



**HOUSE LOCAL GOVERNMENT COMMITTEE**  
**OPPONENT TESTIMONY ON HOUSE BILL 113 | JUNE 11, 2025**  
**Sarah Biehl, Policy Director**

Chair King, Vice Chair Kishman, Ranking Member Sims, and members of the House Local Government Committee, thank you for the opportunity to provide testimony on House Bill 113.

As a bipartisan coalition of mayors in Ohio's largest cities and suburbs, we know that local, regional, and statewide collaboration is critical to the success of our economy and our state, and that when we all work together, we are stronger.

HB 113 permits one local government entity - the county - to override and negate actions taken by other local governments and private land owners. HB 113 would undermine local control and exacerbate local tensions. It would also stifle economic and housing development growth Ohio desperately needs to alleviate property tax burdens, build safe and affordable housing, and foster the creation of good jobs that will support families. It is for these reasons that we submit this opposition testimony today.

Our objections to HB 113 fall into two main categories:

1. **The bill makes it harder to build housing that is desperately needed in Ohio.** HB 113 is fundamentally anti-development, undermining the progress Ohio needs to make in all parts of the state in building more housing of all types and at all price points to meet demand created by the economic development work local governments, the State, and private state and local entities have dedicated countless hours and resources to securing. HB 113 will result in less housing, higher housing costs, and higher property tax burdens across Ohio.
2. HB 113 **severely undermines the authority of municipalities to plan for future growth**, respond to rising housing demands, and responsibly expand their boundaries by placing veto authority over Type 2 annexation decisions between cities and private land owners in the hands of county commissioners. Rather than incentivizing cooperation and agreement among local stakeholders, developers, businesses, and property owners, this approach would exacerbate disagreements and tension.

### **HB 113 is Anti-Development**

In short, HB 113 works against, rather than in collaboration with, local governments to impose an anti-growth, anti-development point of view. This point of view is fundamentally counter to many of the initiatives, projects, programs, and business development goals we have shared with our state partners over the years, and threatens to undo progress many of our cities are making to better respond to local housing needs without precipitously increasing housing and property tax expenses for Ohio families.



Ohioans cannot hope to share in the benefits of large economic development opportunities without making room in our cities, villages, and townships for the new residents who are attracted to Ohio by new jobs and the high quality of life we all enjoy. To endorse the view that new housing developments are bad and should go elsewhere is to codify a “Not In My Backyard” approach statewide that essentially prioritizes the interests of a few over the financial security, housing stability, and job growth potential of the many. This approach is not sustainable and will work against our collective efforts to grow our economy if it is adopted.

### **HB 113 Undermines the Local Authority of Municipalities and Private Property Owners**

By granting county commissioners broad and subjective authority to deny annexation petitions based on an undefined “general good,” HB 113 denies municipalities the right to decide how best to accommodate local expansion and housing needs, and it denies property owners the right to decide how to use their land. Agreements to expand city boundaries and repurpose one’s land to develop needed housing rely on the cooperation of a large number of entities, including school districts, land owners, and municipalities, as well as private developers, business interests, and other stakeholders.

Community input and feedback are crucial parts of any annexation process, and finding agreement in such situations can sometimes lead to heated negotiations and passionate responses. As you know, rarely when one is trying to bring together stakeholders with varying interests and viewpoints is getting everyone on the same page easy. HB 113, however, would introduce a “trump card” into the discussions that has the potential to undo months and sometimes years of work to implement needed community projects. The provisions of this bill are, at best, unnecessary, and, at worst, an explicit cog in the already slow moving process of bringing money-making, economy-boosting development projects online in Ohio.

For these reasons, as well as for the reasons laid out in the testimony of the City of Huber Heights - one of our members - we urge you to decline to advance HB 113 out of committee. I’d be happy to answer any questions.