



New Albany Board of Zoning Appeals
June 23, 2025 Meeting Minutes - Approved

I. Call to order

II. Roll call

III. Swear in new board member, Jeremiah Wood

Council Member Kasey Kist administered the oath of office to Jeremiah Wood. Mr. Wood was appointed to the New Albany Board of Zoning Appeals in April 2025 to serve the balance of a term that expires on December 31, 2026.

IV. Action on minutes February 24, 2025.

Chair LaJeunesse asked if there were any corrections to the minutes from the February 24, 2025 meeting.

Hearing none, Board Member Jacob moved for approval of the February 24, 2025 meeting minutes. Board Member Samuels seconded the motion.

Upon roll call: Mr. Jacob yes, Ms. Samuels yes, Mr. Schell yes, Mr. Wood yes, Mr. LaJeunesse yes. Having five yes votes the motion passed and the February 24, 2025 meeting minutes were approved as submitted.

IV. Additions or corrections to the agenda

Chair LaJeunesse asked if there were any additions or corrections to the agenda.

Planner II Saumenig answered yes, the annual organizational meeting needed to be added to Other business.

Chair LaJeunesse agreed and without objection the annual organizational meeting was added to the agenda under Other business.

Planner II Saumenig also introduced Planner I Sauter who had recently been promoted from Development Technician to Planner I.

Chair LaJeunesse administered the oath to all present who would be addressing the board.

VI. Hearing of visitors for items not on tonight's agenda

Chair LaJeunesse asked whether there were any visitors present who wished to be heard for an item not on the agenda. Hearing none, he introduced the first case and asked to hear from staff.

VII. Cases

VAR-36-2025 Edged Sign Variance

Variance to codified ordinance 1169.16(d) to exceed sign area and quantity requirements for Edged located at 7600 West Campus Road (PID: 222-002127).

Applicant: Signcom, Inc. c/o Kylie Cochran, Bruce Sommerfelt

Planner I Sauter delivered the staff report.

Board Member Jacob moved to admit the staff reports and related documents into the record for VAR-36-2025. Board Member Schell seconded the motion. Upon roll call: Mr. Jacob yes, Mr. Schell yes, Ms. Samuels yes, Mr. LaJeunesse yes, Mr. Wood yes. Having five yes votes, the motion passed and the staff reports and related documents were accepted into the record for VAR-36-2025.

Council Member Kist asked staff to explain the difference between the new code and the pre-existing code.

Planner II Saumenig explained that the prior version of the code allowed signs up to 75 feet and allowed one sign per frontage. The current version allow signs up to 200 square feet and allows one sign per entrance.

Board Member Samuels asked whether there was any additional language regarding the percentages; she also confirmed the size of the largest approved sign.

Planner II Saumenig answered that there was not additional language regarding percentages, that the code permitted a flat 200 square feet, and that Amazon had the largest approved sign.

There was further discussion about staff's rationale, this application, and the board noted that this application was requesting a sign that was almost 100 square feet larger than the code increase.

Chair LaJeunesse asked the applicant whether he considered a sign that complied with the code.

Applicant Bruce Sommerfelt responded that they were cognizant of the code but felt that the size of the sign was inferior. He distributed renderings of options. [see Appendix for Applicant Materials]

Chair LaJeunesse noted that the renderings needed to be accepted into the record.

Board Member Jacob moved to accept the applicant's renderings into the record for VAR-36-2025. Board Member Samuels seconded the motion.

Upon roll call: Mr. Jacob yes, Ms. Samuels yes, Mr. Wood yes, Mr. LaJeunesse yes, Mr. Schell yes. Having five yes votes, the motion passed and the applicant's materials were accepted into the record for VAR-36-2025.

Mr. Sommerfelt continued that the applicants tried to keep it functionally aesthetic for the building and within the business park, however the applicants felt that 200 square feet is just not big enough. This building is 206,000 square feet in total area. He noted that the signs in the business park have different fonts and colors. He added that the code calculates the size of signs by establishing an invisible rectangle at the perimeter. With this sign, subtracting the negative space by removing the stem on the d and the tail on the g makes it almost meet the code.

There was discussion of the size of the Amazon sign, for which a variance was approved in April of 2021.

Chair LaJeunesse remarked that board probably did the code a disservice by not approving a formula to apply. The code change was just approved and the board was already reviewing a request for a bigger sign. He stated that there should be a percentage; or the limit should be 300 square feet.

