NEW ALBANY
COMMUNITY CONNECTS US

New Albany Planning Commission
Monday, July 20, 2026 Meeting Minutes - Approved

I. Call to order

The New Albany Planning Commission held a regular meeting on Monday, July 20, 2026 in the New Albany Village Hall. Chair Kirby called the meeting to order at 7:09 and asked to hear the roll.

II. Roll call

Those answering the roll:

Mr. Neil Kirby	present
Mr. David Wallace	present
Ms. Sarah Briggs	present
Mr. Bruce Larsen	present
Dr. Taru Saigal	absent
Council Member Wiltrout	present

Having four voting members present, the commission had a quorum to transact business.

Staff members present: Law Director Ben Albrecht, Engineer II Josh Albright, Planning Manager Chris Christian, Planner I Kylie Blackburn, Planner I Jay Henderson, Planner II Sierra Saumenig, Planner I Lauren Sauter, Engineer I Sonja Summer, Deputy Clerk Christina Madriguera.

III. Action on minutes: June 15, 2026

Chair Kirby asked if there were any corrections to the minutes from the June 15, 2026 meeting.

Hearing none, Commission Member Briggs moved for approval of the June 15, 2026 meeting minutes. Commission Member Larsen seconded the motion.

Chair Kirby asked whether there was any discussion on the motion. Hearing none, he asked to hear the roll.

Upon roll call: Ms. Briggs yes, Mr. Larsen yes, Mr. Kirby yes, Mr. Wallace yes. Having four yes votes, the motion passed and the June 15, 2026 meeting minutes were approved as submitted.

IV. Additions or corrections to the agenda

Chair Kirby stated that out of courtesy to the applicants in FDP-32-2026, VAR-49-2026, and FDM-50-2026, he would like to move consideration of FDP-04-2026 to the end of the agenda. Without objection, the agenda was changed.

Chair Kirby administered the oath to all present who wished to address the commission.

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

Chair Kirby asked whether there were any visitors present who would like to be heard for items not on the agenda. Hearing none, he introduced the first case to be heard and asked to hear the staff report.

VI. Cases:

FDP-32-2026 6600 New Albany-Condit Road Final Development Plan
Request for approval of the final development plan for the approximately 1.13-acre 605 Neighborhood Office District at 6600 New Albany-Condit Road (PID: 222-000640).
Applicant: Rob Riddle

Planner I Sauter delivered the staff report.

Development Engineer Albright delivered the Engineering Comments.

Chair Kirby asked to hear from the applicant.

Applicant Rob Riddle, 220 Market Street, Suite 201, New Albany, stated he was available to answer any questions and that he agreed with all of the conditions.

Commission Member Larsen confirmed that the changes were architectural and the site plan remained the same.

Commission Member Briggs asked whether the solid screen fencing would go all the way back as it appeared on page 21 of the paper packet.

Planner I Sauter responded that the fence would not go all the way back; it would end at the rear of the accessory structure.

Commission Member Wallace asked what the Architectural Review Board decided.

Planner Sauter explained that they had reviewed and approved the application with conditions last week, but no new conditions were added.

Chair Kirby opened the public hearing.

Danielle Jeffers approached the lectern. She stated that she lives in the house next door and she has two questions regarding the fence. First, it was her understanding that the fence would go all the way back to the Windsor fence line. Second, she was unsure about where the fence was going to go because of the utilities, and it was unclear whether a fire truck would fit without going into the utility easement.

Chair Kirby explained that a condition on the engineering side was Fire Department approval. He asked legal to comment on the easement and whether a fence could be put there.

Law Director Albrecht remarked that he was unsure whether an easement is there.

Engineer II Albright explained that permission from the easement owner would have to be provided. There is a utility easement there and in the right-of-way. He referenced the existing conditions sheet showing the location of the easement and the utility poles.

Chair Kirby said it was page four.

Law Director Albrecht added that if there is an easement, the property owner must work with the holder of the easement to put a fence within the easement.

Commission Member Wallace confirmed that the fence is a condition of approval.

Chair Kirby stated that this is the applicant's problem because it is a condition of approval. He further confirmed with legal that if the applicant is unable to install a fence they would be blocked from proceeding.

Law Director Albrecht stated that was correct, under those circumstances they would need to return to the Planning Commission.

Hearing no further questions, Chair Kirby moved to accept the staff reports and related documents into the record. Commission Member Wallace seconded the motion.

Chair Kirby asked whether there was any discussion on the motion. Hearing none, he asked to hear the roll.

