

## Kayla Holbrook

---

**From:** Nancy Mcgregor  
**Sent:** Wednesday, June 29, 2016 11:29 AM  
**To:** Kayla Holbrook  
**Subject:** FW: Annexation request on tonight's agenda

---

**From:** Debbie Matthews [debbie.matthews53@gmail.com]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, June 29, 2016 9:52 AM  
**To:** Nancy Mcgregor  
**Subject:** Re: Annexation request on tonight's agenda

Thanks Nancy. I appreciate your reply.

I do agree with your concerns as well. What I don't see is a discussion of the increased traffic on these country roads as well.

I really really want to respect the Jefferson Township folks that moved there with the promise of open spaces. I guess that is my motivation because I am clearly in the middle of development on Riva Ridge (the older part by MSE)

Thanks again.

On Tuesday, June 28, 2016, Nancy Mcgregor <[Nancy.Mcgregor@gahanna.gov](mailto:Nancy.Mcgregor@gahanna.gov)> wrote:  
Hi Debbie,

Thank you for writing to me with your opinion on the proposed MI project. I have not had access to my email due to technical issues the last few days.

I will address some of your concerns.

1. The city recognizes the costs that are associated with a new residential development. We are creating a "New Community Authority" NCA that raises money for future repairs and costs. The city has looked at the costs to the city from this development for the next 30 years and beyond- road repair, road replacement, storm water systems, park usage, police call etc. It comes to about \$99K/year. It will take about 7 mills to raise that much money. The money raised from the 7 mills will be put into a fund administered by 7 people appointed by council. Each of the properties within this development and others that may follow will pay 7 mills added onto their property tax bill. New Albany has had a NCA for years. It was developed so that the new housing and businesses in New Albany would pay an extra tax to help pay for, in their case, the school system. It was so the original New Albany people would not be taxed out of existence with all the new needs of the growing city.

2. The school superintendent was asked to weigh in on the potential of additional students. He said at this price point, they estimate .5 students per house. We heard last night that these are 2 bedroom houses with a bonus room.

3. Gahanna will be responsible for police, streets, storm water. Jefferson Township will be responsible for fire service, police and fire.

My concerns right now are the closing of Darling Rd. and the fact that MI started out asking to build in the township. It was more dense than allowed and there was a lot of resistance to the project. Jefferson Township never voted on the project, it was withdrawn. Then MI came to Gahanna to see about annexing. I don't like Gahanna being the fall back position when MI never tried to negotiate with the township.

I don't like the idea of closing Darling Road. It seems like a bad plan to close the middle part of a road.

This all being said, the houses look lovely. The lots are somewhat wider and shallower to accommodate the ranches. There is 21 acres of open space around the perimeter of the project, like a green necklace. It is a price point that will be attractive to some buyers.

Thanks so much,  
Nancy McGregor  
City Council Member

---

From: Debbie Matthews [[debbie.matthews53@gmail.com](mailto:debbie.matthews53@gmail.com)]

Sent: Monday, June 27, 2016 3:59 PM

To: Stephen Renner; Nancy Mcgregor; Karen Angelou; [brian.metzbower@gmail.com](mailto:brian.metzbower@gmail.com); Michael Schnetzer; Brian Larick; Jamie Leeseberg

Subject: Annexation request on tonight's agenda

All, I am extremely concerned about the annexation request on the agenda tonight.

My concerns:

1. There is no mention in the documentation I examined regarding the impact to the schools. 94 new 2000 sq ft homes could have a huge impact to the schools. These are not homes to be inhabited by retirees.
2. This appears to be a second choice for M/I. Jefferson Township said no due to the density of the homes. Do we really want to start a precedent that we will annex to Gahanna if Jefferson Township says no? Is the plan to take over Jefferson Township?
3. The roads leading from that area into Gahanna are already bursting at the seams. What used to be a nice pleasant drive along the back roads of Jefferson Township is now clogged with lined up traffic. Havens Corner is a 2 lane road and so is Morse Rd East of Hamilton. What is the plan for handling 92 more families on those roads? There is no explanation for why Darling Rd is being closed.
4. The documentation stated that there will be a net gain to Gahanna of a total of \$33k per year. Who did that analysis? I am very doubtful of these numbers as the development grows older and needs maintenance. So we all have to deal with even more traffic so the City of Gahanna can gain \$33k? I smell another tax request coming.
5. I've lived in Gahanna for 30 years and I've seen promises that have not come true. I am hoping this is not another one.
6. I hope you ask the people that live around that area what they would like. What I have seen on the Take Back Gahanna Facebook site is that some are not even aware of this proposal.
7. Should this be a vote of the people as it was when the Triangle rezoning was done? That way there is open discussion and debate.

Thank you for listening.

Debbie Matthews  
803 Riva Ridge Blvd.

August 4, 2016

225 W. Johnstown Rd.

Apt. 2C

Gahanna, OH 43230

Dear Mayor and Council members.

Here are my thoughts on the Darling Rd. Project:

Farmland is vanishing. Should the land be developed?

1. Gahanna has good schools, and they will attract young families. Young families can't afford homes that cost \$450,000.
2. It's funny, but I always thought that empty nesters wanted to downsize into smaller less expensive homes with small lots for less mowing. They aren't looking for \$450,000 houses either.
3. I don't think that families that have grown to have 4 or 5 children can afford \$450,000 houses either.
4. Needless to say, I think the MI subdivision should incorporate different size houses for people with different annual incomes. This would probably increase the amount of houses in the project, but you would be creating a more diverse subdivision as well as serving the needs of all the people of Gahanna.
5. If MI homes really wants Gahanna to annex this land, it's an opportunity for the Gahanna Council to work with them to build houses that are built green, and set an example for other contractors who wish to build homes in Gahanna.
6. Is there any reason that these houses could not be built utilizing passive solar and having solar hot water heaters?
7. These houses should be built so that you could age in place. The doorways and hallways could be built wide enough for a wheelchair. The bathroom could be built large to incorporate a wheelchair and have grab bars on the tub. The kitchen cabinets could be right height for a wheelchair. Then the house you bought when you were 30, would be more easily adaptable when you are 75 in a wheelchair.
8. In the last council meeting, a man from the neighborhood stated that there is a problem with runoff during heavy rain. He also said a lake is in the development plan. Maybe that development needs a wetland instead of lake.
9. Homeowners should be encouraged to use native grasses, and Ohio perennials/trees/shrubs in their landscaping to reduce watering and provide shelter and food for wildlife.

If Gahanna Council decides to annex the Darling Rd. Project, please look beyond the amount of real estate taxes that ninety-three houses @ \$450,000 each would bring into Gahanna. Please work with MI Homes to build energy efficient and affordable housing for all the citizens of Gahanna.

Sincerely,  
Marsha Meager

## Kayla Holbrook

---

**From:** Nagy, Timothy P. <nagy@taftlaw.com>  
**Sent:** Friday, July 29, 2016 11:24 AM  
**To:** Council; cyoder@jeffersontownship.org; rcourter@jeffersontownship.org; mrowan@jeffersontownship.org  
**Cc:** Shane Ewald; Anthony Jones; mark@wildwoodohio.com; alfriedmam@aol.com; stephaniedownes@insight.rr.com; tim.gooden@blast-one.com; ohiopace@yahoo.com  
**Subject:** RE: Pre-annexation Agreement Negotiations; Darling Road; Shull Road  
**Attachments:** Letter to Mayor of Gahanna, City Council of Gahanna, Jefferson Township Trustees 7-29-16.PDF

Ladies and Gentlemen:

Please review the attached letter from the Brookhouse Lane Homeowners Association. Thank you.

Sincerely,  
Timothy P. Nagy  
Attachment

## Taft /

**Timothy P. Nagy** / Partner  
Taft Stettinius & Hollister LLP  
65 E. State Street, Suite 1000  
Columbus, Ohio 43215  
Tel: 614.221.2838 • Fax: 614.221.2007  
Direct: 614.220.0220  
[www.taftlaw.com](http://www.taftlaw.com) / [nagy@taftlaw.com](mailto:nagy@taftlaw.com)

This message may contain information that is attorney-client privileged, attorney work product or otherwise confidential. If you are not an intended recipient, use and disclosure of this message are prohibited. If you received this transmission in error, please notify the sender by reply e-mail and delete the message and any attachments.

## Kayla Holbrook

---

**From:** Brian Larick  
**Sent:** Friday, July 01, 2016 4:59 PM  
**To:** Michael Blackford  
**Cc:** Council; Tom Kneeland; Anthony Jones  
**Subject:** Re: Darling Road Annexation

Michael are all of the properties on the Jefferson tab in the unincorporated area of Jefferson? If not which ones are in which municipality?

Also, I see the description of the overlay...what about the PUD or is it just a planned development in an area of a particular zoning?

Brian

On Jul 1, 2016, at 16:38, Michael Blackford <[Michael.Blackford@gahanna.gov](mailto:Michael.Blackford@gahanna.gov)> wrote:

Good afternoon,

Attached is a spreadsheet that looks at single family and condominium developments approved in the last 15 or so years in Jefferson Twp. Please see the tab labeled "Jefferson Twp Properties". This is in response to Council's request for development data for Jefferson Twp. Also included in this email is a brief explanation to Councilwoman McGregor's question regarding the differences between an overlay and a PUD.

What is the difference between a PUD and an overlay text? Generally speaking, overlay's are more restrictive than code. Overlay's must comply with the underline zoning designation and meet all minimum requirements of the district. Overlay's can have more stringent standards than code but cannot grant less restrictive standards. For example, if the Darling Road project were to be rezoned to Single Family 3 with an overlay the zoning classification would be L-SF3. Minimum lot size for SF3 is 11,000 square feet. The overlay could require a greater minimum lot size, 15,000 square feet, but could not permit a smaller lot size, 8,000 square feet, without a variance.

Please let me know if you have any questions. Thanks and have a great July 4<sup>th</sup> weekend!

### **MICHAEL BLACKFORD, AICP**

Deputy Director  
Department of Planning & Development

<IMAGE001.JPG>  
CITY OF GAHANNA

200 S. Hamilton Rd.  
Gahanna, Ohio 43230  
614-342-4029  
614-342-4129 (fax)  
[michael.blackford@gahanna.gov](mailto:michael.blackford@gahanna.gov)  
[www.Gahanna.gov](http://www.Gahanna.gov)  
[www.Facebook.com/CityofGahanna](https://www.facebook.com/CityofGahanna)  
[Twitter@CityOfGahanna](https://twitter.com/CityOfGahanna)

<Darling Road Annexation Pro Forma.xlsx>

## Kayla Holbrook

---

**From:** Michael Blackford  
**Sent:** Friday, July 01, 2016 5:12 PM  
**To:** Brian Larick  
**Cc:** Council; Tom Kneeland; Anthony Jones  
**Subject:** RE: Darling Road Annexation  
**Attachments:** Jefferson Twp Zoning Map.pdf

Good afternoon,

All of the properties are in the unincorporated parts of the twp. Attached is a Township zoning map with the locations of the developments. It's tough to read but may be useful.

A PUD is a separate, standalone zoning designation. Our code has specific standards for PUDs that are different than other zoning designation standards. Most jurisdictions treat PUDs in a different manner. They are site specific, standalone ordinances that *can* vary code requirements.

Hopefully this helps.

### MICHAEL BLACKFORD, AICP

Deputy Director  
Department of Planning & Development



CITY OF GAHANNA

200 S. Hamilton Rd.  
Gahanna, Ohio 43230  
614-342-4029  
614-342-4129 (fax)  
[michael.blackford@gahanna.gov](mailto:michael.blackford@gahanna.gov)  
[www.Gahanna.gov](http://www.Gahanna.gov)  
[www.facebook.com/CityofGahanna](https://www.facebook.com/CityofGahanna)  
[Twitter@CityOfGahanna](https://twitter.com/CityOfGahanna)

---

**From:** Brian Larick  
**Sent:** Friday, July 01, 2016 4:59 PM  
**To:** Michael Blackford <Michael.Blackford@gahanna.gov>  
**Cc:** Council <Council@gahanna.gov>; Tom Kneeland <Tom.Kneeland@gahanna.gov>; Anthony Jones <Anthony.Jones@gahanna.gov>  
**Subject:** Re: Darling Road Annexation

Michael are all of the properties on the Jefferson tab in the unincorporated area of Jefferson? If not which ones are in which municipality?

Also, I see the description of the overlay...what about the PUD or is it just a planned development in an area of a particular zoning?

Brian



On Jul 1, 2016, at 16:38, Michael Blackford <[Michael.Blackford@gahanna.gov](mailto:Michael.Blackford@gahanna.gov)> wrote:

Good afternoon,

Attached is a spreadsheet that looks at single family and condominium developments approved in the last 15 or so years in Jefferson Twp. Please see the tab labeled "Jefferson Twp Properties". This is in response to Council's request for development data for Jefferson Twp. Also included in this email is a brief explanation to Councilwoman McGregor's question regarding the differences between an overlay and a PUD.