Council Member Kist stated that he was getting up to speed on this area of code, that he was sitting in for Council Member Shull. He remarked that the sign did not look out of scale and asked whether the code requires an iron clad calculation of square footage, regardless of the percentage of the building that the sign absorbs.

Board Member Samuels recalled usage of a percentage being a point of conversation. She noted that Tiana that some businesses have a logo with the words. She remarked that she thinks this needs to be revisited.

Board Member Jacob examined the surrounding properties. He noted the visuals of the northern residential neighbors and commented that this is a different part of the business park and we need to be mindful of them.

Mr. Sommerfelt responded that the applicants considered that and further that public entrances did not face the street.

Board Member Schell said that he had no problem with this sign and remarked that this building has a single tenant, but it seems that the board continues to receive requests for bigger and bigger signs.

Mr. Sommerfelt responded that the New Albany criteria is too restrictive; this is a minimalistic sign.

Chair LaJeunesse stated that the question is whether 200 square feet is big enough? It would be helpful to see a rendition that complies with the code.

Council Member Kist remarked that it would be valuable to have a formula mechanism to evaluate the sign.

Mr. Sommerfelt cautioned against making the code too complicated and added that this is only a 20% variance at 241 square feet.

Chair LaJeunesse added that perhaps there could be a mechanism to remove the two boxes. He asked if there were any further questions.

Hearing none, Board Member Samuels moved for approval of VAR-36-2025 A, for sign A based on the findings in the staff report with the conditions in staff report if any, and the condition that based on the new calculation with the removal of the area that is negative space, as that would meet our 200 square foot spirit of the rule, subject to staff approval. Chair LaJeunesse seconded the motion.

Upon roll call: Ms. Samuels yes, Mr. LaJeunesse yes, Mr. Wood yes, Mr. Jacob yes, Mr. Schell yes. Having five yes votes, the motion passed.

Board Member Samuels moved for approval of VAR-36-2025 B for sign B, based on the findings in the staff report with the conditions in the staff report, if any, and the same calculation as sign A, subject to staff approval. Chair LaJeunesse seconded the motion.

Upon roll call: Ms. Samuels yes, Mr. LaJeunesse yes, Mr. Jacob yes, Mr. Wood yes, Mr. Schell yes. Having five yes votes, the motion passed.

Board Member Samuels moved for approval of VAR-36-2025 C based on the findings in the staff report with the conditions in the staff report, if any, subject to staff approval. Chair LaJeunesse seconded the motion.

Upon roll call: Ms. Samuels yes, Mr. LaJeunesse yes, Mr. Schell yes, Mr. Jacob yes, Mr. Wood yes. having five yes votes the motion passed.

Thereafter Planner II Saumenig noted that staff recommended a condition of approval that was not included in the vote for VAR-36-2025 C.

Staff recommended that the board move VAR-36-2025 C again with the condition.

Board Member Samuels moved for approval of VAR-36-2025 C based on the findings in the staff report with the conditions in the staff report and the following additional condition, subject to staff approval:

That the 5.19 square foot sign will meet the 1 inch sign relief requirement.

Chair LaJeunesse seconded the motion. Upon roll call: Ms. Samuels yes, Mr. LaJeunesse yes, Mr. Wood yes, Mr. Jacob yes, Mr. Schell. Having five yes votes, the motion passed.

The board thanked the applicant and wished him good luck.

VAR-41-2025 Amgen Sign Variance

Variance to codified ordinance 1169.16(d) to exceed sign area requirements for Amgen located at 4150 Ganton Parkway (PID: 094-106644-00.000).

Applicant: CRB Group c/o Jon Ficken

Planner II Saumenig delivered the staff report.

Board Member Jacob moved to admit the staff reports and related documents into the record for VAR-41-2025. Board Member Wood seconded the motion.

Upon roll call: Mr. Jacob yes, Mr. Wood yes, Mr. LaJeunesse yes, Ms. Samuels yes, Mr. Schell yes. Having five yes votes the motion passed and the staff reports and related documents were admitted to the record for VAR-41-2025.

Board Member Samuels asked for the zoning classification of the property that sits in front of the sign.

Planner Saumenig answered that it is not residential, it is SR 161.

Board Member Schell asked whether staff had any feedback from the neighbors.

Planner Saumenig answered no.

