New Albany Architectural Review Board
Monday, July 13, 2026 Meeting Minutes - Approved

I. Call to order

The New Albany Architectural Review Board held a regular meeting on Monday, July 13, 2026 in the New Albany Village Hall. Chair Hinson called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. and asked to hear the roll.

II. Roll call

Those answering the roll:

Mr. Alan Hinson	present
Mr. Jon Iten	present
Mr. Jim Brown	present
Mr. Adam Davie	present; recused for consideration of FDP-32-2026.
Mr. Andrew Maletz	present
Ms. Traci Moore	present
Mr. Francis Strahler	present
Council Member Brisk	present

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

Staff members present: Law Director Ben Albrecht, Planner I Kylie Blackburn, Planning Manager Chris Christian, Deputy City Manager Adrienne Joly, Planner I Lauren Sauter, Deputy Clerk Christina Madriguera.

III. Action on minutes: June 8, 2026

Chair Hinson asked if there were any corrections to the minutes from the June 8, 2026 meeting.

Board Member Strahler said on page three, in paragraph three attributed to him that "and stone" should be added so the sentence should read, "Board Member Strahler asked how often hardie board and stone is approved."

Deputy Clerk Madriguera noted the correction.

Hearing no further corrections, Board Member Strahler moved to approve the June 8, 2026 meeting minutes as corrected. Board Member Brown seconded the motion.

Upon roll call: Mr. Strahler yes, Mr. Brown yes, Mr. Hinson yes, Ms. Moore yes, Mr. Maletz abstained, Mr. Davie yes. Having five yes votes the motion passed and the June 8, 2026 meeting minutes were approved as corrected.

IV. Additions or corrections to the agenda

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

Planner II Saumenig stated there was one addition, staff would like to add the informal review of the Athletic Campus Phase I Plan to Other business.

Without objection, Chair Hinson added the item to the agenda.

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

V. Hearing of visitors for items not on tonight's agenda
Chair Hinson asked if there were any visitors present who wished to speak on an item not on the agenda. Hearing none, he introduced the first case and asked to hear from staff.

VI. Cases:

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

Board Member Davie recused himself from consideration of this case and stepped down from the dais.

Planner I Sauter delivered the staff report.

Chair Hinson asked the applicants if they had anything to add.

They indicated they were available for questions.

Board Member Brown asked about the engineer's comments, noting that they are extensive. He asked about condition five and whether the application would need to return to the board if a substantial change was required.

Planner II Saumenig noted that the Planning Commission was the approving body, and answered yes, a substantial change to the final development plan would require approval.

Planning Manager Christian added that this number of comments and conditions was fairly typical for this type of application.

Board Member Maletz asked whether the proposed accessory building was a tear-down or a renovation of the existing structure.

Applicant and Architect Davie for the project answered that it would be a renovation of the existing structure.

Chair Hinson asked about storage on the property.

Mr. Davie answered that storage would be for home staging equipment.

Board Member Maletz clarified that there are two parking spaces on the property.

Chair Hinson moved to favorably recommend FDP-32-2026 to the Planning Commission. Board Member Moore seconded the motion.

Upon roll call: Mr. Hinson yes, Ms. Moore yes, Mr. Strahler yes, Mr. Brown yes, Mr. Maletz yes. Having five yes votes, the motion passed and FDP-32-2026 was favorably recommended to the Planning Commission.

The board wished the applicants good luck.

Mr. Davie took his seat on the dias and remained present for the balance of the meeting.

Chair Hinson introduced the next case and asked to hear the staff report.

ARB-36-2026 6905 Central College Road New Build Certificate of Appropriateness and Waivers
Certificate of Appropriateness for the use of Hardie board and stone as exterior materials on a new home with waivers for DGR Sections 1(I)(G) and 5(II)(B)(2) regarding the contemporary architectural style, 5(II)(F)(4) to allow stone chimneys, 1(I)(E) regarding the visibility of the garage, and 5(II)(B)(3) to allow a double-bay garage at 6905 Central College Road (PID: 222-000349).
Applicant: Old World Custom Homes c/o Patrick Miller

Planner I Sauter delivered the staff report.

Chair Hinson asked to see the west elevation and noted the blank space on the back of the sport building.

Board Member Maletz remarked that four-sided architecture requires some articulation at the gable - this is minimally required in order to address that concern. He confirmed that the blank side was west-facing.

Applicant April Small responded that the west elevation is a sport room, and for that reason they wanted to minimize windows. She confirmed that it was one surface, but a hip return could be added.

Board Member Maletz continued that he understood the reason, and added that the less vertical surface area, the better, but it could be dealt with a shutter or trim condition or a change of surface.