Upon roll call: Mr. Kirby yes, Mr. Wallace yes, Mr. Larsen yes, Ms. Briggs yes. Having four yes votes, the motion passed and the documents were admitted to the record.

Commission Member Larsen moved to approve application FDP-32-2026 based on the findings in the staff report with the conditions in the staff report, subject to staff approval. Commission Member Wallace seconded the motion.

Chair Kirby asked whether there was any discussion on the motion. Hearing none he asked to hear the roll.

Upon roll call: Mr. Larsen no, Mr. Wallace no, Mr. Kirby yes, Ms. Briggs yes. Having two yes votes and two no votes, the motion failed and application FDP-32-2026 was denied.

Commission Member Larsen explained that he voted no for the same reasons that he voted no on the rezoning application. He did not find this use to be appropriate for this location, he was concerned about circulation on the property, and safety.

Commission Member Wallace concurred with Commission Member Larsen. He voted no on the zoning application and the same rationale applied with this application. This use proposes a square peg for a round hole, and he could not find that this was an appropriate use for this location.

The applicants approached the lectern to discuss the possibility and requirements for reconsideration, asserting that they can provide more information.

Planning Manager Christian and Law Director Albrecht discussed these options briefly and then continued discussions in the hallway.

VAR-49-2026 8535 Wood Grove Drive Trim Color Variance
Request for a variance from the Woodhaven zoning text to allow dark-colored trim at 8535 Wood Grove Drive (PID: 222-005329).
Applicant: Kirk Denyes

Planner I Blackburn delivered the staff report.

Chair Kirby confirmed that there were no engineering comments and then asked whether the applicant had anything to add.

Applicant Kirk Denyes with Bob Webb spoke in support of the application. He showed color samples that are lighter in color. He noted that the door on the left rendering was in error because it was actually lighter in color. The dark color looked almost black, but it was not as dark as on the rendering.

Council Member Wiltrout confirmed which colors had been approved and their corresponding doors as compared with the proposed color.

Planner I Blackburn added that the lighter trim would have lighter doors, the dark doors on the proposal would have darker trim.

There was further discussion on this topic.

Commission Member Larsen remarked that this is subjective because lighter meant different things to different people, and asked whether there are were other colors that the customers are interested in.

Mr. Denyes responded that it is a color family.

Chair Kirby asked whether the applicants have spoken to the neighbors.

Planner I Blackburn responded that the neighbors were notified.

Mr. Denyes said he had not been in contact with the neighbors.

Chair Kirby opened the public hearing.

Applicants Bertha and Justin Lun rose in support of the variance. They explained that their intent is to add dimension to the windows.

Council Member Wiltrout confirmed that despite the color of the doors, a variance was needed for the darker trim around the windows.

Chair Kirby moved to accept the staff reports and related documents including the colors shown at the meeting into the record for VAR-49-2026. Commission Member Wallace seconded the motion.

Chair Kirby asked whether there was any discussion on the motion. Hearing none he asked to hear the roll.

Upon roll call: Mr. Kirby yes, Mr. Wallace yes, Mr. Larsen yes, Ms. Briggs yes. Having four yes votes the motion passed and the documents were admitted to the record.

Chair Kirby confirmed that the color samples would be admitted to the record.

Commission Member Briggs moved for approval of application VAR-49-2026 based on the findings in the staff report with the conditions in the staff report, subject to staff approval. Commission Member Larsen seconded the motion.

Chair Kirby asked whether there was any discussion on the motion. Hearing none he asked to hear the roll.

Upon roll call: Ms. Briggs yes, Mr. Larsen yes, Mr. Kirby no, Mr. Wallace no. Having two yes votes and two no votes, the motion failed and the variance was denied.

Chair Kirby explained that he voted no because he did not find that the criteria in *Duncan v. Village of Mayfield* had been met in this case. He further found this request did not meet the criteria established in C.O. 1113.06. In particular, he found that granting this variance will confer a special privilege on this applicant that is denied by the zoning ordinance to other property owners in the same district. The property owners had sufficient notice of the design regulations.

Commission Member Wallace concurred with Chair Kirby's rationale and further found it significant that the staff finds this to be substantial, that it is inconsistent with the guidelines, and the owners had notice of the colors.

FDM-50-2026 Nationwide Children's Hospital Final Development Plan Modification
Request for approval for a final development plan modification to amend the Nationwide Children's Hospital plan to raise the lower west parapet at Level 3 by 8 feet to accommodate sign visibility as well as relocation of a previously approved wall sign (PID: 222-00543).
Applicant: Bryce Shirley

Planner II Saumenig delivered the staff report.