What is the difference between a PUD and an overlay text? Generally speaking, overlay's are more restrictive than code. Overlay's must comply with the underline zoning designation and meet all minimum requirements of the district. Overlay's can have more stringent standards than code but cannot grant less restrictive standards. For example, if the Darling Road project were to be rezoned to Single Family 3 with an overlay the zoning classification would be L-SF3. Minimum lot size for SF3 is 11,000 square feet. The overlay could require a greater minimum lot size, 15,000 square feet, but could not permit a smaller lot size, 8,000 square feet, without a variance.

Please let me know if you have any questions. Thanks and have a great July 4<sup>th</sup> weekend!

**MICHAEL BLACKFORD, AICP**

Deputy Director

Department of Planning & Development

<IMAGE001.JPG>

CITY OF GAHANNA

200 S. Hamilton Rd.

Gahanna, Ohio 43230

614-342-4029

614-342-4129 (fax)

[michael.blackford@gahanna.gov](mailto:michael.blackford@gahanna.gov)

[www.Gahanna.gov](http://www.Gahanna.gov)

[www.facebook.com/CityofGahanna](https://www.facebook.com/CityofGahanna)

[Twitter@CityOfGahanna](https://twitter.com/CityOfGahanna)

<Darling Road Annexation Pro Forma.xlsx>

## Kayla Holbrook

---

**From:** Jennifer Teal  
**Sent:** Monday, July 25, 2016 12:21 PM  
**To:** Stephen Renner  
**Cc:** Tom Kneeland; Council; Shane Ewald; Anthony Jones; Michael Blackford  
**Subject:** RE: Darling Road Development  
**Attachments:** 20160725102135320.pdf

My apologies. Let's try again.

**JENNIFER TEAL**  
City Administrator



CITY OF GAHANNA

200 S. Hamilton Rd.  
Gahanna, Ohio 43230  
614.342.4045  
614.342.4167(fax)  
[jennifer.teal@gahanna.gov](mailto:jennifer.teal@gahanna.gov)  
[www.Gahanna.gov](http://www.Gahanna.gov)  
Twitter @CityOfGahanna

---

**From:** Stephen Renner  
**Sent:** Monday, July 25, 2016 11:32 AM  
**To:** Jennifer Teal <Jennifer.Teal@gahanna.gov>  
**Cc:** Tom Kneeland <Tom.Kneeland@gahanna.gov>; Council <Council@gahanna.gov>; Shane Ewald <Shane.Ewald@gahanna.gov>; Anthony Jones <Anthony.Jones@gahanna.gov>; Michael Blackford <Michael.Blackford@gahanna.gov>  
**Subject:** RE: Darling Road Development

Jennifer,

Looks like the attachment did not come thru. Can you have someone resend that?

Thanks  
Stephen

Stephen A. Renner  
Council Member, Ward 1  
City of Gahanna  
(614) 316-1280

---

**From:** Jennifer Teal  
**Sent:** Monday, July 25, 2016 11:28 AM  
**To:** Tom Kneeland; Council; Shane Ewald; Anthony Jones; Michael Blackford  
**Subject:** Fwd: Darling Road Development

Forwarding at the request of Mr. Albers.

Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

**From:** "John Albers" <[john.albers@alberslaw.com](mailto:john.albers@alberslaw.com)>

**To:** "Jennifer Teal" <[Jennifer.Teal@gahanna.gov](mailto:Jennifer.Teal@gahanna.gov)>

**Subject:** Darling Road Development

Dear Ms. Teal,

Attached please find Letters of Concern and a Petition in Opposition to the Pre-Annexation Agreement and Darling Road Development. Please circulate the same to City Council, The Mayor, and all concerned parties.

Thank You,

John Albers

## Kayla Holbrook

---

**From:** Anthony Jones  
**Sent:** Monday, June 27, 2016 4:30 PM  
**To:** Brian Larick  
**Cc:** Council; Anthony Jones  
**Subject:** RE: Jefferson  
**Attachments:** Darling Road Annexation Subdivision Comparison.docx

Good afternoon Councilman Larick,

Thanks for your questions. I appreciate the opportunity to respond. Please see my response below.

1) I don't have a list of every residential development that has occurred in Jefferson Township over the past 15 years. This would require a public records request to Jefferson Township. I am in the process of investigating it at this time, but won't have that information for Council Committee this evening. I do have the relevant information on a few recent residential subdivisions, including Hannah Farms and the proposed Weldon Place project. Please see the attached sheet for additional information.

2) I have reached out to the School Superintendent and requested to see if they would be willing to make a statement on their (non)objection to the project. However, we have verbally spoken with the School Administration since the beginning of this process. They have indicated to us that homes with this price point have a positive impact on the school district because the revenue generated is greater than the annual cost of educating a child (\$11,063). The City currently does not have any other model to determine the school impact other than comparing the potential project revenues with the annual cost of educating students that were generated from the project.

Please let me know if you have any questions/comments/concerns.

Thanks!

ANTHONY JONES, CECD  
Director  
Planning & Development

### CITY OF GAHANNA

200 S. Hamilton Rd.  
Gahanna, Ohio 43230  
614.342.4020  
614.342.4120(fax)  
anthony.jones@gahanna.gov  
www.Gahanna.gov  
Twitter@CityOfGahanna

-----Original Message-----

From: Brian Larick  
Sent: Monday, June 27, 2016 11:03 AM

To: Anthony Jones <Anthony.Jones@gahanna.gov>

Cc: Council <Council@gahanna.gov>

Subject: Jefferson

Anthony, some questions:

1-How many developments have been added in Jefferson in the last 15 years? (SF and MF) 2-In each development:

A-What is the density?

B-The number of units?

C-Price point?

4-Statement, from the school administration, stating the impact of the development on the schools as well as their position (stating objection or no objection at a minimum).

5-What is the Density, price point and units of Hannah Farms?

Brian

## Kayla Holbrook

---

**From:** Nancy Mcgregor  
**Sent:** Tuesday, June 28, 2016 10:40 PM  
**To:** Anthony Jones; Brian Larick  
**Cc:** Council  
**Subject:** RE: Jefferson

Hi Anthony,

What is the difference between a PUD and an overlay text?

Also, your point two below - given the cost is 11K/year to educate a child. But, maybe my math is wrong, only about half of the property tax goes to the schools. Would the property tax on these homes be 22K? That seems high to me.

Also, I appreciate the clear explanation you gave us on a new community authority. I think I have been able to explain it pretty well to some others :)

Thanks so much,  
Nancy

---

From: Anthony Jones  
Sent: Monday, June 27, 2016 4:29 PM  
To: Brian Larick  
Cc: Council; Anthony Jones  
Subject: RE: Jefferson

Good afternoon Councilman Larick,

Thanks for your questions. I appreciate the opportunity to respond. Please see my response below.

1) I don't have a list of every residential development that has occurred in Jefferson Township over the past 15 years. This would require a public records request to Jefferson Township. I am in the process of investigating it at this time, but won't have that information for Council Committee this evening. I do the relevant information on a few recent residential subdivisions, including Hannah Farms and the proposed Weldon Place project. Please see the attached sheet for additional information.

2) I have reached out to the School Superintendent and requested to see if they would be willing to make a statement on their (non)objection to the project. However, we have verbally spoken with the School Administration since the beginning of this process. They have indicated to us that homes with this price point have a positive impact on the school district because the revenue generated is greater than the annual cost of educating a child (\$11,063). The City currently does have any other model to determine the school impact other than comparing the potential project revenues with the annual cost of educating students that were generated from the project.

Please let me know if you have any questions/comments/concerns.

Thanks!

ANTHONY JONES, CECD  
Director  
Planning & Development

CITY OF GAHANNA

200 S. Hamilton Rd.  
Gahanna, Ohio 43230  
614.342.4020  
614.342.4120(fax)  
anthony.jones@gahanna.gov  
www.Gahanna.gov  
Twitter@CityOfGahanna

-----Original Message-----

From: Brian Larick  
Sent: Monday, June 27, 2016 11:03 AM  
To: Anthony Jones <Anthony.Jones@gahanna.gov>  
Cc: Council <Council@gahanna.gov>  
Subject: Jefferson

Anthony, some questions:

1-How many developments have been added in Jefferson in the last 15 years? (SF and MF) 2-In each development:

A-What is the density?

B-The number of units?

C-Price point?

4-Statement, from the school administration, stating the impact of the development on the schools as well as their position (stating objection or no objection at a minimum).

5-What is the Density, price point and units of Hannah Farms?

Brian

## Kayla Holbrook

---

**From:** Nancy Mcgregor  
**Sent:** Thursday, July 14, 2016 10:43 PM  
**To:** DeAnne Prosek  
**Cc:** Kayla Holbrook  
**Subject:** RE: MI homes on Darling/New Albany Roads

Hi DeAnne,

Thank you for the email. Scott Schmidt, acting superintendent, was at our last meeting. He said the schools use a figure of .6 students/house as an average. That would be 56 additional students. He did not have information about the populations of the affected schools with him, so it will be forthcoming.

Thanks so much,  
Nancy

---

From: DeAnne Prosek [bdprosek@insight.rr.com]  
Sent: Saturday, July 02, 2016 10:37 AM  
To: Council  
Subject: MI homes on Darling/New Albany Roads

To Whom it May Concern,

The Gahanna schools can't handle another large housing development and our communities are large enough. Please don't give permission to MI to annex these areas.

DeAnne Prosek

Sent from my iPhone



## Kayla Holbrook

---

**From:** Nancy Mcgregor  
**Sent:** Tuesday, June 28, 2016 10:14 PM  
**To:** Brenda Hoffman  
**Cc:** Kayla Holbrook  
**Subject:** RE: NO on the M/I Homes

Hi Brenda,

Thank you for writing to me with your opinion on the proposed MI project. I have not had access to my email due to technical issues the last few days.

I will address some of your concerns.

1. The city recognizes the costs that are associated with a new residential development. We are creating a "New Community Authority" NCA that raises money for future repairs and costs. The city has looked at the costs to the city from this development for the next 30 years and beyond- road repair, road replacement, storm water systems, park usage, police call etc. It comes to about \$99K/year. It will take about 7 mills to raise that much money. The money raised from the 7 mills will be put into a fund administered by 7 people appointed by council. Each of the properties within this development and others that may follow will pay 7 mills added onto their property tax bill. New Albany has had a NCA for years. It was developed so that the new housing and businesses in New Albany would pay an extra tax to help pay for, in their case, the school system. It was so the original New Albany people would not be taxed out of existence with all the new needs of the growing city.

2. The school superintendent was asked to weigh in on the potential of additional students. He said at this price point, they estimate .5 students per house. We heard last night that these are 2 bedroom houses with a bonus room.

3. Gahanna will be responsible for police, streets, storm water. Jefferson Township will be responsible for fire service, police and fire.

My concerns right now are the closing of Darling Rd. and the fact that MI started out asking to build in the township. It was more dense than allowed and there was a lot of resistance to the project. Jefferson Township never voted on the project, it was withdrawn. Then MI came to Gahanna to see about annexing. I don't like Gahanna being the fall back position when MI never tried to negotiate with the township.

I don't like the idea of closing Darling Road. It seems like a bad plan to close the middle part of a road.

This all being said, the houses look lovely. The lots are somewhat wider and shallower to accommodate the ranches. There is 21 acres of open space around the perimeter of the project, like a green necklace. It is a price point that will be attractive to some buyers.

Thanks so much,

Nancy McGregor  
Gahanna Council Member

---

**From:** Brenda Hoffman [hoffman.brendar@gmail.com]  
**Sent:** Sunday, June 26, 2016 10:33 PM  
**To:** Council  
**Subject:** NO on the M/I Homes Annex

What are you people thinking?

NO.  
NO MORE.

When will Gahanna stop acting like a spoiled college kid with a credit card?  
We cannot afford the growth that has already been forced on us.

Our resources are strained.

Our services are diminished, and all we hear about as home owners is what the City is buy, implementing, doing, hiring, building and proposing when we can't afford what we already have.

Some of us are RETIRED ON FIXED INCOMES.

MY TAX BILL IS LOOKING LIKE RENT AND I GET LESS NOW THAN EVER despite being responsible and paying off my home years ago.

You people are forcing the retirees out.

This City lacks appropriate services for the current population, and should be FLUSH financially before anything doing more.

We were lied to about Stoneridge.

It has NEVER been what we were sold.

We were lied to about Creekside.

What a mess.

What an expensive mess that eats up City crew time when you haven't even got all the cul de sacs cleared- there's City people cleaning Creekside.

The Kroger/Clark Hall stuff was a dirty deal and purposefully done without voter input.

We can't trust you people. All you do is Spend, Spend, Spend.

GROWTH IS NOT PROGRESS.

ENOUGH!