Board Member Moore stated that projecting it out made sense.

Ms. Small explained that that area was directly behind the basketball hoop.

Chair Hinson answered that many structures were drywalled out beyond the interior wall.

Ms. Small answered that if the fenestration or surface was added, the applicant would like to keep the single wall.

Board Member Davie commented that the garage was greatly improved from the last meeting.

Board Member Strahler asked about the second drive and the landscape plan, and whether there would be screening.

Ms. Small responded that it is a catering access point and that there will be a landscape plan.

Planner I Sauter responded that the drive is permitted.

Board Member Strahler asked if the board could require screening of the drive.

Planning Manager Christian answered yes, if the applicant agrees.

Maletz asked about headlight screening for the neighbor's property to the west. He said he thinks it is solvable with scrutiny of the conditions.

Board Member Strahler confirmed there was parking for the cars accessing the catering drive.

Board Member Maletz remarked that he had no further comments but stated that he thought one more revision to the west elevation was needed.

Chair Hinson agreed that a further revision of the west elevation and screening of the drive was needed.

Chair Hinson moved to table the application for 30 days. Board Member Strahler seconded the motion.

Upon roll call: Mr. Hinson yes, Mr. Strahler yes, Ms. Moore yes, Mr. Davie yes, Mr. Brown yes, Mr. Maletz yes. Having six yes votes, the motion passed and the application was laid upon the table for 30 days.

ARB-45-2026 Cimarron Aesthetics Signage Certificate of Appropriateness
Certificate of Appropriateness for new signs for Cimarron Aesthetics at 110 E Main Street (PID: 222-004299).
Applicant: Morrison Signs c/o Shaun White

Planner I Blackburn delivered the staff report.

Chair Hinson asked whether the signs are the same size.

The applicant answered that they are the same size and acknowledged that they are not proportional in the picture. He noted the difference in the fonts and explained that that is part of the logo.

Board Member Moore noted the differences in the borders and asked whether the dimensions were the same.

The applicant answered yes.

Board Member Davie remarked that the C made the other letters look off-center and recommended that the word be centered.

The applicant agreed and said it is supposed to be centered.

Board Member Brown confirmed with the applicant and with Law Director Albrecht that a condition requiring centering was not needed, and that approval, if granted, was on the recognition that the wording on the sign is centered.

Chair Hinson moved for approval of ARB-45-2026. Board Member Maletz seconded the motion.

Upon roll call: Mr. Hinson yes, Mr. Maletz yes, Mr. Davie yes, Ms. Moore yes, Mr. Brown yes, Mr. Strahler yes. Having six yes votes, the motion passed and the certificate of approved.

The board wished the applicants good luck.

Chair Hinson introduced the next case and asked to hear from staff.

ARB-48-2026 Apollo Coffee Certificate of Appropriateness
Certificate of Appropriateness for a new ADA ramp for Apollo Coffee at 45 N. High Street (PID: 222-000018).
Applicant: Jacob Rovito

Planner I Blackburn delivered the staff report.

Board Member Maletz proposed that the landing be brick pavers instead of cement, remarking that it is a much better solution than concrete.

Law Director Albrecht wanted to be sure that pavers are ADA compliant.

Board Member Maletz agreed and added that there are ADA compliant steps.

Applicant Jacob Rovito agreed to using pavers instead of concrete for the steps.

Board Member Maletz stated that he believes this is a reasonable compromise and that he did not think that the ramp needs to be brick.

Hinson clarified which areas would be brick – the approaches would be brick – and that alone would go a long way to covering the ramp.

Mr. Rovito agreed.

Board Member Davie asked about the change in level from the entry door to the sidewalk, and stated that he would not use the surrounding buildings as a guide.

Mr. Rovito answered that he was not sure.

Board Member Maletz said he did not think the railing was adding anything.

Chair Hinson said there is a brick wall on the other side of the street, adding a similar element here could be complimentary and could obviate the need for a railing.

Board Member Davie suggested that it could be a single rail.

Board Member Brown noted that he appreciated what the applicant was trying to do but the railing really took away from the character of the structure.

Board Member Davie said this was less of a ramp and more of a path to the door.

Board Member Maletz agreed and remarked that the structure was clean in overall appearance, and the wall would solve the need for the railing. He confirmed that the applicant agreed to the proposed conditions.

Mr. Rovito agreed.

Board Member Maletz moved to approve ARB-48-2026 with the conditions in the staff report and the following three additional conditions, with all conditions subject to staff approval:

1. Any horizontal surface adjacent to right of way be constructed of brick pavers or similar materials and be ADA compliant.
2. A masonry stone wall be installed in lieu of proposed railing, and,
3. If railing is required it will be a single, wrought iron rail.
4. All subject to review by the Chief Building Offical and staff of the New Albany Development Department.