Chair Kirby asked about the Architectural Review Board proceedings.

Planner II Saumenig stated that the Architectural Review Board approved the application without conditions and found that it was a better design.

There were no comments from engineering.

The applicant was not present.

Chair Kirby asked for questions from the commission.

Commission Member Wallace stated that the pictures in the packet show that it is a better design.

The commission members agreed.

Chair Kirby moved to accept the staff reports and related documents into the record for FDM-50-2026. Commission Member Wallace seconded the motion.

Chair Kirby asked whether there was any discussion on the motion. Hearing none, he asked to hear the roll.

Upon roll call: Mr. Kirby yes, Mr. Wallace yes, Ms. Briggs yes, Mr. Larsen yes. Having four yes votes, the motion passed and the documents were admitted to the record.

Chair Kirby moved for approval of application FDM-50-2026 based on the findings in the staff report with the conditions in the staff report, subject to staff approval. Commission Member Wallace seconded the motion.

Chair Kirby asked whether there was any discussion on the motion. Hearing none, he asked to hear the roll.

Upon roll call: Mr. Kirby yes, Mr. Wallace yes, Ms. Briggs yes, Mr. Larsen yes. Having four yes votes, the motion passed and the modification to the final development plan was granted.

FDP-04-2026 Edgehill Final Development Plan

Request for approval for a combined preliminary and final development plan for a new 243-unit development to be known as Edgehill at 9582 Johnstown Road (PID: 222-000238).
Applicant: M/I Homes c/o Joe Looby, EMH&T

Planner II Saumenig delivered the staff report for the final development plan.

Waiver A - from UCC Section 2.51 to reduce the minimum percentage of lot width that a townhome building must occupy from 90% to 76%.

Waiver B – from UCC Section 2.51 to reduce the minimum required lot size for townhome lots from 25 to 22 feet.

Planner I Henderson delivered the staff report for waivers A and B.

Chair Kirby suggested the waivers be evaluated individually and asked to hear from the applicants.

Applicant Tom Rubey, Director of Development for the New Albany Company (NACO), spoke in support of the application. He explained that in 1998 this was called a Ganton parcel and was zoned for single-family residences. Last year, NACO and the schools developed the Cooperative Strategies Report with the objective of managing the student population impact that would result from residential development of this property. NACO tapped their design partnership with M/I Homes for this application, which will consist of attached townhomes and single-family residences, similar to Grandview Yard. It is directed at empty nesters and young professionals, and based on the school yield from the project in Grandview Yard, this is projected to increase the student population by 35 students. There are roughly 54 acres of developable land and NACO has committed to a dedication of 21 acres of parkland. The waivers are the result of a months-long negotiation with the fire department and the city architect. He explained the need for the garage door waiver and the window typology waiver. The windows requested were the same as those used at Market and Main. The team is happy to answer any questions about the various waivers.

Council Member Wiltrout asked about the data loaded into the Cooperative Strategies Report with the school.

Mr. Rubey answered that it was 294 single family units and they calculate 0.7 children for each unit for a yield of 200 students. This application proposes 243 units, which is 51 fewer units than what the zoning would permit today, and the units are scaled to appeal to empty nesters and young professionals. This property has been rezoned several times. Also, the parkland dedication will be far above the requirement. It includes creek headwaters and a conservation easement. The applicants will return to the commission for plat approvals.

Chair Kirby restated his suggestion that the waivers be walked through one at a time and asked why the applicant is specifically requesting 22 feet for the lot size.

Planner II Saumenig explained that taken together, Waiver A and Waiver B provide a more appropriate development pattern for the Village Center. Strict application of the lot coverage rule would result in 6-foot spacing between the side facades of the townhomes, which, due to the curvature of the road, will look like an endless row. The requested 22-foot interior width is consistent with the compact form of urban townhomes and would create a 15-foot side yard. The reduction in interior width coupled with the added end-unit spacing will enhance the streetscape.

Chair Kirby noted that the side yard on the ends necessitate waiver A and he confirmed that the end units own the grass.

Commission Member Larsen remarked that if 22 ½ is the building width desired, that is what should be requested.