Applicant Jon Ficken spoke in support of the application. He explained that the size of the sign is based on visibility. He stated that there is no current signage facing the east. The applicants considered compliant signage but desire this size for its visibility.

Chair LaJeunesse – did you know that this sign exceeded the code

Mr. Ficken replied yes, but we also knew of Amazon and other business park neighbors that exceeded the code's size limit.

Board Member Schell remarked that the board wants Amgen to have visibility; and that the board loves having Amgen in New Albany, but this request is scratching the board hard.

Mr. Ficken responded that they understand. He reiterated that this request is all about visibility from the road, the 7-ft letters are invisible from the road.

Board Member Schell stated that everytime the board approves a bigger sign, the board sets a new precedent.

Chair LaJeunesse asked the applicant whether he had a rendition that meets code.

Board Member Samuels asked the applicant to summarize the hardship.

Mr. Ficken replied that the hardship is that the compliant sign is difficult to read.

Board Member Samuels asked whether it is difficult for trucks to find Amgen.

Mr. Ficken replied that Amgen wants to be recognized and that they do not want to remove trees.

Council Member Kist recalled that Amplify Bio was 1.35% of the building and asked how big Amgen's sign letters would be if they were 1.35% of the building.

Planner II Saumenig answered 8 ft.

Board Member Schell asked Mr. Ficken how he felt about that.

Mr. Ficken replied that they prefer the larger sign.

Applicant Maritza Lopez, VP of Amgen explained that the company is growing exponentially and this is for visibility. They want a sign that honors the size of the building. They understand the code, but want the sign to be visible from the road.

Board Member Samuels thanked Ms. Lopez and asked staff whether visibility from the road was considered.

Planning Manager Christian replied that distance came up in older cases, such as Amazon.

Board Member Wood asked whether there are still residents on Babbit Road.

Mr. Ficken replied that there are a few houses on the west side of Babbit Road.

Council Member Kist stated that being a restaurant owner he is very pro sign, and that the sign here is for advertising, not for wayfinding. He is leery of setting a precedent on the heels of this code change. He also asked whether the new building need a sign of this size.

Mr. Ficken replied that the new building will not accommodate a sign because of the trees. This will serve as the sign for the site.

Board Member Schell reiterated that New Albany appreciates Amgen but this is a really big ask and would like Amgen's reconsideration.

Chair LaJeunesse agreed and asked Mr. Ficken when he needed a decision and whether Amgen could wait a couple of months so they could come up with an alternative that considers the distance from the street and the height of the building. He further asked staff whether a group of people to work on this could be assembled.

Mr. Ficken answered that they would like a decision as soon as they can, by October.

Planning Manager Christian stated that staff can take a look at the issue, however he did not see a scenario allowing this sign without allowing others to have a sign of this size.

Council Member Kist added that he did not want to kick the can. Giving this board discretion is useful, but it does open the door for others to ask for the same sign. The board needs to have articulable reasons for voting in favor of these variances.

Planning Manager Christian stated that similar to New Albany Farms, approval of accessory structures has been supported by specific findings.

Chair LaJeunesse advised the gathering of benchmarks to help guide board decisions. The board is not going to see the end of this because buildings in the business park are going to get bigger. Staff should revisit the code and identify objective data to help shape any future code revisions.

Board Member Jacob asked whether this request was an outlier, noting that the commercial signs such as Bob Evans and Lower on 161 are closer to the road.

Planning Manager Christian answered yes, this would be an outlier.

Board Member Samuels moved to table VAR-41-2025 for the 30 days or until the next meeting. Board Member Jacob seconded the motion.

Upon roll call: Ms. Samuels yes, Mr. Jacob yes, Mr. Wood yes, Mr. LaJeunesse yes, Mr. Schell yes. Having five yes votes the motion passed and the application was laid upon the table for 30 days or until the next meeting.

The board wished the applicants good luck. Having completed the scheduled cases, Chair LaJeunesse introduced the first and only item of other business, the Annual Organizational Meeting.

VIII. Other business

Annual Organizational Meeting

Chair LaJeunesse opened the annual organizational meeting, at which the board would elect a chair, vice chair, and secretary; they would establish their regular meeting time, date, and place; and would review the attendance policy. Chair LaJeunesse, Vice Chair Jacob, and Secretary Samuels agreed that it had been their pleasure to serve the board and were willing to continue, however would be willing to step aside if another member wished to occupy a leadership position.