Brenda R Hoffman  
279 Highmeadow Drive  
Gahanna, OH 43230-1749

## Kayla Holbrook

---

**From:** Brenda Hoffman <hoffman.brendar@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Sunday, June 26, 2016 10:34 PM  
**To:** Council  
**Subject:** NO on the M/I Homes Annex

What are you people thinking?

NO.  
NO MORE.

When will Gahanna stop acting like a spoiled college kid with a credit card?  
We cannot afford the growth that has already been forced on us.

Our resources are strained.

Our services are diminished, and all we hear about as home owners is what the City is buy, implementing, doing, hiring, building and proposing when we can't afford what we already have.

Some of us are RETIRED ON FIXED INCOMES.

MY TAX BILL IS LOOKING LIKE RENT AND I GET LESS NOW THAN EVER despite being responsible and paying off my home years ago.

You people are forcing the retirees out.

This City lacks appropriate services for the current population, and should be FLUSH financially before anything doing more.

We were lied to about Stoneridge.  
It has NEVER been what we were sold.

We were lied to about Creekside.

What a mess.

What an expensive mess that eats up City crew time when you haven't even got all the cul de sacs cleared- there's City people cleaning Creekside.

The Kroger/Clark Hall stuff was a dirty deal and purposefully done without voter input.

We can't trust you people. All you do is Spend, Spend, Spend.

GROWTH IS NOT PROGRESS.  
ENOUGH!

Brenda R Hoffman  
279 Highmeadow Drive  
Gahanna, OH 43230-1749

## Kayla Holbrook

---

**From:** Daniel, Emerson - COLUMBUS OH <bruce\_daniel@ml.com>  
**Sent:** Thursday, July 14, 2016 1:15 PM  
**To:** Council  
**Cc:** Cindi Daniel (cindida01@Yahoo.com); s1  
**Subject:** Opposed to MI Homes request for annexing Darling road

As a resident of Jefferson Township I am strongly opposed to MI Homes request to both annex and increase the density of their proposed development on Darling road. We have lived in Blacklick area since 1978 and built here because of its less dense, rural feeling and I want it to remain that way. The traffic is already ridiculous along Reynoldsburg-New Albany road in this area around Havens Road .

Sincerely,

*E. Bruce Daniel CFP® CIMA® CRPC®*

*Wealth Management Advisor / Senior Vice President*

*Portfolio Manager, PIA Program*

*Merrill Lynch*

*8425 Pulsar Pl*

*Columbus, OH 43240*

*NMLS #590814*

*614-825-0374*

*800-254-6674*

*[bruce\\_daniel@ml.com](mailto:bruce_daniel@ml.com)*

*[http://fa.ml.com/DANIEL\\_GROUP](http://fa.ml.com/DANIEL_GROUP)*

---

This message, and any attachments, is for the intended recipient(s) only, may contain information that is privileged, confidential and/or proprietary and subject to important terms and conditions available at <http://www.bankofamerica.com/emaildisclaimer>. If you are not the intended recipient, please delete this message.

## Kayla Holbrook

---

**From:** Eric Cox <ericcox0404@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, July 18, 2016 4:43 PM  
**To:** Council  
**Subject:** Pre annexation

I am displeased with the lack of citizen support for the annexation of the MI homes development. Government is meant to be for the people, by the people. Go forward Gahanna is about bringing our community together, which is why you need to vote no and listen to the community. The community stands united against the project, Jefferson Township trustees say no, 470+ citizens signed a petition saying no. We need to unite Gahanna, if a development the majority of the community doesn't support is built, Go forward Gahanna failed. I love this community and I want council to vote the will of the people. Vote no, tell the community you're with them #DenyMi <https://www.change.org/p/gahanna-do-not-allow-mi-homes-to-annex-into-gahanna>

-Eric Cox, GLHS sophomore.  
Sent from my iPhone

## Kayla Holbrook

---

**From:** Rob sander <rsander11@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, July 11, 2016 7:38 AM  
**To:** Council  
**Cc:** Mayor; Anthony Jones  
**Subject:** Pre-Annexation Agreement 7/8/2016  
**Attachments:** Darling Road Annexation Pro Forma 93.pdf; Darling Road Annexation Pro Forma 1 acre lots.pdf; Darling Road Annexation Pro Forma 1 acre lots.xlsx

Council,

First I would like to Thank You for your careful consideration and attention to my earlier email and concerns.

I would like to point out some additional issues.

### 1) Pre-Annexation Agreement:

The latest draft includes this sentence in section 3.

**"If improvements to Darling Road are to be made beyond those which are described in the immediately preceding sentence, then the responsibility for paying the costs of such improvements as between the County and M/I shall be determined prior to the date when a final plat is approved for the subdivision of the Real Property. M/I and the City will work cooperatively with the County during the annexation and zoning review process in order to identify appropriate improvements to Darling Road. ,"**

I appreciate this attempt to address my issue with the closing Darling Rd. Although the sentence addresses the issue of "determining costs" there is no actual commitment to keep Darling Rd open. When would "final plat" be in the process ? Before approval of annexation ? Or after ? If the costs were too high would M/I be able to withdraw ? Would the City "chip in" ? Would the City allow M/I to close Darling Rd just because the "costs" to keep Darling Rd open were too high to M/I ? These "costs" don't of course include the indirect cost to the County, Township, and surrounding neighbors caused by the closure Darling Rd.

### 2) Development plan and Cost / Income Calculations

The development Director was so kind as to send me a copy of the "Darling Road Annexation Pro Forma" spreadsheet from an earlier COTW presentation. The annual income to the City is shown as \$32,381 per year for the development as proposed.(recalculated for 93 homes) (see attached PDF)

The main issue that I have with this development is not that the land is being developed. It has been zoned for 1 acre lots since long before I moved here. I have always expected (more or less) that it would be developed as 1 acre lots. All of of the homes on Darling Rd are currently on 1+ acre lots. I don't know of one person that lives on Darling or Rovilla that would object to 1 acre lots. I am not anti development. I am against bad developments, whether they are in the City or the Township. With that in mind I used the supplied spreadsheet to recalculate what a development of 1 acre lots would cost the City. I used only the main Darling Rd parcels eliminating the need for a connection to Reynoldsburg New Albany Rd. These 4 parcels comprise approximately 56 acres. So 56 acres, 56 lots. The configuration of using just Darling and Rovilla Roads for development would substantially reduce the road frontage and maintenance costs. The income to the City would be \$32,110. per year with 1 acre lots. So for the additional 37 homes (93 - 56 ) the city nets an additional \$271.00 total per year or a whopping \$7.32 per additional home.

1 acre lots can be developed in the City. The Shull Rd, Cannini development that is in the annexation process is a 1+ acre development.

This proposed plan from M/I is just a bad plan. I realize that as Council you don't choose what plans that will be presented to you. Council only votes to accept or reject presented plans. This plan is just overdevelopment, it has too many homes for the area and requires convoluted road closures, safety gates, and "to be determined costs" for a difference of \$271 per year. Sometimes the simple answer is the right answer. Reject this development now and wait for the right development to be proposed.

I have attached the spreadsheet that I used in my 1 acre lot calculations if you would like to go over my work.

Thank you again for your attention and consideration,

Rob Sander  
614-406-2870

## Kayla Holbrook

---

**From:** Linda Holliday <lholliday57@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Thursday, June 30, 2016 4:33 PM  
**To:** Council  
**Subject:** Proposed Darling Road Annexation

Dear Members of Council,

First thank you in advance for taking time to read this letter. I'm writing in regards to the Darling Road MI Home proposed development. I'm Linda Kitsmiller Holliday one of the four property owners.

Let me start by saying selling this property was a very heart felt decision for me. It has been in my family for many years. However my circumstances changed in 2007 when my husband passed away unexpectedly. Even though the land is currently farmed, there are barns and a house which I'm unable to maintain. Both my parents gave their blessing before they passed for my brother and me to sell the land. They realized that in due time it would become a burden to us in terms of maintaining. In later years, my father mentioned many times that he was both pleased and proud of land he had sold that became Kitsmiller's Crossing. I'm convinced that he would also be very pleased and proud of the development MI is proposing for the property. I also feel that it would be a great asset to the current surrounding neighbors and developments as well to the city of Gahanna.

And one last note before I close, MI Homes did work very hard and diligently with Jefferson Township trying to reach a positive resolution for the planned development before coming to Gahanna with the proposed plan. As social media and much gossip continues surrounding this annexation I truly feel many have not received all the facts.

Thank you again for your time and consideration on this proposed development. It is truly appreciated.

Sincerely,

Linda Holliday  
[lholliday57@gmail.com](mailto:lholliday57@gmail.com)



## Kayla Holbrook

---

**From:** Nagy, Timothy P. <nagy@taftlaw.com>  
**Sent:** Thursday, July 28, 2016 4:53 PM  
**To:** Council; cyoder@jeffersontownship.org; rcourter@jeffersontownship.org;  
mrowan@jeffersontownship.org  
**Cc:** Nagy, Timothy P.; Shane Ewald; Anthony Jones  
**Subject:** Proposed Higher-Density 93-unit Development Proposed by M/I Homes in the Darling Road Area  
**Attachments:** Letter to Mayor of Gahanna, City Council of Gahanna, Jefferson Township Trustees.PDF

Greetings,

Please review the attached correspondence. Thank you.

Sincerely,  
Timothy P. Nagy  
Attachment

# Taft /

**Timothy P. Nagy** / Partner  
Taft Stettinius & Hollister LLP  
65 E. State Street, Suite 1000  
Columbus, Ohio 43215  
Tel: 614.221.2838 • Fax: 614.221.2007  
Direct: 614.220.0220  
[www.taftlaw.com](http://www.taftlaw.com) / [nagy@taftlaw.com](mailto:nagy@taftlaw.com)

This message may contain information that is attorney-client privileged, attorney work product or otherwise confidential. If you are not an intended recipient, use and disclosure of this message are prohibited. If you received this transmission in error, please notify the sender by reply e-mail and delete the message and any attachments.

## Kayla Holbrook

---

**From:** Eric Cox <ericcox0404@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, June 27, 2016 2:51 PM  
**To:** Council  
**Subject:** Mi Homes annexation

Hello Council members,

It has come to my attention and many other residents of Gahanna the impact Mi Homes annexation would have on the community. Our school system cannot handle anymore massive developments, not to mention they are asking to build on roads that were never designed to handle this density of housing. The community agrees, most are against annexation due to the current condition of our schools. I urge you ALL (Including Mayor Kneeland) to walk through Gahanna Lincoln while changing classes in August and then you will see why the community stands against this. As a sophomore, I have 3 more years in this town. I have dealt with overcrowding. We cannot have anymore! Attached you will find a link to my petition that I started last night, the community is against this project, please #DenyMI.

<https://www.change.org/p/gahanna-do-not-allow-mi-homes-to-annex-into-gahanna>

-Eric Cox, Sophomore, Gahanna Lincoln

## Kayla Holbrook

---

**From:** Eric Cox <ericcox0404@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Thursday, July 14, 2016 9:07 PM  
**To:** Council  
**Subject:** MI homes annexation

What is councils response to trustees being against the plan that seems to be going forward with statements like **"I think they are making a mistake to allow MI to build a development that is high density and out of character with the townships zoning map and the surrounding properties"**

Thank you for your time

-Eric Cox, Sophomore at Gahanna Lincoln

## Kayla Holbrook

---

**From:** DeAnne Prosek <bdprosek@insight.rr.com>  
**Sent:** Saturday, July 02, 2016 10:38 AM  
**To:** Council  
**Subject:** MI homes on Darling/New Albany Roads

To Whom it May Concern,  
The Gahanna schools can't handle another large housing development and our communities are large enough. Please don't give permission to MI to annex these areas.

DeAnne Prosek

Sent from my iPhone

## Kayla Holbrook

---

**From:** Jason Shamroski <jshamroski@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Sunday, June 26, 2016 11:40 PM  
**To:** Council  
**Subject:** MI Homes

I urge you, as a 14 year resident, to NOT annex the M/I Homes development into Gahanna. Any property tax advantage is not worth it when we consider the impact of almost 100 additional homes would have on our infrastructure.

Jason Shamroski  
390 Lytton Way  
Gahanna, OH 43230  
614.522.9053

## Kayla Holbrook

---

**From:** Laurie Jacques <ljacques121@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, June 27, 2016 5:33 PM  
**To:** Council  
**Subject:** MI Pre-annexation Agreement

Dear Council Members:

I am writing to encourage you to delay action on this agreement until you have had the opportunity to consider citizen input. I appreciate that this land will eventually be developed. However, it is grating to learn that MI thinks Gahanna will embrace yet another maximum density (SF3) development, especially one that did not meet the approval of a neighboring community. Other communities benefit by setting development standards higher than maximum density. I hope that Gahanna will learn to do the same.

