



**New Albany Architectural Review Board  
Meeting Minutes  
Monday, May 8, 2023**

**I. Call to order**

The New Albany Architectural Review Board met on May 8, 2023 in the New Albany Village Hall. Chair Hinson called the meeting to order at 7:02 p.m.

**II. Roll call**

Those answering roll call:

Mr. Hinson	present
Mr. Iten	present
Mr. Brown	present
Mr. Davie	present
Mr. Maletz	present
Ms. Moore	present
Mr. Strahler	present
Council Member Wiltrout	present

Having all members present, the board had a quorum to transact business.

Staff members present: Planner II Chris Christian; Planning Manager Steve Mayer; Planner Chelsea Nichols; Deputy Clerk Christina Madriguera.

**III. Action on minutes: April 10, 2023**

Chair Hinson asked whether there was any action on the minutes from the April 10, 2023 meeting.

Board Member Strahler moved to approve of the April 10, 2023 meeting minutes. Board Member Brown seconded the motion.

Upon roll call: Mr. Strahler, yes; Mr. Brown, yes; Mr. Iten, yes; Mr. Hinson, yes; Mr. Davie, yes; Mr. Maletz, yes; Ms. Moore, yes. Having 7 yes votes; 0 no votes; and 0 abstentions, the minutes were approved as submitted.

**IV. Additions or corrections to agenda**

Chair Hinson asked whether there were any additions or corrections to the agenda.

Planning Manager Mayer answered that there were none from staff.

Chair Hinson administered the oath to all present who wished to address the board.

**V. Other business**

Informal Presentation by Horus & Ra for Second and Third Street Development

Planning Manager Mayer presented an overview of the existing uses in New Albany's Historic Center and Core Residential District and the anticipated changes that would result if this development is approved. He explained the location of the proposed development and displayed a street map which included the Market Street and Third Street projects that were presented to the board in March 2023. He further stated that development of this area of New Albany's Historic Core District has been in the planning stage since the late '90s, and the city has been working with MKSK on a street grid network that would accommodate New Albany's urban center code requirements, the Strategic Plan, the goal of increasing street connectivity, and the private development.

Board Member Iten indicated the southern portion of Third Street on the diagram, and stated that, if this development progresses as anticipated this will all go away.

Planning Manager Mayer responded, it was currently anticipated that that portion of Third will be vacated. It has not yet been determined what will happen there, it may become developable space, or a pedestrian zone or a farmer's alley, or parking. Further discussions will take place.

Board Member Iten asked whether that, then, would drive more traffic to that alley.

Planning Manager Mayer responded that he did not think so, he thinks it will provide access to the New Albany exchange. Mr. Amr's team has conducted a traffic study that indicated that most cars in that area were trying to get to a primary street.

Chair Hinson asked whether the streets were 2-way.

Planning Manager Mayer answered yes, all the streets and alleys would be 2-way.

Board Member Strahler asked whether the northern alley, as it exists today, was already wide enough for 2 cars.

Planning Manager Mayer answered yes, it was 24-foot wide. So, it is similar in size to a narrow street. He further indicated that the interior streets would be 12-foot wide.

Board Member Strahler asked whether the northern alley [which would become Gingko Street] was owned by the City of New Albany.

Planning Manager Mayer answered yes, the city owns it.

Chair Hinson asked whether the 12-foot width of the streets was adequate for a 2-way street if cars are also parked on both sides of the street.

Planning Manager Mayer answered that there would not be enough room for 2 cars to pass if cars were also parked on both sides of the street, but the narrowness of the streets was intended to be a traffic-calming measure. This would be similar to other historic neighborhoods such as German Village and Merion Village. City staff had worked with their traffic consultant, MKSK, and their engineers to come up with a street plan that could be safely traveled by cars, residents, visitors, and also by emergency services vehicles.

Aaron Underhill, applicant and attorney 8000 Walton Parkway, stated that he frequently appeared before the Planning Commission and New Albany City Council, and it was a pleasure to appear before the Architectural Review Board. He said that this is a complicated and an exciting project and has been a long time in the making. He noted that a lot of the property would become right of way, and the developers were committed to making this area walkable and as beautiful as possible. He introduced Kareem Amr, the developer of the project.

Kareem Amr, applicant Horus & Ra 243 N. 5<sup>th</sup> Street, Suite 330; Columbus, thanked Steve, Chris, Chelsea, and the rest of the members of the planning team.