Hearing none, Vice Chair Jacob moved to re-elect Chair Shaun LaJeunesse, Vice Chair Abe Jacob, and Secretary Tiana Samuels for 2025 Board of Zoning Appeals leadership, and also to establish 6:30 p.m. on the fourth Monday of each month at the New Albany Village Hall as the time, date and location of the Board of Zoning Appeals meetings. Board Member Schell seconded the motion.

Upon roll call: Mr. Jacob yes, Mr. Schell yes, Mr. LaJeunesse yes, Ms. Samuels yes, Mr. Wood yes. Having all votes in favor the motion passed and all were congratulated and thanked.

IX. Poll members for comment

Chair LaJeunesse polled the members for comment.

X. Adjournment

Hearing none and having completed the agenda, Chair LaJeunesse moved to adjourn the June 23, 2025 New Albany Board of Zoning Appeals meeting. Board Member Jacob seconded the motion.

Upon roll call: Mr. LaJeunesse yes, Mr. Jacob yes, Mr. Schell yes, Ms. Samuels yes, Mr. Wood yes. Having all yes votes the motion passed and the June 23, 2025 Board of Zoning Appeals meeting was adjourned at 8:00 p.m.

Submitted by: Deputy Clerk Madriguera, Esq.

Appendix

VAR-36-2025

Staff Report

Applicant Renderings

Record of Action

VAR-41-2025

Staff Report

Record of Action



Architectural Review Board Staff Report
June 9, 2025 Meeting

**CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
6588 NEW ALBANY CONDIT ROAD**

LOCATION: 6588 New Albany Condit Road (PID: 222-000544-00)
APPLICANT: Yost Barns, c/o John Yost
REQUEST: Certificate of Appropriateness
ZONING: Urban Center Code: Rural Residential Sub-District
STRATEGIC PLAN: Village Center
APPLICATION: ARB-26-2025

Review based on: Application materials received May 23, 2025.

Staff report prepared by Kylie Blackburn, Planner.

I. REQUEST AND BACKGROUND

The applicant requests a certificate of appropriateness and waivers for a new garage at an existing residential home located at 6588 New Albany Condit Road. This application was tabled by the ARB during their meeting on May 12th.

Per Section 1157.07(b), any major environmental change to a property located within the Village Center requires a certificate of appropriateness to be issued by the Architectural Review Board. In considering this request for a new garage in the Village Center, the Architectural Review Board is directed to evaluate the application based on criteria in Chapter 1157 and the New Albany Design Guidelines and Requirements.

The applicant has revised their previous submission from May 12th to remove the waivers related to the side yard encroachment and the visibility of the garage door from the public road. In response to board member Maletz's suggestions, they have relocated the garage on the property. As a result of this relocation, the applicant proposes an extension of the existing gravel driveway. An updated list of waivers is included below.

The applicant requests the following waivers as part of this application:

- 1. Waiver to UCC section 3.28.2 to allow the garage to be 1200 square feet in size, where code allows a maximum of 800 square feet.**
- 2. Waiver to DGR Section 2 (II.B.3) to allow the garage to be 16 feet wide, where code allows a maximum of ten feet in width.**
- 3. Waiver to DGR Section 2 (I.A.1) to allow for the extension of a gravel driveway where code requires asphalt, brick, stone, or simulated stone.**

II. SITE DESCRIPTION & USE

The 1.10 +/- acre site is located on the edge of the Village Center on New Albany Condit Road. The property is zoned in the Rural Residential subdistrict of the Urban Center Code and contains a 1,600 sq. ft. single-family home that was built in 1960. The property backs onto the Windsor subdivision to the east and is surrounded by properties on all other boundaries with homes that are also zoned Rural Residential.

III. EVALUATION

Certificate of Appropriateness

The ARB's review is pursuant to C.O. Section 1157.06. No environmental change shall be made to any property within the Village of New Albany until a Certificate of Appropriateness has been properly applied for and issued by staff or the Board. Per Section **1157.09 Criteria for Evaluation of Application for Certification of Design Appropriateness**, the addition of the building and site should be evaluated on these criteria.