Best regards,  
Laurie Jacques

## Kayla Holbrook

---

**From:** Nancy Mcgregor  
**Sent:** Tuesday, June 28, 2016 7:37 PM  
**To:** Council  
**Cc:** Tom Kneeland; Anthony Jones  
**Subject:** MI

Good afternoon,

My two main concerns about the MI project are the closure of Darling Rd. and the annexation itself.

The annexation itself is a concern because I think we want to be good neighbors with Jefferson Township and I don't like the idea of MI using Gahanna to achieve the density they want. This proposal was not turned down by the township as I understand it, MI withdrew the project, so we don't know if a compromise could have been negotiated.

I just couldn't understand why the county would let Darling Rd. be closed. So I called yesterday to ask that and left a voice mail. An engineer in the traffic division, called me back today and I was glad because I had more questions after the meeting last night.....

He said that Darling Rd. is low on the priority list to be improved-low traffic volume and low on safety issues. ( He said at one point that he lives out this way and is familiar with this area.)

He said that if MI applies to have the road vacated, there would have to be a traffic study done to see how the closing would impact the area.

He said most likely the intersection of Rovilla and Darling and the intersection of Rovilla and Reynoldburg-New Albany would have to be improved, somewhat.

He said there would have to be a vacation of the road by the county.

He said there would have to be public hearing on the closure.

He said there commissioners would have to have a hearing to consider the vacation.

I told him the MI guy said the county recommended/suggested the closing of Darling Rd. He said that was not accurate.

He didn't see how Darling could ever be reconnected easily because of the right of way issues. I think it had to do with the vacation of the roadway.

He said the northern end off of Clark State would have to have a bulb that allowed for fire trucks and school buses.

That's about it.

I am really not sure about this annexation. I know we put it on for first reading. It is not our job to make a deal for the developer. It is not our fault that they dropped out of the Jefferson Township process. We should not feel pushed or hurried into anything.

Thanks so much,  
Nancy





## Kayla Holbrook

---

**From:** kford@nisource.com  
**Sent:** Monday, July 11, 2016 8:31 AM  
**To:** Council  
**Cc:** Tami Ford  
**Subject:** M/I Annexation --- Please vote NO  
**Attachments:** Jefferson Township MI Darling Road letterhead 07062016.pdf; PreAnnexation Agreement 782016.pdf

Council,

Good morning.....

I currently live at 2717 Darling Rd and we LOVE the country feel. I am not sure we would have bought the house/land knowing that M/I was going to "bastardize" the land directly behind our house. I am in complete agreement with everything that Mr. Sander has to say in the attached email.

My biggest concern is a couple fold. First, I am in complete agreement that the land plots should be NO less than one acre in size. I have seen

many M/I developments and quite frankly am not impressed. They are junk

in my opinion. I too am not against economic development but, it has to make sense. I have heard quite a few negative comments about the access from Reynoldsburg-New Albany road. The access point will be a disaster as that road is very busy. Also, overcrowding of the schools..... What's your plan to handle this? Secondly, I am not opposed to closing Darling road as long as it is done "right". I DO NOT want M/I to dictate the future of the road and ruin my land value and access points.

Please consider my email and vote against annexation. The Trustees of Blacklick Township has spoken as has the residents. PLEASE VOTE NO!!!!!!

Thank you for your consideration in this matter and please do the "right" thing.

(See attached file: Jefferson Township MI Darling Road letterhead 07062016.pdf)

Kerry M. Ford

Quality Audit & Control Lead Analyst

NiSource Business Improvement

(614) 460-6829 - Office

(614) 230-8707 - Cell

The information contained herein has been reviewed and is complete and accurate to the best of my knowledge.

----- Forwarded by Kerry Ford/NCS/Enterprise on 07/11/2016 08:19 AM -----

(See attached file: PreAnnexation Agreement 782016.pdf)

## Kayla Holbrook

---

**From:** Jamie Leeseberg  
**Sent:** Friday, July 01, 2016 9:32 AM  
**To:** Council  
**Cc:** Mayors Office; Anthony Jones; Michael Blackford  
**Subject:** M/I Annexation  
**Attachments:** Jefferson Subdivisions.xlsx

Like many of you I've been thinking a lot about the proposed pre-annexation agreement we've been asked to consider. I've heard the argument that the City will be helping M/I to bypass the Twp with this deal and avoid their standards. This got me thinking and in response to Mr. Larrick's request to Anthony about information about other subdivisions in Jefferson Twp. I did a little digging of my own.

I keep hearing that the Twp. requires "1.0 Ac Lots" and/or 1.0 Ac/Lot. There is a subtle difference which was explained the other night and has to do with the overall acreage of the project.

While not a complete list of all the subdivisions in the Twp. I've compiled a list of subdivisions in the area of the development in question that have been approved and constructed recently. (Please see attached)

The spreadsheet clearly shows that the average Ac/Lot of the 13 developments is 0.787 Ac/Lot with typical Lot sizes of 0.41 Ac. which is consistent with what M/I is asking for.

I have copies of the plats for these developments and am more than happy to explain any of the info in the spreadsheet.

Thanks,

Jamie Leeseberg

City Council - Ward 4

City of Gahanna  
200 S. Hamilton Rd.  
Gahanna, OH 43230

## Kayla Holbrook

---

**From:** Don Bowen <dbowen.email@yahoo.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, August 15, 2016 6:35 PM  
**To:** Council  
**Subject:** M/I annexation

I am writing in opposition to the annexation of the proposed M/I Homes development off of Darling Rd. The way I see it, M/I was fully aware the property they purchased was in the township of Jefferson. M/I was also aware of the zoning requirements when they made the purchase. If they did not know, then someone did not do their job and should be fired. It appears to the majority of the public following this proposal that M/I became greedy and wants to build more homes in a smaller space. It appears to the public that since Jefferson township would not change the zoning restrictions that M/I approached the city of Gahanna because they knew the city would not pass up on the tax income of this development. M/I originally stated that this would be a senior community but I do not know of many seniors that can afford a \$400k home. This development will be directed to working professionals with established families (i.e. children). Many arguments have been made in reference to the additional students to the schools and the congested traffic on both Reynoldsburg New Albany and Havens Corners and I would ask that you look at those concerns closely. I am asking that you honor the wishes of Jefferson township and those of the residents of Darling Rd area to not allow the annexation of this property. I am just a humble lay person who confesses not to know that much about the procedures of governing a city but I do know a money grab when I see one and it seems that's exactly what M/I is doing.

Thank you for your time.  
Donald Bowen  
Gahanna resident

## Kayla Holbrook

---

**From:** Mark Deeds <madeed@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, July 04, 2016 9:07 PM  
**To:** Mayor; Anthony Jones; jamie.leesburg@gahanna.gov; Stephen Renner; Michael Schnetzer; Brian Larick; Karen Angelou; Brian Metzbower; Nancy Mcgregor; Planning Commission  
**Subject:** MI annexation

Hello all,

I am writing you all in reference to the request by MI homes to annex the properties associated with their Darling Rd project.

I do live on Reynoldsburg New Albany Rd. just one property south of the proposed entrance, maybe 100 feet. I do have issue with the fact that they are only going to have a mere 50 feet of frontage on this busy, busy road. Ok now add 200 more automobiles using this road, and yes slowing down, stopping & getting on the road in front of my property. I have looked at other new developments on this road and took note, they all seem to have taken on much more frontage on this busy road. In my opinion I believe MI needs to take more ownership of the road that is making it possible to get back to their property. It seems MI has forgot that the entry could be a good point of displaying their development.

Just my 2 cents worth, but something I feel you should consider.

Respectfully,  
Mr. Deeds

## Kayla Holbrook

---

**From:** Jeff Route <Jeff@routeconstruction.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, July 11, 2016 2:50 PM  
**To:** Council; Anthony Jones; Mayor  
**Subject:** M/I Darling Rd

Live at 6475 Darling immediately west of the project

History of the land; 20 some years ago Mr. Kitsmiller sold a large portion of his land to CV Perry to build what is now Kitsmiller Crossing. CV Perry had an option on the land which I believe is the south section of Linda's land. At the pleading of his kids the option went away and Mr. Kitsmiller got the land rezoned to its current zoning. Those kids were Gary Kitsmiller and Linda Holliday, they are probably also the only two that are alive that can deny or confirm the story. With that I purchased my lot with the thought that no tract development would be built next to me  
In 2003 Darling Rd. became an Ohio Byway reassuring that a project like this would not be built on this land  
All of you are welcome to spend a day at the house and see the true tranquility of Darling Rd. You will observe more foot and bike traffic than cars and probably an array of wild life

M/I Development as shown

1. Closing Darling Rd. is an unreal option do to emergency response and side A wanting to east and side B wanting to go west
2. No matter how you present it 1.5 unit per acre, they are still ¼ acre lots
3. The buffer area around the perimeter would need to be maintained on a weekly bases either by the association or Gahanna and not planted as pasture grass to be mowed once every couple of months as presented by M/I
4. Does M/I have any central Ohio development that has an 1,800 sq. ft. 2 bedroom house for \$300,000.00 let alone \$450,000.00 as stated for this project and does anyone really think these as executive homes?
5. Screening of Darling Rd. as an Ohio Byway is extensive and must be addressed
6. County already denied it why does Gahanna want to pursue it?

I would prefer the devolvement not to take place period. I do realize additional homes will be built here sooner than later but the property should be built on as it was intended when Mr. Kitsmiller had it rezoned

Thanks

**Jeffrey A Route**  
**Route Construction, Inc.**  
**PO Box 30726**  
**Gahanna, Ohio 43230**  
**Office 614-751-2433**  
**Fax 614-751-2435**  
**Cell 614-206-5904**

## Kayla Holbrook

---

**From:** Gary Kitsmiller <gkitsmil@columbus.rr.com>  
**Sent:** Thursday, June 30, 2016 10:26 AM  
**To:** Council  
**Subject:** Darling Road Property

To Members of Gahanna City Council:

We are one of the principal property owners of the Darling Road parcels that currently are under review for annexation to the City of Gahanna. Please know how much we appreciate council considering the possible annexation of this property.

However, we are very concerned about the misinformation that has spread so rapidly on emails and social media during the past few days. Some of it is astonishing and completely inaccurate.

Our hope is that the ultimate decision is made based on sound facts and thoughtful deliberation.

Our desire to sell the property is primarily based on our age and increasing inability to take care of it as well as we would like and as it should be. We feel the project as proposed offers a unique opportunity for the City of Gahanna to gain an upscale community which provides additional revenue and complements Hannah Park, Hannah Farms and Kitsmiller's Crossing. It was the same opportunity that MI Homes presented to Jefferson Township officials over nearly one year of negotiation. Having met numerous change requests by Township officials, including significant reduction in density, MI Homes presumed we had an agreement; however, the Township officials changed their minds at the last minute.

Again, thank you for your consideration. Should you ever have any questions for us, we would be glad to discuss them with you.

Gary and Sandi Kitsmiller  
918 Old Pine Dr  
Gahanna, OH 43230  
614-855-9586  
[kitsmiller.1@osu.edu](mailto:kitsmiller.1@osu.edu)



## Kayla Holbrook

---

**From:** Shirley Williams <willsyf@hotmail.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, July 11, 2016 4:16 PM  
**To:** Council  
**Subject:** Darling Road

*Dear council members, Not everyone that lives on Darling road is in favor of it staying opening and becoming a part of the development. Some of us want the road to be closed, that is the lest amount of infringement to the individuals living here now. If I had my way I would say no development to this area, reasons you have already been given, Thank you, Shirley Williams*

## Kayla Holbrook

---

**From:** Jennifer Teal  
**Sent:** Monday, July 25, 2016 4:18 PM  
**To:** Tom Kneeland; Council; Anthony Jones; Michael Blackford; Shane Ewald  
**Subject:** FW: Annexation Request

FYI

### JENNIFER TEAL

City Administrator



CITY OF GAHANNA

200 S. Hamilton Rd.  
Gahanna, Ohio 43230  
614.342.4045  
614.342.4167(fax)  
[jennifer.teal@gahanna.gov](mailto:jennifer.teal@gahanna.gov)  
[www.Gahanna.gov](http://www.Gahanna.gov)  
Twitter @CityOfGahanna

---

**From:** Elaine May [mailto:emay@insight.rr.com]  
**Sent:** Monday, July 25, 2016 1:07 PM  
**To:** Jennifer Teal <Jennifer.Teal@gahanna.gov>  
**Subject:** Annexation Request

July 25, 2016

To the Gahanna Mayor, City Council and Jefferson Township Trustees:

As residents and taxpayers in Gahanna/Jefferson Township and Gahanna-Jefferson School District, we are very concerned about the proposed higher-density 93-unit development proposed by M/I Homes in the Darling Road area.

Historically there has been good cooperation and coordination between Gahanna and Jefferson Township on residential development; and there has been a goal to avoid development that would unfavorably impact our schools. On this project, however, there is a proposal to have an added seven-mill property tax included, with none of that money earmarked to directly benefit the schools.