Mr. Amr delivered a slide presentation which displayed and described the New Albany Town Center Design Intent Package. He stated that he was not at the meeting seeking a vote, rather was appearing before the board informally and was seeking feedback on the concepts and layout prior to the next stage of development. He continued that the land consisted of 7 parcels, the development would consist of 3 subparcels, A – C, from west to east. The project brief slide indicated that the proposed project is a mixed-use development and with 88-market rate apartments, ranging from studio flats to 2-bedroom townhomes, and commercial retail space. He stated that a key component of their design was to keep with precedent and to refrain from proposing things that had not been done. Over 60% of the site had been dedicated to the city for right of way. This area of New Albany was ripe for development and activity. He stated that they would be seeking variances but those would be in what they felt was good taste.

Board Member Maletz asked whether the product would be for lease or for sale or both.

Mr. Amr responded that for now, they were proposed just for lease. He continued his explanation of the site plan, and the 3 buildings. He stated that what was not visible was the proposed parking garage which would be half underground. He explained that the apartments would be well-appointed and luxury-style.

Council Member Wiltout asked whether subparcel C would be all residential or whether it would contain commercial space, and also whether it would contain a mix of studios, 1, and 2, bedrooms, with townhomes on the bottom.

Mr. Amr responded that subparcel C would be all residential and he confirmed that it would contain a mix of studios, 1, and 2-bedroom units. He explained that it would not have townhomes but it would have a townhome-like façade. Subparcel B would also be all residential and would contain all of the townhomes. Subparcel A would contain commercial and residential space.

Council Member Wiltout asked whether the 45-foot building height was in line with the building heights for the apartments at Market and Main.

Planning Manager Mayer responded that the heights were within requirements of a townhome permitted within this area and that he believed the height of Market and Main was 48-50 feet.

Council Member Wiltout thanked Planning Manager Mayer and said that she wanted to get a sense of where this proposal stood in relation to current developments, and that this looked amazing.

Mr. Amr then stated that regarding parking, the unspoken word was that there was a parking minimum of one parking space per bedroom and was confident this development achieved that. This proposed development provided for 1.07 parking spaces per bedroom without including the right of way. Including the right of way it was 1.74 per bedroom. He explained that he wanted to keep residents' vehicles off the street. He further stated that he would propose hours-restricted parking around subparcel A similar to German Village and the Short North.

Mr. Amr then asked if the board had any questions.

Board Member Moore asked whether parking spaces would be assigned for residents.

Mr. Amr responded that it will be assigned for residents, and residents would have to pay for a parking space.

Board Member Moore asked where the parking for commercial patrons would be.

Mr. Amr responded that it would be on the right of way; there would be head-in spots for commercial patrons.

Board Member Maletz noted that Mr. Amr stated there would be 88 dwelling units including townhomes and asked whether the parking garage was 1 level or 2 levels.

Mr. Amr responded that the garage was 1 level and was partially underground and that it would have 82 parking spaces.

Board Member Maletz asked whether the townhomes were self-park.

Mr. Amr responded that they were, and there would be 2 parking spots for the townhomes.

Council Member Wiltout asked where the commercial patrons for subparcel A would park.

Mr. Amr responded there was parking along the right of way.

Council Member Wiltout added that something to consider was parking on the right of way when there is a snow emergency. During a snow emergency, vehicles may need to be moved off of the right of way.

Mr. Amr responded that was good to know.

Board Member Iten asked whether head-in parking would be affected during a snow emergency and further commented that he was accustomed to being plowed-in in German Village.

Parking Manager Mayer responded that head-in parking as indicated on the diagram was accessed by the public right of way but was actually on private property which meant that the tenants would need to arrange for plowing. Gingko, Second, and Third, would be public and would need to be cleared.

Chair Hinson observed that this would be similar to Market and Main, sometimes the residents get plowed in.

Chair Hinson continued that he liked the broad strokes of the proposal. He stated that he would like to keep the design in line with the design of Market and Main. He remarked that this development would increase density which would likely result in comments from existing residents. Nonetheless, he observed that it looks like a good use for New Albany's urban center.

Board Member Iten stated that he shared that reaction. He further stated that he looked forward to seeing window detail and that he liked divided light, or simulated divided light. He did not see any major concerns, but observed that subparcel C seemed to be a kind of hybrid consisting of colors that the board had not typically seen and would appreciate input from the architects on the board.