1. *The compliance of the application with the Design Guidelines and Requirements*
 - Section 2 of the Design Guidelines and Requirements (DGRs) – Village Center Residential- provides the requirements for all residential development within the Village Center in the city. This section states that there are certain design characteristics that distinguish the Village Center from the rest of the city, and it gives those characteristics.
 - Since this application is for the addition of a garage located within the Village Center, staff evaluated the proposal using the standards found in section 2 of the DGRs (Village Center Residential) and, where applicable, section 4 (Existing Buildings). The city architect reviewed the application and is supportive of the design.
 - Section 2 (II.B.3) states garages and outbuildings shall be clearly secondary in character, by means of a simplified design compatible with that of the primary structure.
 - The applicant proposes using a simple barn/garage design with a steel roof and wood sides that match the building colors of the existing residence. The roof is proposed to be in an ivy color, which does not match that of the roof of the existing building. Staff recommends a condition of approval to change the roof to a historic color matching the existing house.
 - Section 2 (II.B.3) states that garages may be attached or detached and must have single-bay doors no greater than ten feet in width.
 - The applicant proposes to use a single bay door that is 16 feet wide and requests a waiver.
2. *The visual and functional components of the building and its site, including but not limited to landscape design and plant materials, lighting, vehicular and pedestrian circulation, and signage.*
 - The applicant proposes to extend the existing gravel driveway in order to access the new garage. DGR Section 2 (I.A.1) states that asphalt, brick, stone, or simulated stone pavers are appropriate surfaces for driveways. The applicant requests a waiver to allow for the existing gravel driveway to be extended.
3. *The distinguishing original qualities or character of a building, structure, site and/or its environment shall not be destroyed.*
 - The original qualities and character of the existing structure will not be destroyed as the applicant proposes to use the same primary building colors on the garage as used on the rest of the home, if the condition regarding the roof color is applied
4. *All buildings, structures and sites shall be recognized as products of their own time.*
 - The new garage design is complimentary to the existing character of the home.
5. *Distinctive stylistic features or examples of skilled craftsmanship which characterize a building, structure or site shall be created with sensitivity.*
 - This is met as the new structure is consistent with the existing home, so long as the proposed condition of approval is applied.

6. *The surface cleaning of masonry structures shall be undertaken with methods designed to minimize damage to historic building materials.*
 - Not applicable.
7. *Wherever possible, new additions or alterations to structures shall be done in such a manner that if such additions or alterations were to be removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the original structure would be unimpaired.*
 - Not applicable.

Urban Center Code Compliance

- The proposed garage does not meet all development standards for the Rural Residential sub-district of the Urban Center Code as outlined below.

3.28 Detached Rear Covered Parking Standards

3.28.1 If an alley is present, access to the covered parking structure must be from the alley.

3.28.2 The following standards for covered parking structures shall be as follows:

Minimum side (a): Same as building typology

Minimum rear (b): 5' or up to 0' if 16' wide alley is present

Minimum clear (c): 15% of rear yard

Maximum height (d): 25'

Maximum area: 800 sq

- The proposed garage will be 15 feet from the side yard, meeting the Urban Center Code standards.
- The proposed garage will be 15 feet tall, meeting the Urban Center Code standards.
- The garage is proposed to be 1,200 square feet, which exceeds the maximum allowable size of 800 square feet [waiver requested].

Waiver Request

The ARB's review is pursuant to C.O. Section 1113.11 Action by the Architectural Review Board for Waivers, within thirty (30) days after the public meeting, the ARB shall either approve, approve with supplementary conditions, or disapprove the request for a waiver. The ARB shall only approve a waiver or approve a waiver with supplementary conditions if the ARB finds that the waiver, if granted, would:

- a) *Provide an appropriate design or pattern of development considering the context in which the development is proposed and the purpose of the particular standard. In evaluating the context as it is used in the criteria, the ARB may consider the relationship of the proposed development with adjacent structures, the immediate neighborhood setting, or a broader vicinity to determine if the waiver is warranted;*
- b) *Substantially meet the intent of the standard that the applicant is attempting to seek a waiver from, and fit within the goals of the Village Center Strategic Plan, Land Use Strategic Plan and the Design Guidelines and Requirements;*
- c) *Be necessary for reasons of fairness due to unusual building, structure, or site-specific conditions; and*
- d) *Not detrimentally affect the public health, safety or general welfare*

The applicant requests the following waivers as part of this application:

- A. Waiver to UCC section 3.28.2 to allow the garage to be 1200 square feet in size, where code allows a maximum of 800 square feet.**
- B. Waiver to DGR Section 2 (II.B.3) to allow the garage to be 16 feet wide, where code allows a maximum of ten feet in width.**
- C. Waiver to DGR Section 2 (I.A.1) to allow for the extension of a gravel driveway where code requires asphalt, brick, stone, or simulated stone pavers.**

(A) Waiver to UCC section 3.28.2 to allow the garage to be 1200 square feet in size, where code allows a maximum of 800 square feet.