Applicant Josh Barkan with M/I Homes, 4131 Worth Avenue, explained that this request is the result of two years of planning and wanting to create something unique that built off the UCC. We saw this as two communities in one that would work well with the hospital to the north and the park to the west. M/I is using their city collection, which is the 94 single-family homes. This has been very successful at Grandview Yard. The units are 22 feet wide on 28-foot lots. The townhomes have not been built in Columbus; they have been built in Naperville, Indianapolis, and Cincinnati. The waivers requests are distinctly different from a variance, as a waiver offers some fluidity in design from the Urban Center Code, a form-based code. He added that 22-foot interior units in a setting like this are actually fairly large, and getting larger than that could push close to 2,700 to 3,000 square feet.

Chair Kirby confirmed that the square footage did not include the garage space.

Commission Member Wallace confirmed that the end unit square footage is greater than the interior units by about 300 to 350 feet.

Mr. Rubey explained that the larger size for the end units was at the recommendation of the city architect. It is intended to improve the roofline and other visual aspects of the design and the impact of the neighborhood.

Chair Kirby asked staff why the UCC set the standard at 25 feet, because the intent tells us whether a waiver is trivial or substantial. The rationale supports the factual determination for the waiver.

Planning Manager Christian answered that he is not sure; the form-based code establishes the baseline but does not provide for all building iterations, which is why the waiver process exists. Further, he suspects that there are dozens of examples of deviation from that standard.

Mr. Rubey agreed and added that legislating good design is an impossible task as a practical matter. Legislation provides the baseline, professionals design specific real-life examples.

Chair Kirby summarized that perhaps the implication is 25 feet works, but it does not mean that other numbers do not work.

Planning Manager Christian agreed and stated that for an application of this size to only have 8 waivers is significant.

Commission Member Wallace stated that some of the other waiver requests result from this request, and this appears to be a situation of cascading waivers, and he has not heard a strong case for granting the waiver from 25 feet to 22 feet.

Law Director Albrecht remarked that the waiver process is different than the variance process. The waiver process allows for deviations, provided they are part of the design.

Mr. Rubey added that the team knew that they would need a few waivers. They have met with and continue to meet with the schools. The objective is to diversify the housing stock and not negatively impact the schools. A significant amount of design time has been invested in this application. This is more about roof form and the appearance from the public road than the interior.

Chair Kirby acknowledged the effort in the design plan and suggested that the commission put a pin in 22 feet.

<u>Waiver C</u> – from Section 2 of the Village Residential Design Guidelines and Requirements (DGRs), subsection II.A.2, to allow small surface parking areas to not be located behind primary buildings.

Planner I Henderson continued the staff report for Waiver C.

Commission Member Larsen confirmed that the applicant agreed to maintain no visibility of the parking areas from Ganton Parkway or Miller Avenue as a condition of approval.

Council Member Wiltrout confirmed that the visitor parking lots have a total of 52 spots.

Mr. Barkan added that each unit has an 8-foot driveway in addition to the 2-bay garage, so there are four spots per unit.

Planner II Saumenig added that the applicant is above and beyond the minimum parking requirements.

Council Member Wiltrout asked whether there is parking in the alleys or just the main streets and driveways.

Mr. Rubey answered that there is parking in the driveway and the alleys are 20 feet to accommodate fire trucks. He continued that one could argue that there is insufficient parking in Richmond Square and Keswick.

Commission Member Wallace asked what consideration drove the decision about where to locate the extra parking lots.

Applicant Joel West with M/I Homes explained they wanted convenient parking in front of as many of the detached homes without on-street parking as possible. There are more parking areas in the attached townhome portion due to there being less on-street parking. Some of the parking areas also serve as parking for the cluster mailbox units.

Commission Member Larsen commented that it is nice to have the extra spots for visitors when holding a function.

<u>Waiver D</u> – from Section 2 of the Village Residential Design Guidelines and Requirements (DGRs), subsections II.B.3 and III.B.3, to allow double-bay garage doors.

Planner I Henderson continued the staff report for Waiver D.

Council Member Wiltrout confirmed that the proposal is not intended to appear like two single-bay garage doors.

Chair Kirby confirmed there have been prior city approvals of double-bay garage doors that appear like two single-bay garage doors, either as part of a zoning text or as individual variances.

Commission Member Wallace asked if the appearance of single-bay garage doors could be placed as a condition of approval.

Mr. Barkan confirmed that hardware could be used to accomplish the appearance of two individual garage doors on one double-bay door. He agreed that it was okay as long as it is just hardware.

Commission Member Larsen noted that this waiver is being driven by the earlier waiver for a 22-foot-wide house. If the house were wider, this would not be a discussion item. He asked why this could not be done with two nine-foot-wide doors.