There are claims that these single-family homes being built in territory now within Jefferson Township would be filled by "empty-nesters." This sales concept at this price level is an unproven market concept for our community, and there are no guarantees or protections against adverse impact on our local schools; nor are there any long-term protections that this added seven-mill property tax could not be mis-used or result in negative property value conditions.

**We respectfully ask Gahanna officials to table for six months any actions to advance this untested tax and higher-density development until ALL legal details and questions can be carefully examined and fully reviewed. If not, we will consider all of our legal/court and ballot options in order to protect the schools and property values in our community.**

Sincerely,



## Kayla Holbrook

---

**From:** Nancy Mcgregor  
**Sent:** Tuesday, June 28, 2016 11:02 PM  
**To:** Kayla Holbrook  
**Subject:** FW: Annexation request on tonight's agenda

---

**From:** Nancy Mcgregor  
**Sent:** Tuesday, June 28, 2016 10:17 PM  
**To:** Debbie Matthews  
**Subject:** RE: Annexation request on tonight's agenda

Hi Debbie,

Thank you for writing to me with your opinion on the proposed MI project. I have not had access to my email due to technical issues the last few days.

I will address some of your concerns.

1. The city recognizes the costs that are associated with a new residential development. We are creating a "New Community Authority" NCA that raises money for future repairs and costs. The city has looked at the costs to the city from this development for the next 30 years and beyond- road repair, road replacement, storm water systems, park usage, police call etc. It comes to about \$99K/year. It will take about 7 mills to raise that much money. The money raised from the 7 mills will be put into a fund administered by 7 people appointed by council. Each of the properties within this development and others that may follow will pay 7 mills added onto their property tax bill. New Albany has had a NCA for years. It was developed so that the new housing and businesses in New Albany would pay an extra tax to help pay for, in their case, the school system. It was so the original New Albany people would not be taxed out of existence with all the new needs of the growing city.

2. The school superintendent was asked to weigh in on the potential of additional students. He said at this price point, they estimate .5 students per house. We heard last night that these are 2 bedroom houses with a bonus room.

3. Gahanna will be responsible for police, streets, storm water. Jefferson Township will be responsible for fire service, police and fire.

My concerns right now are the closing of Darling Rd. and the fact that MI started out asking to build in the township. It was more dense than allowed and there was a lot of resistance to the project. Jefferson Township never voted on the project, it was withdrawn. Then MI came to Gahanna to see about annexing. I don't like Gahanna being the fall back position when MI never tried to negotiate with the township.

I don't like the idea of closing Darling Road. It seems like a bad plan to close the middle part of a road.

This all being said, the houses look lovely. The lots are somewhat wider and shallower to accommodate the ranches. There is 21 acres of open space around the perimeter of the project, like a green necklace. It is a price point that will be attractive to some buyers.

Thanks so much,  
Nancy McGregor  
City Council Member

---

**From:** Debbie Matthews [debbie.matthews53@gmail.com]  
**Sent:** Monday, June 27, 2016 3:59 PM

**To:** Stephen Renner; Nancy Mcgregor; Karen Angelou; brian.metzbower@gmail.com; Michael Schnetzer; Brian Larick; Jamie Leeseberg

**Subject:** Annexation request on tonight's agenda

All, I am extremely concerned about the annexation request on the agenda tonight.

My concerns:

1. There is no mention in the documentation I examined regarding the impact to the schools. 94 new 2000 sq ft homes could have a huge impact to the schools. These are not homes to be inhabited by retirees.
2. This appears to be a second choice for M/I. Jefferson Township said no due to the density of the homes. Do we really want to start a precedent that we will annex to Gahanna if Jefferson Township says no? Is the plan to take over Jefferson Township?
3. The roads leading from that area into Gahanna are already bursting at the seams. What used to be a nice pleasant drive along the back roads of Jefferson Township is now clogged with lined up traffic. Havens Corner is a 2 lane road and so is Morse Rd East of Hamilton. What is the plan for handling 92 more families on those roads? There is no explanation for why Darling Rd is being closed.
4. The documentation stated that there will be a net gain to Gahanna of a total of \$33k per year. Who did that analysis? I am very doubtful of these numbers as the development grows older and needs maintenance. So we all have to deal with even more traffic so the City of Gahanna can gain \$33k? I smell another tax request coming.
5. I've lived in Gahanna for 30 years and I've seen promises that have not come true. I am hoping this is not another one.
6. I hope you ask the people that live around that area what they would like. What I have seen on the Take Back Gahanna Facebook site is that some are not even aware of this proposal.
7. Should this be a vote of the people as it was when the Triangle rezoning was done? That way there is open discussion and debate.

Thank you for listening.

Debbie Matthews  
803 Riva Ridge Blvd.

## Kayla Holbrook

---

**From:** Rob sander <rsander11@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, July 18, 2016 9:37 PM  
**To:** Council; Kim Banning  
**Cc:** Mayor  
**Subject:** Apologies for my poor wording.  
**Attachments:** RMS Darling Rd Comments to council 7 18 2016.pdf

Gahanna City Council,

I apologize for the choice of the words “Flood Zone” in my comments tonight.

I didn’t think about the legal definition of that term and I didn’t mean to mislead you. I don’t know what “Flood Zone” this area would be in.

A more correct characterization would have been low lying area subject to frequent standing water after moderate to heavy rains. (Still not a good place to put up houses)

Thank you again for listening,

Rob Sander  
614-406-2870

## Kayla Holbrook

---

**From:** Rob sander <rsander11@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Friday, June 24, 2016 6:23 PM  
**To:** Council  
**Cc:** Mayor; Kayla Holbrook; Jennifer Teal; Anthony Jones  
**Subject:** Darling Rd, M/I development, Pre-Annexation Agreement  
**Attachments:** New Community Organization.pdf

To: Gahanna City Council members,

While I have I have many concerns with the proposed development, this email will only address some issues with the New Community Authority, Estimated Costs, and the closure of Darling Rd.

The New Community Authority (NCA) is the mechanism for collecting any additional (new) money from this project. If for some reason the NCA is unable to be created or is nullified after annexation, the city might get nothing, therefore losing the anticipated revenue and still having to bear the costs. It is vital to the City that the NCA be successful. Upon reviewing Ohio Revised Code Chapter 349 (attached for your convenience) I have some questions regarding the set-up and running of the NCA. As of 6-20-16 the Administration did not have a draft or prototype document for the NCA available for my review, so the following are my concerns.

1. New Community organization ORC Chapter 349 :

### **349.04 Method of selecting board of trustees.**

The following method of selecting a board of trustees is deemed to be a compelling state interest. Within ten days after the new community authority has been established, as provided in section 349.03 of the Revised Code, an initial board of trustees shall be appointed as follows: the organizational board of commissioners shall appoint by resolution at least three, but not more than six, citizen members of the board of trustees to represent the interests of present and future residents and employers of the new community district and one member to serve as a representative of local government, and the developer shall appoint a number of members equal to the number of citizen members to serve as representatives of the developer.

From Pre-Annexation agreement section 7. "The petition shall provide, among other things, that the City shall be entitled to appoint all members to the Authority's board of trustees."

Conclusion : It appears that the board will be made up of a minimum of 7 members, all appointed by the City. I believe that this board would be larger than most of the other boards in the City. Seems like a lot of work for such a small project.

Continuing with section 349.04:

Members shall serve two-year overlapping terms, with two of each of the initial citizen and developer members appointed to serve initial one-year terms. The organizational board of commissioners shall adopt, by further resolution adopted within one year of such resolution establishing such initial board of trustees, a method for selection of successor members thereof which determines the projected total population of the projected new community and meets the following criteria:

(A) The appointed citizen members shall be replaced by elected citizen members according to a schedule established by the organizational board of commissioners calculated to achieve one such replacement each time the new community district gains a proportion, having a numerator of one and a denominator of twice the number of citizen members, of its projected total population until such time as all of the appointed citizen members are replaced.

(B) Representatives of the developer shall be replaced by elected citizen members according to a schedule established by the organizational board of commissioners calculated to achieve one such replacement each time the new community district gains a proportion, having a numerator of one and a denominator equal to the number of developer members, of its projected total population until such time as all of the developer's representatives are replaced.

(C) The representative of local government shall be replaced by an elected citizen member at the time the new community district gains three-quarters of its projected total population.

Conclusion : It is a little hard to follow the math but it appears that it is required that the appointed board of trustees will be replaced as the population in the area increases so that the entire board is eventually elected by the residents of the area. Is it thereby possible that the elected board could choose to discontinue the tax to themselves?

Caveat : in the next section there appears to be an alternative for selection of the board of trustees,

Continuing with section 349.04:

Elected citizen members of the board of trustees shall be elected by a majority of the residents of the new community district voting at elections held at the times and in the manner provided in a resolution of the organizational board of commissioners. Each citizen member except an appointed citizen member shall be a qualified elector who resides within the new community district. **The organizational board of commissioners, by resolution, may adopt an alternative method of selecting or electing successor members of the board of trustees** provided that if an alternative method of selection is adopted for a new community authority organized prior to March 22, 2012, the board of trustees of that authority shall be limited in the collection of a community development charge, collected pursuant to division (Q) of section 349.06 of the Revised Code, and the issuance of bonds or notes, issued pursuant to section 349.08 of the Revised Code, to the amount or to the extent otherwise permitted for a board of trustees whose members are not elected by residents of the new community district. If the alternative method provides for the election of citizen members, the elections may be held at the times and in the manner provided in the petition or in a resolution of the organizational board of commissioners, and the elected citizen members shall be qualified electors who reside in the new community district.

Conclusion : The New Community Organization ORC section 349 seems to be written for large community development projects in mind, something like Sun City in Florida or New Albany. Smaller projects such as these proposed by the City would seem to be second hand thoughts at best and the actual organizing documents and resolutions will be critical in evaluating the probability of success. Since the success of the NCA is so



critical to this annexation I urge City Council to postpone adopting the pre-annexation agreement until the NCA documents are available for review and discussion.

2. Costs : While there is nothing wrong with using average numbers of police calls to a given area based on a similar development it is quite dangerous to use average citywide “costs” to provide services in these calculations. Without doing a thorough cost analysis I cannot give an actual cost for any given area or service but it would be safe to say that the cost of providing a police call to Hunters Ridge apartments is less than a call to Hanna Farms. In fact, all services will cost more the further from the city center that you go. It takes nearly 10 minutes to drive to Hanna Farms while only seconds to get to Hunters Ridge from the police station.

Conclusion : Based on the average costs used in the presentation to council it is safe to assume that actual real world costs will be higher and that the City will be lucky to break even on this project and unwise to think that the City will have money left over to spend on other projects.

3. Darling Rd : Without the impact of this development, Darling Rd is fine just the way it is. Sure I would love to have a new surface and bigger turn lanes but there is no immediate need close Darling Rd because of current conditions. I believe that the major undeveloped parcels on Darling Rd could be developed under current zoning (Jefferson Township RSR, Gahanna ER2 ) without requiring a complete rebuild or closure of Darling Rd. It is the change in zoning to allow more lots and the curb cut to Reynoldsburg New Albany Rd that is causing the developer to attempt to evade the full cost of this development on Darling and Rovilla Roads. The major parcels of this project have significant frontage on both streets and by turning the development “inside out” the developer is attempting to claim they are having no impact on Darling or Rovilla and therefore should not shoulder any burden of the impact on Darling or Rovilla. The opposite is true. Closing Darling Rd to through traffic is a major impact to safety and security of the residents currently living on Darling and Rovilla. We would be forced to get onto Reynoldsburg New Albany Rd when there is no requirement now. I would invite anyone to come out to Rovilla or Havens Rd during rush hour and attempt to make a left hand turn (north across traffic).

Conclusion : It is clear from the proposal that the developer recognizes the continued need for full Darling Road access and proposes it's closure only as a means to assure that the cost of road improvements be a burden to the City and not the developer, as it is certain that the re-opening of it will be a necessity sometime in the future when the developer is long gone. Based on the harm caused by the closure of Darling Rd to the nearby and adjacent properties alone, this proposed development should be denied by the Planning Commission. It would be far easier for the developer to submit a plan that properly addressed the impact to Darling and Rovilla Roads now, and not leave this burden for the City. On this point, I request that Council reject this pre-annexation agreement.

I expect to be attending the Monday night COTW and I would be glad to clarify anything and add additional comments if you desire.

Please call me anytime @ 614-406-2870

Thank you so much for listening,

Rob Sander

## Kayla Holbrook

---

**From:** Michael Blackford  
**Sent:** Friday, July 01, 2016 4:38 PM  
**To:** Council  
**Cc:** Tom Kneeland; Anthony Jones  
**Subject:** Darling Road Annexation  
**Attachments:** Darling Road Annexation Pro Forma.xlsx

Good afternoon,

Attached is a spreadsheet that looks at single family and condominium developments approved in the last 15 or so years in Jefferson Twp. Please see the tab labeled "Jefferson Twp Properties". This is in response to Council's request for development data for Jefferson Twp. Also included in this email is a brief explanation to Councilwoman McGregor's question regarding the differences between an overlay and a PUD.