Board Member Brown seconded the motion.

Upon roll call: Mr. Maletz yes, Mr. Brown yes, Mr. Hinson yes, Ms. Moore yes, Mr. Davie yes, Mr. Strahler yes.
Having six yes votes, the motion passed and the certificate of appropriateness was granted.

The board wished the applicant good luck.

Chair Hinson introduced the next case and asked to hear the staff report.

FDM-50-2026 Nationwide Children's Hospital Final Development Plan Modification
Certificate of Appropriateness 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 Hinson had no questions.

Board Member Brown confirmed that the sign specifications are the same it was only the location of the signs would change.

Board Member Strahler moved for approval of the FDM-50-2026. Board Member Moore seconded the motion.

Upon roll call: Mr. Strahler yes, Ms. Moore yes, Mr. Davie yes, Mr. Maletz yes, Mr. Hinson yes, Mr. Brown yes.

Having six yes votes, the motion passed and the modification to the final development plan was approved.

The board wished the applicant good luck.

Chair Hinson introduced the next case and asked to hear the staff report.

ARB-47-2026 Edgehill Building Typology Certificate of Appropriateness
Certificate of Appropriateness to allow for a new building typology for 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.

Chair Hinson asked if the applicant had anything to add

Applicant Tom Rubey said he was happy to go through this application but it was difficult to explain it without also explaining FDP-04-2026.

Planner II Saumenig offered to deliver the staff report for FDP-04-2026.

Chair Hinson asked her to please do so.

Following the discussion for both applications, ARB-47-2026 and FDP-04-2026, Chair Hinson moved for approval of ARB-47-2026. Board Member Maletz seconded the motion.

Upon roll call: Mr. Hinson yes, Mr. Maletz yes, Mr. Davie yes, Ms. Moore yes, Mr. Brown yes. Having six yes votes the motion passed and a certificate of appropriateness for the new building typology was granted.

FDP-04-2026 Edgehill Final Development Plan
Certificate of Appropriateness 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.

Chair Hinson asked if the applicant had anything to add.

Tom Rubey, Applicant and Director of Development for the New Albany Company (NACO) spoke in support of the application. He explained that this area has been zoned for residential development since the 1990s. In conjunction with the schools a study was performed to calculate the student population yield attendant to residential development. The schools asked NACO to keep the growth of student population in mind. For that reason, despite the fact that all 54 acres of the land was zoned for residential development, NACO donated a large portion of the land to Nationwide Children's Hospital. With these applications they propose a residential development. The parkland dedication will be 20 acres and will exceed the 13 acre requirement. This plan represents 243 residential units, it is similar to Grandview Yard. These are intended to meet the demands of emply nesters and young professionals. He highlighted technical details and noted that this is not a Hampstead or Windsor type development. They have been working with the city architect and the city engineer to get the circulation right. Vinyl windows will be identical to the windows used at Market and Main.

Applicant Josh Harken with M/I Homes spoke in support of the application. This has been the culmination of two years of work. He explained the two separate products in this development, single family residences and townhomes. The single family residences are a product they built at Founders Park. They will all have big brick water tables and big front porches, there will be six feet between the houses. The townhomes have not been built in Columbus but have been built in places like Chicago, Indianapolis, and Cincinnati.

Applicant Dan O'Malley, Chief Product Architect from M/I Homes, spoke in support of the application. He explained that the homes will be built with a Georgian theme and they will be 1,960 to 2,100 square feet. All the homes have a standard frame elevation set up on a brick plinth.

Chair Hinson asked the applicants about which details were most discussed.

Mr. O'Malley answered that the brick allocations were frequently discussed; this gives the vertical and depth separation

Mr. Rubey added that the final window selection and roof selection were also frequently discussed. Those two details took a lot of time.

Chair Hinson asked about the cost differential between the two products.

Mr. Rubey responded that he was not sure.

Board Member Strahler asked about the first time this type of window was approved.

Mr. Rubey responded that these windows have been approved, and a notable example is Market and Main.

Board Member Maletz confirmed that these are considered simulated divided-lite; he further confirmed the width of the alleys and asked whether the rear drive was sufficient to accommodate a vehicle.

Mr. Harken explained that the rear drive was planned to be 18 feet, which is wide enough for one car.

Board Member Maletz asked whether they are concerned about encroachment from sport utility vehicles.

The applicant responded that a large truck will encroach but they do not anticipate that these residents will have that size of vehicle.