Mr. Rubey stated that because of the limited size of the alleys, the larger garage opening is most functionally appropriate for entering and exiting cars. The single-bay garage doors are usually used for single-family detached homes on much wider lots.

At 8:43 p.m., Chair Kirby called a five-minute recess.

At 8:52 p.m., Chair Kirby called the meeting to order.

Applicant Aaron Underhill discussed the intent of the Urban Center Code and the waiver provisions. While the city zoning code is a Euclidian code, which has objective and measurable standards, the UCC is a form-based code that provides flexible options for development. The design condition of this area and the intersecting Ganton Parkway are much different than that of the Village Center. The area is also unique due to its C-PUD zoning, which was intended to accommodate the Nationwide Children's Hospital, and the best option at the time was to defer to the UCC for these standards. The ARB, who usually reviews waiver requests, unanimously recommended approval of this plan, even though they did not vote on the waivers.

Chair Kirby commented that the waivers would not be necessary if this development had been figured out earlier in the zoning process and codified in the zoning text.

Commission Member Wallace asked staff about the four consideration factors for waivers.

Law Director Albrecht verified all four factors should be considered.

Commission Member Wallace noted the requirement that a waiver must be necessary for reasons of fairness due to unusual building, structure, or site constraints. The other waiver criteria have been focused on, but not so much this one.

Mr. Underhill stated the roadway configuration and the typology of Ganton Parkway are different than the conditions of the rest of the Village Center.

Waiver E – from Section 2 of the Village Residential DGRs, subsection II.B.5, to eliminate the requirement that shutters, when used, must be used on all windows of the elevation.

Planner I Henderson continued the staff report for Waiver E.

Chair Kirby confirmed that the intent of the waiver is what is shown in the picture, not necessarily all windows. Shutters would not be required on a door's window.

Commission Member Wallace stated no shutters on the windows is better than no windows at all.

Commission Member Larsen asked why there are shutters on all of the brick townhome windows except for the center section of the first level.

Planner I Henderson responded that the shutter requirement does not apply to townhomes.

Commission Member Larsen stated he believed the shutter condition should be consistent across the entire façade.

Mr. Rubey stated there is not enough room in those locations for shutters that appear proportional to the window. It is important that the shutters be proportioned to look like they could cover the width of the window. He discussed how different architectural elements make each building of the townhome unique from one another.

Commission Member Larsen noted the banded brick around the subject windows and stated it makes him comfortable with Waiver E.

Waiver F – from Section 2 of the Village Residential DGRs, subsection II.B.6, to allow primary home entrances to face open space or parkland rather than a street.

Planner I Henderson continued the staff report for Waiver F.

Mr. Barkan spoke in support of the waiver. There was lots of discussion with staff about this. Particularly for the units on the far west side, there is a path that splits the middle of the homes and a path that wraps around on all sides in addition to parking to the south. This is the most important part of the site to allow this, as it is a particularly beautiful and desirable setting.

Chair Kirby noted the waiver exhibit page in the notebook and the waiver map in the presentation show where this waiver would apply in red crosshatching. He asked whether wayfinding signs could assist with navigation toward front doors.

Mr. Barkan responded that there have been conversations about putting unit numbers on the parking areas and garages. He continued that the reason for the orientation of the homes on the far west side is also to minimize wetland impacts. They may end up installing a fence there.

Chair Kirby confirmed that the discussion also pertains to the homes facing Dublin-Granville Road and the roundabout.

Council Member Wiltrout asked about access by visitors or delivery drivers.

Mr. Barkan explained that they were intentional in connecting all of the walks around the units, especially the townhomes. A delivery driver could park in the satellite parking and take the path to the front of the home.

Commission Member Larsen stated he is having trouble with this waiver. It breaks the connectivity of the Strategic Plan. He explained that he thinks this is safety issue, and lack of connectivity is not as safe as if there is a street in front of the homes.

Mr. Barkan stated every house will have a light on the front.

Mr. Rubey added that this condition also exists on the south side of the Landsdowne subdivision.

Council Member Larsen discussed the conditions at Grandview Yard.

Council Member Wiltrout noted that there are other ways to enter the homes, such as through the garages.

Planning Manager Christian stated he visited their sites in Grandview, looking at Founders Park and Harrison West from this perspective, and believes it is well-executed. He had no concerns from a safety perspective.

Mr. Rubey stated there will be a perimeter sidewalk as well as a leisure trail; additionally, all roads will be public roads. This is a heavily treed area.