What is the difference between a PUD and an overlay text? Generally speaking, overlay's are more restrictive than code. Overlay's must comply with the underline zoning designation and meet all minimum requirements of the district. Overlay's can have more stringent standards than code but cannot grant less restrictive standards. For example, if the Darling Road project were to be rezoned to Single Family 3 with an overlay the zoning classification would be L-SF3. Minimum lot size for SF3 is 11,000 square feet. The overlay could require a greater minimum lot size, 15,000 square feet, but could not permit a smaller lot size, 8,000 square feet, without a variance.

Please let me know if you have any questions. Thanks and have a great July 4<sup>th</sup> weekend!

### **MICHAEL BLACKFORD, AICP**

Deputy Director  
Department of Planning & Development



CITY OF GAHANNA

200 S. Hamilton Rd.  
Gahanna, Ohio 43230  
614-342-4029  
614-342-4129 (fax)  
[michael.blackford@gahanna.gov](mailto:michael.blackford@gahanna.gov)  
[www.Gahanna.gov](http://www.Gahanna.gov)  
[www.facebook.com/CityofGahanna](https://www.facebook.com/CityofGahanna)  
[Twitter@CityOfGahanna](https://twitter.com/CityOfGahanna)

## Kayla Holbrook

---

**From:** Heidi S <xloveyourqueen@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Sunday, June 26, 2016 5:08 PM  
**To:** Council  
**Subject:** Darling Road development

I'm writing to express my opinion as well as the opinion of many of my friends in the area. The land on Darling road needs to stay rural and in keeping with the nature of Jefferson township. I hope the council is listening to the people they are representing! The people of Gahanna and also of Black are highly opposed to the annexation and re zoning of this land.

**HIGHLY OPPOSED.**

This would be a disaster for traffic, schools, and the emergency services. It is crowded enough already in these rural byways which we need to keep in order to preserve the land for future generations.

Please do not consider allowing M/I homes to destroy our neighborhood



Virus-free. [www.avast.com](http://www.avast.com)

## Kayla Holbrook

---

**From:** Nancy Mcgregor  
**Sent:** Wednesday, June 29, 2016 11:29 AM  
**To:** Kayla Holbrook  
**Subject:** FW: NO on the M/I Homes

---

**From:** Brenda Hoffman [hoffman.brendar@gmail.com]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, June 29, 2016 9:55 AM  
**To:** Nancy Mcgregor  
**Subject:** RE: NO on the M/I Homes

Nancy,

Thank you for your response and great explanation. I wholly agree with your point on M/I in Jefferson Township. It needs to be put back to the residents. Thank you again. Brenda

On Jun 28, 2016 10:13 PM, "Nancy Mcgregor" <[Nancy.Mcgregor@gahanna.gov](mailto:Nancy.Mcgregor@gahanna.gov)> wrote:

Hi Brenda,

Thank you for writing to me with your opinion on the proposed MI project. I have not had access to my email due to technical issues the last few days.

I will address some of your concerns.

1. The city recognizes the costs that are associated with a new residential development. We are creating a "New Community Authority" NCA that raises money for future repairs and costs. The city has looked at the costs to the city from this development for the next 30 years and beyond- road repair, road replacement, storm water systems, park usage, police call etc. It comes to about \$99K/year. It will take about 7 mills to raise that much money. The money raised from the 7 mills will be put into a fund administered by 7 people appointed by council. Each of the properties within this development and others that may follow will pay 7 mills added onto their property tax bill. New Albany has had a NCA for years. It was developed so that the new housing and businesses in New Albany would pay an extra tax to help pay for, in their case, the school system. It was so the original New Albany people would not be taxed out of existence with all the new needs of the growing city.

2. The school superintendent was asked to weigh in on the potential of additional students. He said at this price point, they estimate .5 students per house. We heard last night that these are 2 bedroom houses with a bonus room.

3. Gahanna will be responsible for police, streets, storm water. Jefferson Township will be responsible for fire service, police and fire.

My concerns right now are the closing of Darling Rd. and the fact that MI started out asking to build in the township. It was more dense than allowed and there was a lot of resistance to the project. Jefferson Township never voted on the project, it was withdrawn. Then MI came to Gahanna to see about annexing. I don't like Gahanna being the fall back position when MI never tried to negotiate with the township.

I don't like the idea of closing Darling Road. It seems like a bad plan to close the middle part of a road.

This all being said, the houses look lovely. The lots are somewhat wider and shallower to accommodate the ranches. There is 21 acres of open space around the perimeter of the project, like a green necklace. It is a price point that will be attractive to some buyers.

Thanks so much,

Nancy McGregor  
Gahanna Council Member

---

From: Brenda Hoffman [[hoffman.brendar@gmail.com](mailto:hoffman.brendar@gmail.com)]  
Sent: Sunday, June 26, 2016 10:33 PM  
To: Council  
Subject: NO on the M/I Homes Annex

What are you people thinking?

NO.  
NO MORE.

When will Gahanna stop acting like a spoiled college kid with a credit card?  
We cannot afford the growth that has already been forced on us.

Our resources are strained.  
Our services are diminished, and all we hear about as home owners is what the City is buy, implementing, doing, hiring, building and proposing when we can't afford what we already have.  
Some of us are RETIRED ON FIXED INCOMES.  
MY TAX BILL IS LOOKING LIKE RENT AND I GET LESS NOW THAN EVER despite being responsible and paying off my home years ago.

You people are forcing the retirees out.

This City lacks appropriate services for the current population, and should be FLUSH financially before anything doing more.

We were lied to about Stoneridge.  
It has NEVER been what we were sold.

We were lied to about Creekside.  
What a mess.  
What an expensive mess that eats up City crew time when you haven't even got all the cul de sacs cleared- there's City people cleaning Creekside.

The Kroger/Clark Hall stuff was a dirty deal and purposefully done without voter input.

We can't trust you people. All you do is Spend, Spend, Spend.

GROWTH IS NOT PROGRESS.  
ENOUGH!

Brenda R Hoffman  
279 Highmeadow Drive  
Gahanna, OH 43230-1749

## Kayla Holbrook

---

**From:** Jennifer Teal  
**Sent:** Monday, July 25, 2016 5:16 PM  
**To:** Council; Shane Ewald  
**Subject:** FW: Proposed annexation  
**Attachments:** 20160725093553341.pdf

FYI—received earlier today.

**JENNIFER TEAL**  
City Administrator



200 S. Hamilton Rd.  
Gahanna, Ohio 43230  
614.342.4045  
614.342.4167(fax)  
[jennifer.teal@gahanna.gov](mailto:jennifer.teal@gahanna.gov)  
[www.Gahanna.gov](http://www.Gahanna.gov)  
Twitter @CityOfGahanna

---

**From:** Don M. Casto III [mailto:DCasto@castoinfo.com]  
**Sent:** Monday, July 25, 2016 9:38 AM  
**To:** Jennifer Teal <Jennifer.Teal@gahanna.gov>  
**Subject:** Proposed annexation

### Cheryl Holmes

Executive Assistant  
250 Civic Center Dr  
| Suite 500  
Columbus, Ohio  
43215  
P: 614-744-2047  
F: 614-221-4527



## Kayla Holbrook

---

**From:** Nancy Mcgregor  
**Sent:** Friday, July 15, 2016 12:27 AM  
**To:** Kayla Holbrook  
**Subject:** FW: Proposed Darling Road Annexation

---

**From:** Nancy Mcgregor  
**Sent:** Thursday, July 14, 2016 10:32 PM  
**To:** Linda Holliday  
**Subject:** RE: Proposed Darling Road Annexation

Dear Linda,  
Thanks for the email. I appreciate you giving me some history about your property.

I told your brother that I remember your dad bringing a team of horses into Gahanna for the Flea Market. Everyone loved the rides. I manned that post several years for the Historical Society.

Thanks again,  
Nancy McGregor

---

**From:** Linda Holliday [lholliday57@gmail.com]  
**Sent:** Thursday, June 30, 2016 4:33 PM  
**To:** Council  
**Subject:** Proposed Darling Road Annexation

Dear Members of Council,

First thank you in advance for taking time to read this letter. I'm writing in regards to the Darling Road MI Home proposed development. I'm Linda Kitsmiller Holliday one of the four property owners.

Let me start by saying selling this property was a very heart felt decision for me. It has been in my family for many years. However my circumstances changed in 2007 when my husband passed away unexpectedly. Even though the land is currently farmed, there are barns and a house which I'm unable to maintain. Both my parents gave their blessing before they passed for my brother and me to sell the land. They realized that in due time it would become a burden to us in terms of maintaining. In later years, my father mentioned many times that he was both pleased and proud of land he had sold that became Kitsmiller's Crossing. I'm convinced that he would also be very pleased and proud of the development MI is proposing for the property. I also feel that it would be a great asset to the current surrounding neighbors and developments as well to the city of Gahanna.

And one last note before I close, MI Homes did work very hard and diligently with Jefferson Township trying to reach a positive resolution for the planned development before coming to Gahanna with the proposed plan. As social media and much gossip continues surrounding this annexation I truly feel many have not received all the facts.

Thank you again for your time and consideration on this proposed development. It is truly appreciated.

Sincerely,  
Linda Holliday  
[lholliday57@gmail.com](mailto:lholliday57@gmail.com)



## Kayla Holbrook

---

**From:** Tom Kneeland  
**Sent:** Monday, July 11, 2016 4:16 PM  
**To:** Council  
**Cc:** Anthony Jones; Dottie Franey; Jennifer Teal; Shane Ewald  
**Subject:** FW: Response to JT's document

Please see the attached data that I had sent to Marla in response to the letter that was just forwarded to council and which was received by us from the Township. Our response was sent on Friday.

Feel free to call if there are any questions.

Thanks

### **TOM KNEELAND**

Mayor



CITY OF GAHANNA  
200 S. Hamilton Rd.  
Gahanna, Ohio 43230  
614.342.4045  
[tom.kneeland@gahanna.gov](mailto:tom.kneeland@gahanna.gov)  
[www.Gahanna.gov](http://www.Gahanna.gov)  
Twitter @CityOfGahanna

---

**From:** Niel Jurist  
**Sent:** Monday, July 11, 2016 4:10 PM  
**To:** Tom Kneeland  
**Subject:** Response to JT's document

Mayor,  
Below is what I sent over to Marla regarding the concerns raised by Jefferson Township.

Thanks,  
Niel

## **Darling Road Pre-Annexation Agreement**

### **Response to concerns raised by Jefferson-Township**

- The City of Gahanna has had multiple meetings with the Jefferson Township Trustees throughout the process to gain a better understanding of their concerns.
- The City made a concerted effort to address the Township's concerns throughout the negotiation of the pre-annexation agreement.
- The City negotiated a density that more closely aligns with that of the township.

- The proposed project type, which are high-end executive level homes will meet the current market demands of the community. This project also meets the City’s goals identified in the Mayor’s [Commitment to Gahanna 10 –point plan](#) to *“Implement and maintain a comprehensive economic development plan that will excel at business development, job creation, and revenue growth.”*
- The City is not providing any financial incentives on this project.
- Every jurisdiction including Jefferson Township, the Gahanna-Jefferson School district, the City of Gahanna and other county entities will be fully compensated from this project according to their current tax rates.
- This project is providing additional residential customers to create more revenue for the Jefferson Township Water and Sewer District.
- The City is responding to a request from a Jefferson Township resident for annexation to the City of Gahanna.
- The City of Gahanna will provide full-service police protection and street maintenance for the project.

**Mayor’s Quote:**

“We will continue to partner with our neighbors to encourage compatible developments with comparable average densities and a high quality product type.”

**NIEL M. JURIST**  
Public Information Manager



CITY OF GAHANNA

200 S. Hamilton Rd.  
Gahanna, Ohio 43230  
614.342.4043  
614.342.4144(fax)  
[niel.jurist@gahanna.gov](mailto:niel.jurist@gahanna.gov)  
[www.Gahanna.gov](http://www.Gahanna.gov)



## Kayla Holbrook

---

**From:** Stephen Renner  
**Sent:** Monday, August 01, 2016 10:06 AM  
**To:** Council  
**Cc:** Tom Kneeland  
**Subject:** FW: Statement on Darling Rd. development  
**Attachments:** Position Statement from GJPS on the Proposed Annexation of the 63.pdf

Colleagues,

Please see the attached statement from the schools which apparently they plan to read this evening.