The following should be considered in the board’s decision:

1. UCC section 3.28.2 lists the standards for Detached Rear Covered Parking Standards, one of which is that the maximum allowed area is 800 square feet. The applicant proposes to construct a 1,200 square foot garage therefore, a waiver is required.
2. Per the waiver requirements outlined in C.O. Section 1113.11(a), the ARB may consider the relationship of the proposed development to adjacent structures and the immediate neighborhood setting. The proposed garage is similar in size, style, and location to other garages on the street and fits well with the character of the neighborhood. The application provides an appropriate design considering the context of the surrounding area and with the proposed condition of approval for the roof, the design matches the existing home as well.
3. The application may not substantially meet the intent of the standard that the applicant is attempting to seek a waiver from but it does maintain a proper proportion between developed and undeveloped portions of the property and maintains a high development standard of the built environment which is a goal found in the Engage New Albany Strategic Plan. The city architect reviewed the proposal and states that the garage is appropriately designed. While the structure is larger than what is permitted by code, the total lot coverage (including existing improvements) is only 5-7%, which is far less than the maximum of 50% that is permitted by right.
4. While the request may not be strictly necessary for reasons of fairness due to unusual building, structure, or site-specific constraints, it should be recognized that maintaining a one size fits all approach to accessory structures in the Village Center may not be appropriate in cases like this one. The total lot area is 1.10 acres and the UCC allows 50% lot coverage (23,894.97 sq. ft.). The UCC also describes this Rural Residential sub-district as “a large, detached structure placed on a generous lot and larger permitted accessory structures”. The UCC only contemplates larger “garden structures” within the Rural Residential sub-district and does not define what other *larger* detached structures may be appropriate on these larger lots. City staff believes that this is a shortcoming in the code that should be addressed via a code change to be more consistent with the policies that have been adopted for lots of similar size outside of the Village Center.
5. Prior to 2019, variances to allow larger accessory structures were common for properties outside of the Village Center. In 2019, city council approved a code amendment to allow larger accessory structures, based on the size of a lot (see list below), demonstrating a shift in policy that supports greater flexibility for larger properties. Granting this waiver would be in keeping with the established policy for other similarly sized lots outside the Village Center.

Lot Size	Permitted Accessory Structure Area
Less than 1 acre	800 sq. ft.
Between 1 acre and 2 acres	1,200 sq. ft.
Greater than 2 acres	1,600 sq. ft.

6. It does not appear that the waiver would detrimentally affect public health, safety, or general welfare.

(B) Waiver to DGR Section 2 (II.B.3) to allow the garage to be 16 feet wide, where code allows a maximum of ten feet in width.

1. DGR section 2 (II.B.3) states that garages must have single-bay doors that are no greater than ten feet in width and the applicant requests a waiver to allow a 16 foot wide, single bay door to be used.
2. The application provides an appropriate design considering the context of the surrounding area. Per the waiver requirements outlined in C.O. Section 1113.11(a), the

ARB may consider the relationship of the proposed development to adjacent structures and the immediate neighborhood setting. The proposed garage is similar in size, style, and location to other garages on the street, and fits well with the character of the neighborhood.

3. The application may not substantially meet the intent of the standard that the applicant is attempting to seek a waiver from but granting it does not compromise the ability to maintain a high development standard of the built environment which is a goal found in the Engage New Albany Strategic Plan. The applicant proposes to use a wider single bay door due to the larger size of the garage. The applicant also provided an option for two smaller garage doors but requests consideration for the larger single bay door. It is worth noting that the neighboring properties have garages/detached structures with doors over the maximum allowable size.
4. It does not appear that granting the request is necessary for reasons of fairness due to the unusual building, structure, or site-specific constraints.
5. It does not appear that the waiver would detrimentally affect public health, safety, or general welfare.

(C) Waiver to DGR Section 2 (I.A.1) to allow for the extension of a gravel driveway where code requires asphalt, brick, stone, or simulated stone pavers.