Chair Kirby asked whether the perimeter sidewalks will be illuminated independently of the house lighting.

Mr. Rubey stated there is no lighting on the leisure trail and there are detached front yard lampposts with each of the houses, but they had not considered independent sidewalk lighting.

Chair Kirby suggested the applicant explore sidewalk illumination.

Waiver G – from Section 2 of the Village Residential DGRs, subsection II.F.7, to allow new windows to be made of vinyl rather than being just cladded with vinyl.

Planner I Henderson continued the staff report for Waiver G.

Commission Member Wallace asked why there are nine waiver requests in the application but only eight in the staff report.

Planner I Henderson clarified that upon staff review of the application, it was determined that one waiver pertaining to the alley width was not needed.

Mr. Rubey explained that the DGRs recommend alleys be 18 feet, but the Plain Township Fire Department was insistent on 20-foot alleys. The 20-foot width is a good layout and mitigates some of the turning radius problems that exist in places like Windsor.

Waiver H – from UCC Section 5.19 to allow a minimum 10-foot-wide center median within the internal streets of the development that are designed as boulevards when a 12-foot-wide minimum is standard.

Planner I Henderson continued the staff report for Waiver H.

Chair Kirby confirmed the medians will be made up of trees.

Planner II Saumenig concluded the staff report.

Mr. Rubey asked the commission members to agree to the modification to condition 3 that would allow staff approval of the stormwater basin design rather than PC approval. The design of the park, playground, and basin will require another level of iteration and evaluation with the city landscape architects and the planners.

Commission Member Wallace asked why the condition originally stated that the stormwater basin design must come back to PC for review.

Planner II Saumenig responded that re-review of an unfinished portion of a plan by PC is consistent with the process for other subdivisions. The ARB saw the same condition and voted to revise it per the applicant's request.

Mr. Rubey stated that he was the one who requested the modification to the condition, because he believes the city engineer and the city landscape architect are the ones most qualified to evaluate the design of the regional stormwater basin.

Commission Member Larsen stated that his understanding is the final development plan requires the stormwater basin to be part of the submission.

Chair Kirby confirmed that the park area is not part of this application and PC will review it in another application.

Mr. Rubey stated that he is not opposed to the commission reviewing the park or the stormwater basin, but he anticipates that it will be more involved.

Council Member Wiltrout stated that she believes the reasoning for the request is that the basin is one piece of a larger, separate project that will have different areas of review.

Planning Manager Christian summarized the discussion and condition that once the final basin design has been determined for the area between Miller Road and Ganton Parkway, the applicant will return to the PC for review and approval of that basin design. There might be a temporary solution between now and the final design that would not require PC approval.

Commission Member Briggs asked who is paying for the construction of Miller Road.

Mr. Rubey discussed some of the history of the extension of Miller Road and stated that, where negotiations are today, they are paying for the extension from the development up to the creek, and the city will pay across the creek. This will ultimately be a City Council decision.

Hearing no further questions from the commission, Chair Kirby opened the public hearing.

Hearing no comment from the public, Chair Kirby confirmed that the waivers could be voted on all together or individually.

Law Director Albrecht confirmed that the commission can vote waiver by waiver or all at the same time.

Chair Kirby stated that the commission will vote on the final development plan first, and then they will vote on the waivers individually.

Commission Member Wallace requested a five-minute break to review the waivers.

Chair Kirby moved to accept the staff reports and related documents, including the presentation slides, into the record for FDP-04-2026. Commission Member Larsen seconded the motion.

Chair Kirby asked whether there was any discussion on the motion. Hearing none, he asked to hear the roll.

Upon roll call: Mr. Kirby yes, Mr. Larsen yes, Ms. Briggs yes, Mr. Wallace yes. Having four yes votes, the motion passed and the documents were admitted.

Chair Kirby moved for approval of FDP-04-2026 based on the findings in the staff report, with the conditions in the staff report, with condition 3 as modified below, and the following additional conditions 7 through 10:

1. The applicant works with the city on the Miller Avenue road construction.
2. The applicant works with city staff to identify and install appropriate fence end caps at the opening along Dublin-Granville Road.
3. Once the final basin design has been determined between future Miller and Ganton, it will come before the commission.