Furthermore, you may have seen the Dispatch article published today on the M/I homes projects. At the very end of the article, it insinuates two things: (1) that I called the 7 mil a tax, and (2) that I gave a specific number of revenue to the city. Neither is true. I did try to teach the reporter where she can find all the public records, most specifically the proforma spreadsheet, etc. I also was clear that the surcharge revenue would go to the NCA as it is written in the agreement, and the NCA would in turn use these funds to pay for expenses of the development. Finally, I was very clear that we (Council) have not yet discussed the details of the NCA or even the relationship between the City and the NCA. Will be making this clear this evening.

Thanks  
Stephen

Stephen A. Renner  
Council Member, Ward 1  
City of Gahanna  
(614) 316-1280

---

**From:** piccolantonio@gjps.org [piccolantonio@gjps.org]  
**Sent:** Sunday, July 31, 2016 10:23 PM  
**To:** Tom Kneeland; Stephen Renner  
**Cc:** barretts@gjps.org  
**Subject:** Statement on Darling Rd. development

Mayor Kneeland and President Renner (Tom & Stephen),

In follow up to several conversations we've had, the Board and Superintendent, Steve, want to provide the city and council with a clear statement of how the discussed Darling Rd. project impacts the school district. Daphne, Steve, and I plan to be at the council meeting tomorrow night and one of us will read the statement. Please don't hesitate to give Steve or me a call tomorrow with any questions. Thanks.

Beryl and Steve

Sent from my iPhone

Beryl Brown Piccolantonio  
President, Gahanna-Jefferson board of education  
[PiccolantonioB@gjps.org](mailto:PiccolantonioB@gjps.org)

Personal Cell: (614) 286-2766

## Kayla Holbrook

---

**From:** Nancy Mcgregor  
**Sent:** Tuesday, June 28, 2016 11:01 PM  
**To:** Kayla Holbrook  
**Subject:** FW: Darling Road development

FYI

---

**From:** Nancy Mcgregor  
**Sent:** Tuesday, June 28, 2016 10:15 PM  
**To:** Heidi S  
**Subject:** RE: Darling Road development

Hi Heidi,

Thank you for writing to me with your opinion on the proposed MI project. I have not had access to my email due to technical issues the last few days.

I will address some of your concerns.

1. The city recognizes the costs that are associated with a new residential development. We are creating a "New Community Authority" NCA that raises money for future repairs and costs. The city has looked at the costs to the city from this development for the next 30 years and beyond- road repair, road replacement, storm water systems, park usage, police call etc. It comes to about \$99K/year. It will take about 7 mills to raise that much money. The money raised from the 7 mills will be put into a fund administered by 7 people appointed by council. Each of the properties within this development and others that may follow will pay 7 mills added onto their property tax bill. New Albany has had a NCA for years. It was developed so that the new housing and businesses in New Albany would pay an extra tax to help pay for, in their case, the school system. It was so the original New Albany people would not be taxed out of existence with all the new needs of the growing city.

2. The school superintendent was asked to weigh in on the potential of additional students. He said at this price point, they estimate .5 students per house. We heard last night that these are 2 bedroom houses with a bonus room.

3. Gahanna will be responsible for police, streets, storm water. Jefferson Township will be responsible for fire service, police and fire.

My concerns right now are the closing of Darling Rd. and the fact that MI started out asking to build in the township. It was more dense than allowed and there was a lot of resistance to the project. Jefferson Township never voted on the project, it was withdrawn. Then MI came to Gahanna to see about annexing. I don't like Gahanna being the fall back position when MI never tried to negotiate with the township.

I don't like the idea of closing Darling Road. It seems like a bad plan to close the middle part of a road.

This all being said, the houses look lovely. The lots are somewhat wider and shallower to accommodate the ranches. There is 21 acres of open space around the perimeter of the project, like a green necklace. It is a price point that will be attractive to some buyers.

Thanks so much,  
Nancy

**From:** Heidi S [xloveyourqueen@gmail.com]

**Sent:** Sunday, June 26, 2016 5:07 PM

**To:** Council

**Subject:** Darling Road development

I'm writing to express my opinion as well as the opinion of many of my friends in the area. The land on Darling road needs to stay rural and in keeping with the nature of Jefferson township. I hope the council is listening to the people they are representing! The people of Gahanna and also of Black are highly opposed to the annexation and re zoning of this land.

**HIGHLY OPPOSED.**

This would be a disaster for traffic, schools, and the emergency services. It is crowded enough already in these rural byways which we need to keep in order to preserve the land for future generations.

Please do not consider allowing M/I homes to destroy our neighborhood



Virus-free. [www.avast.com](http://www.avast.com)

## Kayla Holbrook

---

**From:** Nancy Mcgregor  
**Sent:** Friday, July 15, 2016 12:26 AM  
**To:** Kayla Holbrook  
**Subject:** FW: Darling Road Property

---

**From:** Nancy Mcgregor  
**Sent:** Thursday, July 14, 2016 10:23 PM  
**To:** Gary Kitsmiller  
**Subject:** RE: Darling Road Property

Dear Gary and Sandy,  
Thanks for your email. I appreciate you giving us the facts about the sale of your property.

I remember your dad fondly. He brought a team of horses to the Flea Market for years. Everyone loved the wagon rides. He was so patient to do that for the Historical Society.

Thanks so much,  
Nancy McGregor

---

**From:** Gary Kitsmiller [gkitsmil@columbus.rr.com]  
**Sent:** Thursday, June 30, 2016 10:26 AM  
**To:** Council  
**Subject:** Darling Road Property

To Members of Gahanna City Council:

We are one of the principal property owners of the Darling Road parcels that currently are under review for annexation to the City of Gahanna. Please know how much we appreciate council considering the possible annexation of this property.

However, we are very concerned about the misinformation that has spread so rapidly on emails and social media during the past few days. Some of it is astonishing and completely inaccurate.

Our hope is that the ultimate decision is made based on sound facts and thoughtful deliberation.

Our desire to sell the property is primarily based on our age and increasing inability to take care of it as well as we would like and as it should be. We feel the project as proposed offers a unique opportunity for the City of Gahanna to gain an upscale community which provides additional revenue and complements Hannah Park, Hannah Farms and Kitsmiller's Crossing. It was the same opportunity that MI Homes presented to Jefferson Township officials over nearly one year of negotiation. Having met numerous change requests by Township officials, including significant reduction in density, MI Homes presumed we had an agreement; however, the Township officials changed their minds at the last minute.

Again, thank you for your consideration. Should you ever have any questions for us, we would be glad to discuss them with you.

Gary and Sandi Kitsmiller  
918 Old Pine Dr  
Gahanna, OH 43230  
614-855-9586  
[kitsmiller.1@osu.edu](mailto:kitsmiller.1@osu.edu)



## Kayla Holbrook

---

**From:** Nancy Mcgregor  
**Sent:** Tuesday, June 28, 2016 11:03 PM  
**To:** Kayla Holbrook  
**Subject:** FW: Kitsmiller - MI development

---

**From:** Nancy Mcgregor  
**Sent:** Tuesday, June 28, 2016 10:24 PM  
**To:** Justin Sanford  
**Subject:** RE: Kitsmiller - MI development

Hi Justin,

Thanks for the email of a differing opinion I am copying my response that I have sent to others.

\*\*\*Thank you for writing to me with your opinion on the proposed MI project. I have not had access to my email due to technical issues the last few days.  
I will address some of your concerns.

1. The city recognizes the costs that are associated with a new residential development. We are creating a "New Community Authority" NCA that raises money for future repairs and costs. The city has looked at the costs to the city from this development for the next 30 years and beyond- road repair, road replacement, storm water systems, park usage, police call etc. It comes to about \$99K/year. It will take about 7 mills to raise that much money. The money raised from the 7 mills will be put into a fund administered by 7 people appointed by council. Each of the properties within this development and others that may follow will pay 7 mills added onto their property tax bill. New Albany has had a NCA for years. It was developed so that the new housing and businesses in New Albany would pay an extra tax to help pay for, in their case, the school system. It was so the original New Albany people would not be taxed out of existence with all the new needs of the growing city.

2. The school superintendent was asked to weigh in on the potential of additional students. He said at this price point, they estimate .5 students per house. We heard last night that these are 2 bedroom houses with a bonus room.

3. Gahanna will be responsible for police, streets, storm water. Jefferson Township will be responsible for fire service, police and fire.

My concerns right now are the closing of Darling Rd. and the fact that MI started out asking to build in the township. It was more dense than allowed and there was a lot of resistance to the project. Jefferson Township never voted on the project, it was withdrawn. Then MI came to Gahanna to see about annexing. I don't like Gahanna being the fall back position when MI never tried to negotiate with the township.

I don't like the idea of closing Darling Road. It seems like a bad plan to close the middle part of a road.

This all being said, the houses look lovely. The lots are somewhat wider and shallower to accommodate the ranches. There is 21 acres of open space around the perimeter of the project, like a green necklace. It is a price point that will be attractive to some buyers.\*\*\*

This is a long process and this is the start. The city is trying to offset some of the expenses that come with residential development. Thanks for weighing in.

Thanks so much,  
Nancy McGregor  
City Council Member

---

**From:** Justin Sanford [jsan0900@gmail.com]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, June 28, 2016 6:47 PM  
**To:** Council  
**Subject:** Kitsmiller - MI development

Members of Council,

I hope this email finds you prior to any decision rendered on the proposed development for the property off of Darling Rd. As a resident and proponent of seeing the City of Gahanna prosper, I hope that you might simply look at the Hannah Park and Kitsmiller Crossing developments as reference of what a great addition this proposal might mean to the northeast quadrant of the city.

As the naysayers might contest, congestion and student population at the high school, as their chief concerns, I would argue the Clark State - Hamilton Rd roundabout is designed specifically for such an increase and given recent discussions with school officials for facility upgrades, expansions and modifications, that neither be a consideration to deny such a proposal. As I understand it, this development is not designated a single family neighborhood but one that appeals to a more mature couple looking to downsize and find roots in a prospering city that will bring a much needed revenue taxable for our city.

So I encourage you to consider more than just a few social media signatures and weigh the most positive of benefits to the City of Gahanna. This would be a great development and one that would certainly be a highlight to our city.

Thank you  
Justin Sanford  
614-580-0900

## Kayla Holbrook

---

**From:** Tom Kneeland  
**Sent:** Monday, July 11, 2016 4:07 PM  
**To:** Kim Banning; Kayla Holbrook  
**Subject:** FW: Letter - MI Homes Darling Rd.  
**Attachments:** Jefferson Township Letter (7.11.16).pdf

Sorry. You two weren't copied when this went out a few minutes ago.

### TOM KNEELAND

Mayor



CITY OF GAHANNA

200 S. Hamilton Rd.

Gahanna, Ohio 43230

614.342.4045

[tom.kneeland@gahanna.gov](mailto:tom.kneeland@gahanna.gov)

[www.Gahanna.gov](http://www.Gahanna.gov)

Twitter @CityOfGahanna

---

**From:** Rita Westhoff  
**Sent:** Monday, July 11, 2016 4:06 PM  
**To:** Jennifer Teal; Anthony Jones; Council Members  
**Cc:** Tom Kneeland  
**Subject:** FW: Letter - MI Homes Darling Rd.

Good afternoon,

Please see the attached letter from Jefferson Township.

Thank you,

### RITA WESTHOFF

Administrative Assistant

Mayor's Office



CITY OF GAHANNA

200 S. Hamilton Rd.

Gahanna, Ohio 43230

614.342.4044

614.342.4144(fax)

[rita.westhoff@gahanna.gov](mailto:rita.westhoff@gahanna.gov)

[www.Gahanna.gov](http://www.Gahanna.gov)

[www.Facebook.com/CityofGahanna](https://www.facebook.com/CityofGahanna)

Twitter @CityOfGahanna

[www.YouTube.com/CityOfGahanna](https://www.YouTube.com/CityOfGahanna)

## Kayla Holbrook

---

**From:** Nancy Mcgregor  
**Sent:** Friday, July 15, 2016 12:26 AM  
**To:** Kayla Holbrook  
**Subject:** FW: MI annexation

---

**From:** Nancy Mcgregor  
**Sent:** Thursday, July 14, 2016 10:52 PM  
**To:** Mark Deeds  
**Subject:** RE: MI annexation

Hi Mr. Deeds,

One of the things I want to ask MI is about a left turn lane and/or a deceleration lane for right turns. Not only is there a lot of traffic on Reynoldsburg New Albany but the traffic is fast.

Thanks so much,  
Nancy McGregor

---

**From:** Mark Deeds [madeed@gmail.com]  
**Sent:** Monday, July 04, 2016 9:06 PM  
**To:** Mayor; Anthony Jones; jamie.leesburg@gahanna.gov; Stephen Renner; Michael Schnetzer; Brian Larick; Karen Angelou; Brian Metzbower; Nancy Mcgregor; Planning Commission  
**Subject:** MI annexation

Hello all,

I am writing you all in reference to the request by MI homes to annex the properties associated with their Darling Rd project.

