 yards) of a farm access road that does not have any trees. This is now where the bike path is to be located. So Addison's supposed 100 feet of trees is down to 70 - only about 20 yards. And behind many of the homes it's not a full 20 yards. While having a bike/walking path directly behind our homes is more appealing than a road, the road is still too close. In truth allowing strangers easy access to our backyards via a walking path is also completely discomfiting. When we purchased our homes, this was Nowhere near anyone's thoughts.

The area in question is also home to a wetland and a stream. The farmer's access road remains wet and soggy long after it rains - not a great place for a path. The path was placed there versus next to the road soley so Addison could have more land to develop on the northern side of the road.

Addison is averse to moving the road further north because it forces them to rethink their design of putting rental units in the space between two long established neighborhoods. If the area cannot be saved for a park - that all city residents would benefit from - then the area needs single-family, owner-occupied, housing. R1 and not large scale rental units. Those can easily be placed further west (in Areas A and B) away from existing neighborhoods and homes.

Addison clearly cares more about profit than the impact on the neighbors or the environment. Profit that will be taken and used outside of Delaware.

We hope our representatives in city government and our city's administrators will actually consider our concerns and reasonable requests. Follow the Delaware Together comprehensive plan objectives, especially in terms of natural resources and use of land.

If the PMU is voted through - rather than the leaving the existing zoning in place - you do much more harm than proving our city government doesn't really care about what is best for its residents or our city. The proposal is callous and lacks vision.

On another note, why in the world would a government city council meeting have an invocation by a pastor? -Separation of church and state.

Thank you very much,

Heather Bulwinkle
985 Executive Boulevard
Delaware, Ohio 43015

From: Stacy B. Chaney
To: [Elaine McCloskey](#); [Stephen Tackett](#)
Subject: public comment for the record - Addison Farms PMU, City Council 1/10/2022
Date: Monday, January 10, 2022 2:37:42 PM

Caution! This message was sent from outside your organization.

Dear members of City Council:

Thank you for your important work for our community.

I have a couple of questions about the PMU text for Addison Farms:

1) Is it appropriate to allow a “bed and breakfast” use for the entire subdivision of over 250 single-family homes? (See charts on p. 42 and 44 of the Addison Farms PMU text; starting around p. 419 of [tonight's agenda packet](#)) Does this allow for short-term rentals, e.g. Airbnb/VRBO rentals? Will allowing so many of these types of rentals have a negative impact on surrounding property values? Are there other examples of subdivisions that allow this type of use on such a large scale? Would it be more appropriate to have individual homeowners apply for this type of use?

2) Are the “minor modifications” allowed to the plan appropriate amounts (see p. 13 of the Addison Farms PMU text; p.391 of tonight's agenda packet)? It currently allows a change of "less than 10% in the total number of dwelling units or any increase less than 15% in the non-residential building areas” to be done without full review by the City. An increase in 10% of the dwelling units would result in 98 more units; 31 of those would be in the already dense Sub Area E where the Redwood apartments are in the woods next to a stream. As proposed, a 15% increase in non-residential building area would amount to nearly 34 acres of commercial property across Sub Areas F and G, as opposed to the ~6 acres of business district that was purchased by the applicant (an increase of 567% overall).

Shouldn't changes of this magnitude require re-submittal and review by our review boards and City Council?

Given the size of the development, a much smaller percentage seems more appropriate as a "minor modification." Please consider reducing the allowable increases to 1%, or (preferably) eliminating them altogether. The increase in size and scope of the development should remain part of the public process.

3) When is the PMU text adopted?

Thank you for your time and attention to these matters.

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

From: [Linsey Griffith](#)
To: [Elaine McCloskey](#); [Kenneth Doughman](#)
Subject: For public Comment Addison Properties proposal
Date: Monday, January 10, 2022 3:07:02 PM

Caution! This message was sent from outside your organization.

Dear members of City Council;

Thank you for your service to our community.

I have serious concerns over the Addison Farms Proposal. In addition to the concerns we have previously expressed: the language on charts on p. 42 and 44 of the Addison Farms PMU text; starting around p. 419 of tonight's agenda package is very disconcerting. Is it appropriate to allow a "bed and breakfast" use for the entire subdivision of over 250 single-family homes? I am concerned this will allow an entire subdivision to be short term rentals. According to our recent housing study the City paid for, short term rentals were not identified as a pressing need for our community. They do tend to decrease property values and increase property crimes and property maintenance issues. I'm a fan of Air BnBs, but the idea of 250 units of short term rentals in my backyard is a concern.

On p. 13 of the Addison Farms PMU text; p.391 of tonight's agenda packet) It currently allows a change of "less than 10% in the total number of dwelling units or any increase less than 15% in the non-residential building areas" to be done without full review by the City. This could potentially amount to nearly 34 acres of commercial property across Sub Areas F and G, as opposed to the ~6 acres of business district that was purchased by the applicant (an increase of 567% overall). It could also increase residential development substantially without Council Approval. Council and Planning Commission is charged with oversight of developments. This level of free reign to a developer without oversight and Council approval is inappropriate don't you think?

As with the application for an overarching PMU for a multiple sub-area development, it seems the developer is attempting to subvert Council's authority and undermine City policy and ordinances. If anything, this developer needs additional oversight and transparency instead of less. Please do what is in the best interest of the voters who elected you and require that this developer adheres to our current zoning code, do not pass this proposal with the PMU and the additional change without oversight permissions.

Thank you for your time and attention in this matter.

Linsey Erin Griffith and Kenneth Doughman
419 Taylor Ave, Delaware, Ohio