4. The applicant shall work with city staff to determine the playground equipment to be installed within one of the HOA-owned and maintained reserve areas.
5. The applicant shall provide the fixture design for the front doors of the homes, subject to staff approval.
6. The city engineer's comments shall be addressed during the permit review process.
7. The parking in Waiver C shall be hidden from Ganton and Miller.
8. The double-bay garage doors shall appear as a pair of single-bay garage doors.
9. Waiver E only applies to the windows highlighted on the Baldwin as presented.
10. The applicant shall work with staff on low-level, downcast lighting in areas affected by Waiver F.

Commission Member Briggs seconded the motion.

Chair Kirby asked whether there was any discussion on the motion and whether the conditions were clear. Hearing no comment he asked to hear the roll.

Upon roll call: Mr. Kirby yes, Ms. Briggs yes, Mr. Wallace yes, Mr. Larsen no. Having three yes votes and one no vote, the motion passed and the final development plan was approved.

Commission Member Larsen explained that he voted no because the layout was not in conformity with the Strategic Plan and he has safety concerns.

At 10:00 p.m. Chair Kirby called a five-minute recess.

At 10:10 p.m. Chair Kirby called the meeting to order.

Mr. Underhill approached the lectern. He noted Commission Member Saigal's absence. He also noted the discussions surrounding Waivers F and G and said that if passage of any of the waivers is in jeopardy, they would like to wait for consideration by the full five-member commission.

Mr. Underhill discussed this with the commission. The commission noted the substantial amount of time that had been devoted to the application at this meeting, and the availability of a motion for reconsideration if any of the waivers failed. Mr. Underhill requested that the application be tabled until the regular meeting in August so that the application could be considered by the full commission.

Motion to table – denied 2-2
Chair Kirby moved to table consideration of the waivers until the regular August meeting. Commission Member Wallace seconded the motion.

Chair Kirby asked whether there was any discussion on the motion. Hearing none, he asked to hear the roll.

Upon roll call: Mr. Kirby yes, Mr. Wallace no, Mr. Larsen no, Ms. Briggs yes. Having two yes votes and two no votes, the motion failed and the Waivers were not laid upon the table.

Commission Member Wallace explained that he voted no because of the amount of time spent by the applicant and the staff and the availability of reconsideration.

Commission Member Larsen concurred in the rationale.

Mr. Underhill stated that the applicants wanted consideration by the full commission and he was unsure whether or not the presence of the fifth member was sufficient to support a motion for reconsideration.

Mr. Harkin added that the design team wanted time to consider and apply the comments made at this meeting.

Waiver A – granted 4-0
Commission Member Larsen moved for approval of Waiver A. Chair Kirby seconded the motion.

Chair Kirby asked whether there was any discussion on the motion. Hearing none, he asked to hear the roll. Upon roll call: Mr. Larsen yes, Mr. Kirby yes, Ms. Briggs yes, Mr. Wallace yes. Having four yes votes, the motion passed and Waiver A was granted.

Waiver B – granted 4-0
Chair Kirby moved to approve Waiver B. Commission Member Briggs seconded the motion.

Chair Kirby asked whether there was any discussion on the motion. Hearing none, he asked to hear the roll. Upon roll call: Mr. Kirby yes, Ms. Briggs yes, Mr. Larsen yes, Mr. Wallace yes. Having four yes votes, the motion passed and Waiver B was granted.

Waiver C – granted 4-0
Commission Member Briggs moved for approval of Waiver C. Chair Kirby seconded the motion.

Chair Kirby asked whether there was any discussion on the motion. Hearing none, he asked to hear the roll. Upon roll call: Ms. Briggs yes, Mr. Kirby yes, Mr. Larsen yes, Mr. Wallace yes. Having four yes votes, the motion passed and Waiver C was granted.

Waiver D – granted 4-0
Commission Member Larsen moved for approval of Waiver D. Chair Kirby seconded the motion.

Chair Kirby asked whether there was any discussion on the motion. Hearing none, he asked to hear the roll. Upon roll call: Mr. Larsen yes, Mr. Kirby yes, Ms. Briggs yes, Mr. Wallace yes. Having four yes votes, the motion passed and Waiver D was granted.

Waiver E – granted 4-0
Commission Member Briggs moved for approval of Waiver E. Chair Kirby seconded the motion.

Chair Kirby asked whether there was any discussion on the motion. Hearing none, he asked to hear the roll. Upon roll call: Ms. Briggs yes, Mr. Kirby yes, Mr. Larsen yes, Mr. Wallace yes. Having four yes votes, the motion passed and Waiver E was granted.

Waiver F – granted 3-1
Commission Member Larsen moved for approval of Waiver F. Chair Kirby seconded the motion.