I do live on Reynoldsburg New Albany Rd. just one property south of the proposed entrance, maybe 100 feet. I do have issue with the fact that they are only going to have a mere 50 feet of frontage on this busy, busy road. Ok now add 200 more automobiles using this road, and yes slowing down, stopping & getting on the road in front of my property. I have looked at other new developments on this road and took note, they all seem to have taken on much more frontage on this busy road. In my opinion I believe MI needs to take more ownership of the road that is making it possible to get back to their property. It seems MI has forgot that the entry could be a good point of displaying their development.

Just my 2 cents worth, but something I feel you should consider.

Respectfully,  
Mr. Deeds

## Kayla Holbrook

---

**From:** Nancy Mcgregor  
**Sent:** Tuesday, June 28, 2016 11:02 PM  
**To:** Kayla Holbrook  
**Subject:** FW: MI Pre-annexation Agreement

---

**From:** Nancy Mcgregor  
**Sent:** Tuesday, June 28, 2016 10:19 PM  
**To:** Laurie Jacques  
**Subject:** RE: MI Pre-annexation Agreement

Hi Laurie,

Thank you for writing to me with your opinion on the proposed MI project. I have not had access to my email due to technical issues the last few days.

I will try to address some of your concerns.

1. The city recognizes the costs that are associated with a new residential development. We are creating a "New Community Authority" NCA that raises money for future repairs and costs. The city has looked at the costs to the city from this development for the next 30 years and beyond- road repair, road replacement, storm water systems, park usage, police call etc. It comes to about \$99K/year. It will take about 7 mills to raise that much money. The money raised from the 7 mills will be put into a fund administered by 7 people appointed by council. Each of the properties within this development and others that may follow will pay 7 mills added onto their property tax bill. New Albany has had a NCA for years. It was developed so that the new housing and businesses in New Albany would pay an extra tax to help pay for, in their case, the school system. It was so the original New Albany people would not be taxed out of existence with all the new needs of the growing city.

2. The school superintendent was asked to weigh in on the potential of additional students. He said at this price point, they estimate .5 students per house. We heard last night that these are 2 bedroom houses with a bonus room.

3. Gahanna will be responsible for police, streets, storm water. Jefferson Township will be responsible for fire service, police and fire.

My concerns right now are the closing of Darling Rd. and the fact that MI started out asking to build in the township. It was more dense than allowed and there was a lot of resistance to the project. Jefferson Township never voted on the project, it was withdrawn. Then MI came to Gahanna to see about annexing. I don't like Gahanna being the fall back position when MI never tried to negotiate with the township.

I don't like the idea of closing Darling Road. It seems like a bad plan to close the middle part of a road.

This all being said, the houses look lovely. The lots are somewhat wider and shallower to accommodate the ranches. There is 21 acres of open space around the perimeter of the project, like a green necklace. It is a price point that will be attractive to some buyers.

Thanks so much,  
Nancy McGregor  
City Council Member

---

**From:** Laurie Jacques [ljacques121@gmail.com]  
**Sent:** Monday, June 27, 2016 5:32 PM

**To:** Council

**Subject:** MI Pre-annexation Agreement

Dear Council Members:

I am writing to encourage you to delay action on this agreement until you have had the opportunity to consider citizen input. I appreciate that this land will eventually be developed. However, it is grating to learn that MI thinks Gahanna will embrace yet another maximum density (SF3) development, especially one that did not meet the approval of a neighboring community. Other communities benefit by setting development standards higher than maximum density. I hope that Gahanna will learn to do the same.

Best regards,  
Laurie Jacques

## Kayla Holbrook

---

**From:** Stephen Renner  
**Sent:** Monday, August 01, 2016 6:28 PM  
**To:** Council  
**Subject:** Fwd: Request to Table M/I Pre-Annexation Agreement

FYI.

Begin forwarded message:

**From:** Kevin Zeppernick <[KZeppernick@MIHOMES.com](mailto:KZeppernick@MIHOMES.com)>  
**Date:** August 1, 2016 at 5:44:09 PM EDT  
**To:** "[Stephen.renner@gahanna.gov](mailto:Stephen.renner@gahanna.gov)" <[Stephen.renner@gahanna.gov](mailto:Stephen.renner@gahanna.gov)>  
**Cc:** "[kim.banning@gahanna.gov](mailto:kim.banning@gahanna.gov)" <[kim.banning@gahanna.gov](mailto:kim.banning@gahanna.gov)>, "[Anthony.Jones@gahanna.gov](mailto:Anthony.Jones@gahanna.gov)" <[Anthony.Jones@gahanna.gov](mailto:Anthony.Jones@gahanna.gov)>, "[aaron@uhlfirm.com](mailto:aaron@uhlfirm.com)" <[aaron@uhlfirm.com](mailto:aaron@uhlfirm.com)>  
**Subject:** Request to Table M/I Pre-Annexation Agreement

Councilman Renner,

We respectfully request to table our pre-annexation vote tonight in relation to our proposed Weldon project. We are aggressively addressing some new information for this project and doing everything we can to structure a true "Win-Win" for all parties involved. I will be in touch very soon to discuss next steps.

Thank you!

Kevin

Kevin Zeppernick | Vice President  
Land | M/I Homes of Central Ohio, LLC  
Office: (614) 418-8608<tel:(614)%20418-8608> | Mobile: (614) 439-2688<tel:(614)%20439-2688> |  
3 Easton Oval | 310 | Columbus, Oh<x-apple-data-detectors://4/1> | 43219  
[kzeppernick@mihomes.com](mailto:kzeppernick@mihomes.com) <<mailto:kzeppernick@mihomes.com>>

## Kayla Holbrook

---

**From:** Brian Larick  
**Sent:** Monday, June 27, 2016 11:03 AM  
**To:** Anthony Jones  
**Cc:** Council  
**Subject:** Jefferson

Anthony, some questions:

1-How many developments have been added in Jefferson in the last 15 years? (SF and MF) 2-In each development:

A-What is the density?

B-The number of units?

C-Price point?

4-Statement, from the school administration, stating the impact of the development on the schools as well as their position (stating objection or no objection at a minimum).

5-What is the Density, price point and units of Hannah Farms?

Brian



## Kayla Holbrook

---

**From:** Justin Sanford <jsan0900@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, June 28, 2016 6:47 PM  
**To:** Council  
**Subject:** Kitsmiller - MI development

Members of Council,

I hope this email finds you prior to any decision rendered on the proposed development for the property off of Darling Rd. As a resident and proponent of seeing the City of Gahanna prosper, I hope that you might simply look at the Hannah Park and Kitsmiller Crossing developments as reference of what a great addition this proposal might mean to the northeast quadrant of the city.

As the naysayers might contest, congestion and student population at the high school, as their chief concerns, I would argue the Clark State - Hamilton Rd roundabout is designed specifically for such an increase and given recent discussions with school officials for facility upgrades, expansions and modifications, that neither be a consideration to deny such a proposal. As I understand it, this development is not designated a single family neighborhood but one that appeals to a more mature couple looking to downsize and find roots in a prospering city that will bring a much needed revenue taxable for our city.

So I encourage you to consider more than just a few social media signatures and weigh the most positive of benefits to the City of Gahanna. This would be a great development and one that would certainly be a highlight to our city.

Thank you  
Justin Sanford  
614-580-0900

## Kayla Holbrook

---

**From:** Kim Banning  
**Sent:** Wednesday, July 27, 2016 5:32 PM  
**To:** Council  
**Subject:** Ltr from Jefferson Township Brd of Trustees Re: Darling Road  
**Attachments:** 20160727171416662.pdf

Good afternoon all,

I received this letter in the mail today relating to comments made by Anthony regarding the Darling Road Annexation. I've attached the link to the article they are referring to for your convenience.

<http://www.thisweeknews.com/content/stories/gahanna/news/2016/07/12/mi-homes-development-jefferson-trustees-emphatically-oppose-plan.html>

**KIMBERLY BANNING, CMC**

*(formerly McWilliams)*

**Clerk of Council**

CITY OF GAHANNA

200 S. Hamilton Rd.

Gahanna, OH 43230

614.342.4090

614.342.4190(fax)

[kim.banning@gahanna.gov](mailto:kim.banning@gahanna.gov)

[www.Gahanna.gov](http://www.Gahanna.gov)

## Kayla Holbrook

---

**From:** Jennifer Teal  
**Sent:** Tuesday, July 26, 2016 7:39 PM  
**To:** Council; Tom Kneeland; Anthony Jones; Michael Blackford  
**Subject:** Fwd: Darling Rd Issue  
**Attachments:** 072616\_ Panzano Letter to Gahanna re Darling Road Issue.pdf; ATT00001.htm

FYI

Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

**From:** PHYLLIS <[phyllis.panzano@dssincorporated.com](mailto:phyllis.panzano@dssincorporated.com)>  
**Date:** July 26, 2016 at 4:19:45 PM EDT  
**To:** <[jennifer.teal@gahanna.gov](mailto:jennifer.teal@gahanna.gov)>  
**Cc:** Vince Panzano <[vpanzano@outlook.com](mailto:vpanzano@outlook.com)>  
**Subject:** Darling Rd Issue

Dear Ms. Teal,

Please see our attached letter of support for community petitions that are now circulating in Jefferson Township and Gahanna opposing the current M/I Home Darling Road development proposal. Due to our travel schedules, it is not feasible to sign those petitions. This letter is submitted in lieu of signing a petition.

Respectfully,

Phyllis C. and Vincent L. Panzano

Phyllis C. Panzano, PhD  
President  
Decision Support Services, Inc.  
[dssinc@dssincorporated.com](mailto:dssinc@dssincorporated.com)  
614-221-1474

## Kayla Holbrook

---

**From:** Jennifer Teal  
**Sent:** Monday, July 25, 2016 11:28 AM  
**To:** Tom Kneeland; Council; Shane Ewald; Anthony Jones; Michael Blackford  
**Subject:** Fwd: Darling Road Development  
**Attachments:** image001.jpg; ATT00001.htm;  
A\_POLICY\_VIOLATED\_FILE\_WAS\_DETECTED\_AND\_REMOVED.TXT; ATT00002.htm

Forwarding at the request of Mr. Albers.

Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

**From:** "John Albers" <[john.albers@alberslaw.com](mailto:john.albers@alberslaw.com)>  
**To:** "Jennifer Teal" <[Jennifer.Teal@gahanna.gov](mailto:Jennifer.Teal@gahanna.gov)>  
**Subject:** Darling Road Development

Dear Ms. Teal,  
Attached please find Letters of Concern and a Petition in Opposition to the Pre-Annexation Agreement and Darling Road Development. Please circulate the same to City Council, The Mayor, and all concerned parties.  
Thank You,  
John Albers

## Kayla Holbrook

---

**From:** Jennifer Teal  
**Sent:** Tuesday, July 26, 2016 8:21 PM  
**To:** Council; Tom Kneeland; Anthony Jones; Michael Blackford  
**Subject:** Fwd: Letter concerning the proposed higher-density development proposed by M/I Homes  
**Attachments:** ATT00001.gif; ATT00001.htm; [Untitled].pdf; ATT00002.htm

FYI

Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

**From:** <[SIMAITJ1@nationwide.com](mailto:SIMAITJ1@nationwide.com)>  
**Date:** July 26, 2016 at 3:03:45 PM EDT  
**To:** <[jennifer.teal@gahanna.gov](mailto:jennifer.teal@gahanna.gov)>  
**Subject:** Letter concerning the proposed higher-density development proposed by M/I Homes

## Kayla Holbrook

---

**From:** Stephen Renner  
**Sent:** Monday, August 15, 2016 2:10 PM  
**To:** Council  
**Subject:** Fwd: M/I Homes Pre-Annexation Agreement

Colleagues,  
Please see the request below. A postponement of six months would be Feb 20, 2017.

Thanks  
Stephen

Begin forwarded message:

**From:** Aaron Underhill <[aaron@uhlfirm.com](mailto:aaron@uhlfirm.com)>  
**Date:** August 15, 2016 at 12:24:21 PM EDT  
**To:** "Stephen.renner@gahanna.gov" <[Stephen.renner@gahanna.gov](mailto:Stephen.renner@gahanna.gov)>  
**Cc:** Kevin Zeppernick <[KZeppernick@MIHOMES.com](mailto:KZeppernick@MIHOMES.com)>, "[kim.banning@gahanna.gov](mailto:kim.banning@gahanna.gov)" <[kim.banning@gahanna.gov](mailto:kim.banning@gahanna.gov)>  
**Subject:** M/I Homes Pre-Annexation Agreement

Mr. Renner,

Following up on our meeting last week, M/I has made the decision to make one more attempt to pursue the zoning in the township. We would like to request a tabling of the pre-annexation agreement for up to 6 months to leave open the possibility of returning this project to the City should negotiations with the township be unsuccessful. Please advise if you are willing to accommodate this request.

Thank you for your consideration.

Aaron L. Underhill

Sent from [Outlook Mobile](#)