Board Member Maletz asked whether the typology could be used in other areas or whether it was restricted to this area. He confirmed that the planning commission is the decision-making body for the waivers. He further remarked that as much as he preferred the single door, the practicality of it was difficult. He also confirmed that there were 27 decision points for the buyers.

Planner II Saumenig answered that the typology was restricted to this area.

Council Member Brisk asked about the width of the alleys in Windsor compared to this development and the width of the roads.

Mr. Rubey answered that these would be wider than Windsor and that it has been reviewed by the fire chief.

Board Member Davie asked about the Baldwin options, noting that the windows appeared to be different from each other, some 2x2 and others 3x2.

Mr. O'Malley explained that the windows match on a single elevation but could be different from elevation to elevation.

Hearing no further questions, the board voted on the typology as indicated above.

Chair Hinson asked for further comments or conditions on FDP-04-2026.

Mr. Rubey requested that condition 3 be modified to provide that the applicant shall return to City Staff or the City Architect, rather than the Planning Commission, for approval once the basin design and details have been reworked to service the entire development at full buildout.

Hearing no further questions or comments, Chair Hinson moved to recommend approval to the Planning Commission of FDP-04-2026 subject to the conditions in the staff report, with condition 3 modified as indicated below:

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. The applicant shall come back to the ~~Planning Commission~~ <u>city and city architect</u> for approval once the basin design and details have been reworked to service the entire development at full buildout.
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.

Board Member Moore seconded the motion.

Upon roll call: Mr. Hinson yes, Ms. Moore yes, Mr. Strahler yes, Mr. Davie yes, Mr. Maletz yes, Mr. Brown yes. Having six yes votes the motion passed and the application was favorably recommended to the Planning Commission.

The board wished the applicants good luck.

Chair Hinson asked to hear the informal review of the New Albany Plain Local Schools Athletic Campus Phase IA.

VII. Other business

New Albany – Plain Local Schools Athletic Campus Phase IA Informal ARB Hearing

Planner II Saumenig provided a brief introduction.

Architect Nathan Gammela delivered the informal presentation.

Chair Hinson commented that the press box is over the team's dugout and noted it could provide an advantage.

Board Member Maletz asked whether they planned to install snow guards on the roofs. Next he called attention to the hitting facility. He further remarked that attention should be given to the press box condition noting that they are accustomed to seeing a press box that is 10 feet wide, and, if there is any way to center the pressbox over the dugout it should be, otherwise it will cause some heartburn. He advised examination of the hip roof on the press box. He also state that, regarding the stair, the long-term maintenance would be troublesome, enclosing it will improve this.

Mr. Gammela answered that the budget was driving the exterior location of the stair. He thanked Board Member Maletz and said that all of his comments are well taken, particularly his comment about the eve condition.

Board Member Maletz said that anything to disrupt the vertival façade would be helpful. He further stated that he was available to help if needed.

Board Member Davie commented that from a sport side of things, the restrooms feel far away. The concession restroom would get the most use. He recommended considering bumping up the restroom count. He further remarked that the area behind the spectator area feels very unresolved and recommended that among the things to consider are the proximity of home and away teams. Packing the spectators together behind homeplate may not be ideal; also the netting behind homeplate needs netting protection. Safety in the concourse between the fields is a prudential concern. The parking feels a bit tight and he encouraged a closer look at parking, even on practice days. The metal roof needs to be high impact.

Mr. Gammela thanked Board Member Davie and stated that he appreciated the comments, particularly the parking comments.

Hearing no further comments, Chair Hinson asked whether there was any further business before the board.

Planner II Saumenig then displayed a photograph showing the that the CVS Pharmacy sign had been fixed.

Chair Hinson thanked staff. He further noted that many, if not all, of the city signs posted in town are crooked.

VIII. Adjourn

Having no further business and having completed their agenda, Board Member Brown moved to adjourn the July 13, 2026 meeting of the New Albany Architectural Review Board. Board Member Strahler seconded the motion.

Upon roll call: Mr. Brown yes, Mr. Strahler yes, Mr. Maletz yes, Mr. Davie yes, Ms. Moore yes, Mr. Hinson yes. Having six yes votes the motion passed and the meeting was adjourned at 9:43 p.m.

Appendix – Available upon request
FDP-32-2026
- **Staff Report**
- **Record of Action**

ARB-36-2026
- **Staff Report**
- **Record of Action**

ARB-45-2026
- **Staff Report**
- **Record of Action**

ARB-48-2026
- **Staff Report**
- **Record of Action**

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

ARB-47-2026
- **Staff Report**
- **Record of Action**

FDP-04-2026
- **Staff Report**
- **Record of Action**