Chair Kirby asked whether there was any discussion on the motion. Hearing none, he asked to hear the roll. Upon roll call: Mr. Larsen no, Mr. Kirby yes, Ms. Briggs yes, Mr. Wallace yes. Having three yes votes and one no vote, the motion passed and Waiver F was granted.

Commission Member Larsen explained that he voted no for the same reasons he voted no on the final development plan.

Waiver G – granted 3-1
Chair Kirby moved for approval of Waiver G. Commission Member Briggs seconded the motion.

Chair Kirby asked whether there was any discussion on the motion. Hearing none, he asked to hear the roll. Upon roll call: Mr. Kirby yes, Ms. Briggs yes, Mr. Larsen yes, Mr. Wallace no. Having three yes votes and one no vote, the motion passed and Waiver G was granted.

Commission Member Wallace explained that he voted no because he did not find that the request meets the four waiver requirements.

Waiver H – granted 4-0

Commission Member Briggs moved for approval of Waiver H. Chair Kirby seconded the motion.

Chair Kirby asked whether there was any discussion on the motion. Hearing none, he asked to hear the roll. Upon roll call: Ms. Briggs yes, Mr. Kirby yes, Mr. Wallace yes, Mr. Larsen yes. Having four yes votes, the motion passed and Waiver H was granted.

The commission thanked the applicants and wished them good luck.

The applicants thanked the board.

VII. Other business

1. Informal Review: Walton Parkway Mershad

Kareem Amr with Mershad Development, 7775 Walton Parkway, and Brandon Diamond with Torti Gallas + Partners, 1923 Vermont Avenue NW, Washington, D.C., delivered the informal presentation.

Chair Kirby asked about the school impact of the development.

Mr. Amr explained the basis of the study was performed as part of the US-62 focus area plan and they are hoping to stick to that level of density.

Chair Kirby and Commission Member Wallace asked how this will relate to or impact the Hamlet development.

Mr. Diamond stated there will need to be focus on getting the scale right and making the two developments different. Traditionally, large developments will go after national restaurants and national retailers. The Hamlet is doing something different in terms of its scale and likely its merchandizing strategy. We will search for the right operators for this to feel very local and very New Albany.

Mr. Amr added that the reality of planning and real estate is that uses often mix nowadays. While the development may feel like more of the same, numerous good-quality users are needed to succeed. The size and amount of each use are different, as is the aggregate component. This acts more as a refuge from the busyness of US-62 and from the intensity of the Business Park.

Chair Kirby expressed concern about prices and margins for small operators. Small businesses might have trouble getting a foothold. Market Square had struggled early on.

Mr. Diamond responded that the neighborhood and commercial development are very related; if you try to start with just retail, this would struggle. They need to come up together.

Mr. Amr continued that they are proposing a slightly wider retail user than Market Street that has not really been seen yet in the city.

Commission Member Larsen stated that there is a lot of parking area and few gathering areas or public spaces. The community is looking for somewhere to spend time and make connections. This seems to pull people in from a much broader area, and there are no connection points that really invite people to get together.

Mr. Diamond pointed out the pedestrian connectivity throughout the proposal as well as the commercial cluster and central conservatory. This is a fairly conservative amount of parking; it is ultimately integrating parking and hiding it.

Commission Member Larsen asked why the office building is at the front of the site instead of keeping the residential closer to the civic and retail uses.

Mr. Diamond stated deed restrictions impacted how they configured the site.

Chair Kirby hoped to see electric car charging in the parking lots or even solar panels above them to minimize the heat island effect.

Commission Member Larsen reiterated that the residential and retail uses feel disconnected, and he wonders if there is a way to make it flow together better.

Mr. Amr discussed their concept for the conservatory acting as a gathering place and a driver for all uses.

Hearing no further comments, Chair Kirby thanked the applicants.

VIII. Poll members for comment

Hearing no other business, Chair Kirby polled the members for comment.

IX. Adjournment

Having completed the agenda and hearing no further comment, Chair Kirby adjourned the July 20, 2026 New Albany Planning Commission meeting without objection at 11:28 p.m.

Submitted by Deputy Clerk Madriguera, Esq. and Planner I Lauren Sauter

Appendix – To be added
FDP-32-2026
- **Staff Report**
- **Record of Action**

VAR-49-2026
- **Staff Report**
- **Colors shown at hearing added to the record**
- **Record of Action**

FDM-50-2026
- **Staff Report**
- **Record of Action**

FDP-04-2026
- **Staff Report including slides from presentation**
- **Record of Action**