



New Albany Architectural Review Board
Monday, June 9, 2025 Meeting Minutes - Approved

I. Call to order

The New Albany Architectural Review Board held a regular meeting on Monday, June 9, 2025 in the New Albany Village Hall. Vice Chair Iten called the meeting to order at 7:02 p.m. and asked to hear the roll.

II. Roll call

Those answering the roll

Mr. Hinson	absent
Mr. Iten	present
Mr. Brown	absent
Mr. Davie	present
Mr. Maletz	present
Ms. Moore	present
Mr. Strahler	present
Council Member Brisk	absent
Mayor Spalding	present

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

Staff members present: Planner I Blackburn, Planning Manager Christian, Deputy Clerk Madriguera.

III. Action on minutes: May 12, 2025

Mr. Strahler moved for approval of the May 12, 2025 meeting minutes. Ms. Moore seconded the motion.

Upon roll call: Mr. Strahler yes, Ms. Moore yes, Mr. Davie yes, Mr. Maletz yes, Mr. Iten yes. Having five yes votes, the motion passed and the May 12, 2025 meeting minutes were approved as submitted.

IV. Additions or corrections to the agenda

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

Planning Manager Christian answered yes, there is one addition to the agenda. The New Albany Plain Local School District (NAPLS) would like to present some changes that they have made to the proposed elementary school building. Staff was requesting them to be added under Other business.

Vice Chair Iten thanked Planning Manager Christian and, without objection, NAPLS was added to the agenda under Other business. Thereafter, Vice-Chair Iten administered the oath to all present who would be addressing the board.

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

Vice Chair Iten asked whether there were any visitors present who wished to address the board for an item not on the agenda. Hearing none, he introduced the first and only case and asked to hear from staff.

VI. Cases:

ARB-26-2025 Certificate of Appropriateness and Waivers

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).

Applicant: Yost Barns

Planner I Blackburn delivered the staff report.

Vice Chair Iten confirmed with Planner I Blackburn the location of the home, the existing driveway, the proposed garage, and the extension of the driveway. He further confirmed that this revised proposal included a rear load [garage].

Planner I Blackburn further confirmed that the applicants were requesting a 1200 square foot garage where only 800 square feet is permitted for the door size, and a 16 foot wide by eight feet tall garage door where a width of 10 feet is permitted, and finally a request for the extension of a gravel driveway.

Ms. Moore remarked that she had driven past the property multiple times. The property owner to the left has a very large structure with one door. The homeowner to the right has a very tall red barn. She observed that the applicant's home was built in 1960, and that she felt that the surrounding homes looked similar. She stated that she would like to revisit the applicant's first proposal because she did not see a problem with it. The applicant's first proposal fit within the aesthetic of the neighborhood.

Mr. Maletz remarked that he was not supportive of that, the board had already taken action on the old submission. He asked Ms. Moore whether she was asking the board to revisit it, that he was not supportive of it but would defer to the board.

Ms. Moore explained that the adjacent properties had bigger structures, that she had driven past the property many times. The speed of the traffic on the road and the fact that this property was set back farther from the road than other properties, made it hard to see and she was wondering whether the board could think through this and reconsider.

Vice Chair Iten asked for other comments. He stated that he had an analysis but was reluctant to offer it since he was the chair of the meeting. He did not want to chill comments or questions. He confirmed the lot size and the fact that this size structure would not need a variance if it was located outside of the urban center and thus not subject to the urban center code. He called on Mr. Maletz to offer comments.

Mr. Maletz stated that he felt like the proposed revision was consistent with his comments regarding the prior presentation of this application. This proposed solution is marginally improved. He remarked that he had questions about the elevations that did not provide the kind of detail that the board would otherwise be able to comment on in terms of structures facing SR 605. He noted a single line drawing of an elevation with what appeared to be a blank surface and stated that he would at least request a small window. He noted however, that with the garage door in the back and the driveway on the side very little of the building will be visible from the road. It appeared to be tucked behind.

Vice Chair Iten complimented staff on an improved staff report, it really helped him and changed his view on at least two of the matters. He then performed an analysis of each of the waiver requests relative to the standards.

When Vice Chair Iten reached the waiver request for the big garage door, waiver B there was discussion with the applicant and the board regarding whether the request substantially meets the intent of the standards.

The applicant asserted that he was willing to install two eight- foot doors in order to secure approval. He noted however, that the garage was rear-facing.

Vice Chair Iten confirmed that in response to comments from the prior meeting the garage had been reoriented to be rear-facing because front-load garages are not permitted.

Mr. Maletz added that the board was dealing with several variables, there were members present at this meeting that were not part of the original review, and the board was now tripping into procedural issues. He continued that the board took action at the prior meeting and he did not know what the procedure was to revisit that; he found this to proposal more acceptable and would support it but going backward does not seem appropriate as an administrative policy as the board is concerned and based upon the feedback at last month's meeting.

Mr. Davie stated that he was not willing to stand against either direction. If this proposed solution gets the applicant what he needs and gets the board what they need, it was perfectly reasonable.