1. DGR Section 2 (I.A.1) states that asphalt, brick, stone, or simulated stone driveway pavers are appropriate surfaces for driveways and parking areas. The applicant proposes to extend the existing gravel driveway, therefore a waiver is required.
2. Per the waiver requirements outlined in C.O. Section 1113.11(a), the ARB may consider the relationship of the proposed development to adjacent structures and the immediate neighborhood setting. The existing driveway is already gravel, and the site immediately north also has a gravel driveway so the proposed extension in this case wouldn't necessarily compromise the established character of the neighborhood. The application appears to provide an appropriate design considering the context of the surrounding area.
3. Similar waiver requests have been heard before and although it was a different material, a concrete driveway was approved by the ARB in September of 2024 (ARB-54-2024).
4. The application does not substantially meet the intent of the standard for which the waiver is being requested and does not fully align with the goals outlined in the Village Center Strategic Plan or the Design Guidelines and Requirements (DGR). However, the proposed extension of the existing gravel driveway is intended to accommodate the relocated garage and reduce the need for waivers that were previously requested. While gravel is not a preferred driveway material, the overall proposal better complies with city code. Additionally, the Strategic Plan encourages garages to be side- or rear-loaded whenever possible and this standard is met with the proposed relocation. Visibility of the new gravel driveway will be very minimal from public streets and may not be visible at all.
5. While the request may not be strictly necessary for reasons of fairness due to unusual building, structure, or site-specific constraints, it is recognized that the current driveway configuration limits options for garage placement that meet all code requirements. To place the proposed garage on the property in a way that keeps the garage doors hidden from street view and avoids encroachment into the side yard setback, the driveway must be modified.
6. It does not appear that the waiver would detrimentally affect public health, safety, or general welfare.

IV. SUMMARY

The ARB should evaluate the overall proposal based on the requirements in the Urban Center Code, Design Guidelines and Requirements and recommendations from the Engage New Albany Strategic Plan. In accordance with the waiver provisions outlined in C.O. Section 1113.11(a), which allow the Architectural Review Board to consider the relationship of proposed development to adjacent structures and the immediate neighborhood setting, the proposed garage ARB 25 0609 6588 New Albany Condit Road Garage ARB-26-2025

and the associated waivers accomplish a design that is consistent with the built environment of the surrounding area.

V. ACTION

Should the Architectural Review Board find a sufficient basis for approval, the following motion would be appropriate.

Suggested Motion for ARB-26-2025

Move to approve Certificate of Appropriateness application ARB-26-2025 and associated waivers with the following condition:

1. The roof color is changed to a historic color matching the existing house.

Approximate Site Location:



Source: Near Map



Community Development Department

RE: City of New Albany Board and Commission Record of Action

Dear Daniel & Danielle Jeffers,

Attached is the Record of Action for your recent application that was heard by one of the City of New Albany Boards and Commissions. Please retain this document for your records.

This Record of Action does not constitute a permit or license to construct, demolish, occupy or make alterations to any land area or building. A building and/or zoning permit is required before any work can be performed. For more information on the permitting process, please contact the Community Development Department.

Additionally, if the Record of Action lists conditions of approval these conditions must be met prior to issuance of any zoning or building permits.

Please contact our office at (614) 939-2254 with any questions.

Thank you.



Community Development Department

Decision and Record of Action

Monday, June 09, 2025

The New Albany Architectural Review Board took the following action on 06/09/2025 .

Certificate of Appropriateness

Location: 6588 NEW ALBANY CONDIT RD

Applicant: Yost Barns,

Application: PLARB20250026

Request: Certificate of Appropriateness to allow for a garage to be built and waivers for the garage size, garage door size, and driveway material at 6588 New Albany Condit Road (PID: 222-000544).

Motion: To approve

Commission Vote: Motion Approval with Conditions,

Result: Certificate of Appropriateness, PLARB20250026 was Approval with Conditions, by a vote of 5-0

Waiver A for gargae size was Approved, by a vote of 5-0

Waiver B for garage door size was Approved, by a vote of 4-1

Waiver C for the extention of a gravel driveway was Approved, by a vote of 4-1.

Recorded in the Official Journal this June 09, 2025

Condition(s) of Approval:

1. The roof color is changed to a historic color matching the existing house.

Staff Certification:

Kylie Blackburn
Planner