Board Member Maletz added that he echoed Board Member Iten's comments about subparcel C. He stated that he had 2 general statements about subparcels A and C. He would encourage a stronger gateway between the 2 building forms, and maybe not make them as distinct from each other. He did not want to squelch creativity. He explained that he saw subtle moves to break

with the traditional architecture of New Albany in comparing parcel A to the 68-unit structure of subparcel C, with the overall massing, fenestration, materiality, and consistency. There was room for diversification but he hated to see the design run too far down that path. He stated that the consistency does not need to exactly track from subparcel A to subparcel C, and noted that some would say the Market and Main apartment were an example of consistency gone too far, but perhaps there was too much movement here. He further stated that he was sure there was plenty of time and room for adjustments.

Board Member Strahler asked what kind of exceptions the board will have to consider with this development.

Planning Manager Mayer responded that this application will likely require the addition of a building typology for subparcel C since it would present a townhome façade but was an apartment building. The city also anticipated some setback variances.

Board Member Iten asked whether, on the variance point, the board's code revision had passed.

Planning Manager Mayer responded that it had.

Board Member Iten stated that the code revision would be helpful. He remarked that he was enthusiastic, that he echoed Board Member Maletz' comments, and he looked forward to seeing greater detail in future presentations.

Mr. Amr thanked Board Members Iten and Maletz for their comments and responded that he is taking a cautious approach.

Chair Hinson asked what % of the site had gone for the roads.

Mr. Amr responded that including setbacks it was 60%.

Planning Manager Mayer responded that the urban center code requires dedication of land for the public right of way. Mr. Amr and his team have been very easy to work with and have provided the land in order for the city to design this meaningful grid. He added that the design of the street trees and sidewalk is part of the city's capital budget as permitted by the urban center code.

Board Member Iten asked whether the Architectural Review Board would be the only board reviewing this development or whether the Planning Commission would review any portion of it.

Planning Manager Mayer responded that the Planning Commission would only review the platting of the public streets.

Council Member Wiltout stated that she thinks the plan is beautiful. She added that she has spent a lot of time in this area and she thinks it could really benefit from a glow-up and this is a beautiful way to do it.

Board Member Iten asked whether Mr. Amr expected push-back from residents who were concerned about more kids in the schools.

Mr. Amr responded that they specifically did not include 3-bedroom units for that reason. These units would be priced and directed to attract young professionals.

Planning Manager Mayer added that from a regulatory perspective the urban center code does not have any density minimums or maximums. The board has always approved a minimum of 1 parking space per bedroom.

Board Member Iten clarified that he was indifferent on that issue, he was just asking whether the board should anticipate that kind of feedback.

Council Member Wilttrout stated that increased density was an issue that the city council would be likely be addressing. She further stated that an increase in residents in this location would support existing and future restaurants and retail. She also wanted to put a placeholder on the issue of traffic flow, particularly at school times. She acknowledged the ongoing efforts to increase road connectivity and stated that she would be looking to Mr. Amr for assistance on that issue as this proposal progresses.

Mr. Amr responded that this project has many access points in and out.

Board Member Iten observed that this [the ingress and egress] is ideal compared to a lot of places where there was only one access point.

Board Member Davie whether and where the trash receptacles were located; the service components of subparcel C appeared to be facing the main road.

Mr. Amr responded that the dumpsters were on the east and west alley.

Board Member Davie added that the development feels good within the site from a scale standpoint. He pointed out that there is a major need in this area and he recognized the amount of development that went into this proposal. He asked whether there was a timeline.

Mr. Amr responded that in a perfect world they would like to break ground by spring 2024.

Board Member Davie asked which unit would get the bridge portion.

Mr. Amr responded that it would be the lucky resident of the corner townhome.

Chair Hinson asked whether there would be roof-mounted HVAC and/or where the HVAC screening would be located.

Mr. Amr responded that that was a great question and that he would have the answer at their next appearance before the board.

Chair Hinson and the board thanked Mr. Amr.

**VI. Poll members for comment**

Chair Hinson asked if the board members had any further comment and no further comments were offered.

**VII. Adjourn**

Chair Hinson stated there was no further before the board and asked for a motion to adjourn.

Board Member Moore moved to adjourn. Board Member Strahler seconded the motion.

Upon roll call: Ms. Moore, yes; Mr. Strahler, yes; Mr. Maletz, yes; Mr. Davie, yes; Mr. Brown, yes; Mr. Iten, yes; Mr. Hinson, yes. Having 7 yes votes; 0 no votes; and 0 abstentions, the meeting was adjourned at 7:58 p.m.

Submitted by: Christina Madriguera, Esq., Deputy Clerk.