Mr. Strahler stated that he was going to revisit the single door versus the two door so it backs up. He noted that it would face the Windsor neighborhood which had single doors, so this proposal would result with single doors facing each other. Thus he could approve a single door if that is what the applicant preferred, because it would be fair to have a single door facing a single door.

Vice Chair Iten suggested the board approve the waiver requests sequentially. Thereafter he moved for approval of Waiver A to UCC Section 3.2, 8.2 to allow the garage to be 1200 square feet in size where the code allows a maximum of 800 feet. Mr. Strahler seconded the motion.

Upon roll call: Mr. Iten yes, Mr. Strahler yes, Ms. Moore yes, Mr. Davie yes, Mr. Maletz yes. Having five yes votes the motion passed and Waiver A was granted.

Vice Chair Iten moved for approval of Waiver B, Roman 2b3, to allow the garage door to be 16 feet wide, where the code allows a maximum of 10 feet. Ms. Moore seconded the motion.

Upon roll call: Mr. Iten no. Mr. Iten explained that he voted no because the 16-foot wide door does not meet the substantial intent of the standard.

Ms. Moore yes, Mr. Davie yes, Mr. Maletz yes. Having four yes votes and one no vote, the motion passed and Waiver B was granted.

Vice Chair Iten moved for approval of Waiver C, Roman 1a1 to allow for extension of the gravel driveway where the code requires asphalt, brick, stone, or simulated stone. Mr. Davie seconded.

Upon roll call: Mr. Iten yes, Ms. Moore no, Mr. Strahler yes, Mr. Maletz yes. Having four yes votes and one no vote, the motion passed and Waiver C was granted.

Ms. Moore explained that she voted no because she was not in favor of the rear-facing, if it was turned the other way the driveway would not be needed given the adjacencies; but she was not opposed to approving more gravel driveway.

Vice Chair Iten moved for approval of a certificate of appropriateness for ARB-26-2025 subject to the condition in the staff report that the roof color is changed to a historic color matching the existing house. Ms. Moore seconded the motion.

Upon roll call: Mr. Iten yes, Ms. Moore yes, Mr. Strahler yes, Mr. Davie yes, Mr. Maletz yes. Having five yes votes, the motion passed and the certificate of appropriateness and each waiver requested in ARB-26-2025 was granted.

Vice Chair Iten and the board wished the applicant good luck. Vice Chair Iten thanked staff again for an excellent report. Thereafter he introduced the first and only item of Other business, the New Albany Plain Local Schools (NAPLS) who were present to update the board on their design progress for the new elementary school.

VII. Other business NAPLS

Architect Vicki Newell from Schorr Architects updated the board on significant changes in the floor plans and the elevations. The building has been converted into a very symmetrical design. It also avoids all three of the wetlands. She indicated two buildings that are now completely symmetrical in plan. There will likely be ongoing changes in moving some spaces around it, but the overall form of the building massing would stay the same. She explained that the design team is looking for feedback to ensure they are on the right track for modeling.

Mr. Maletz responded that he thinks this is more responsive to the design principles within the community and it certainly moves in the direction that he urged them to pursue. He cautioned the team to pay attention to the hierarchy of roof massing. He noted that the side wings are a bit diminutive compared to the wings themselves. He indicated examples on the rendering - the eave height of the flanking wings as it relates to the ridgeline, the hyphen connectors seem to be a little unresolved. He remarked that the Palladian window seems to be responsive. He proposed looking at using cast stone for detailing. In closing he urged Ms. Newell to look closely at the proportions of column to height ratios noting that it would be very important in the board's final review. He also said that he believed his comments at the prior review were not intended to be so stringent upon symmetry. Balance is more important than symmetry.

Vice Chair Iten praised Mr. Maletz' comments and stated that he thinks it fits in the space plan very nicely, and it does feel like it's a relative to the other buildings on the campus. He thanked Ms. Newell and stated that he found the design improved from the prior iteration.

There was discussion about column style and diameter. There was also discussion about circulation, the roads through the site, parking, existing trees and the adjacent wetlands.

Mr. Davie remarked that it seemed there were controls in place in terms of vehicular traffic separation, and the installation of a service drive in the wooded area may not be the best use of that space. A better turf field connection could be created in the back.

Mayor Spalding thanked Ms. Newell, the team at Schorr, and the school for working so diligently with some of our other partners to make some improvements to the design. He noted that it is a very careful balance between aesthetics and cost, and the school is being very careful on the cost side, but the balance sometimes gets a little out of proportion. This plan shows a little bit more balance in that approach.

VIII. Poll members for comment and adjournment

Hearing no further comments on the NAPLS informal presentation, Vice Chair Iten polled the members for comment and commented that it is a pleasure to serve on the board with each member.

Ms. Moore moved to adjourn the meeting. Mr. Davie seconded the motion.

Upon roll call: Ms. Moore. Yes, Mr. Davie yes. Mr. Iten. Yes. Mr. Strahler. Yes. Mr. Maletz yes. Having five yes votes the motion passed and the June 9, 2025 meeting of the New Albany Architectural Review Board was adjourned at 7:46 p.m.

Submitted by: Deputy Clerk Madriguera, Esq.

Appendix

ARB-26-2025

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 garage 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 extension 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