



New Albany Architectural Review Board
Monday, August 10, 2026, Meeting Minutes - Approved

I. Call to order

The New Albany Architectural Review Board held a regular meeting on Monday, August 10, 2026 in the New Albany Village Hall. Chair Hinson called the meeting to order at 7:02 p.m. and asked to hear the roll.

II. Roll call

Those answering the roll:

Mr. Alan Hinson	present
Mr. Jon Iten	absent
Mr. Jim Brown	present
Mr. Adam Davie	present
Mr. Andrew Maletz	present
Ms. Traci Moore	present
Mr. Francis Strahler	present

Council Member Marlene Brisk absent; arrived at 7:06 p.m.

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, Planner I Lauren Sauter, Deputy Clerk Madriguera.

III. Action on minutes: July 13, 2026

Chair Hinson asked if there was any action on the minutes from the July 13, 2026 meeting.

Hearing none, Board Member Brown moved to approve the July 13, 2026 minutes. Board Member Maletz seconded the motion.

Upon roll call: Mr. Brown yes, Mr. Maletz yes, Ms. Moore yes, Mr. Hinson yes, Mr. Strahler yes, Mr. Davie yes. Having six yes votes, the motion passed and the minutes were approved as submitted.

IV. Additions or corrections to the agenda

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

Planner I Sauter answered none from staff.

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 whether there were any visitors present who wished to be heard for an item not on the agenda.

Hearing none, he introduced the first case and asked to hear from staff.

VI. Cases:

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. She noted that updated renderings had been distributed at this meeting.

Board Member Maletz said that the inclusion of the bump out and the reconciliation of the roof line goes a long way in tying this application all together. He confirmed that the height of the barn is within compliance. He also pointed out a place where the hip roof appeared to be different and observed that reconciling them would improve the design. He asked whether the garage door was a programmatic or an aesthetic request.

Planner I Sauter said she would confirm that the height of the barn was in accordance with city regulations.

The applicant explained that the single garage door was neither a programmatic or aesthetic choice, it was at the request of the city architect.

Board Member Maletz requested use of glass transoms in the garage door if the property owner was in agreement, he continued that otherwise he did not have further comments.

Board Member Moore pointed out that the windows on the rear elevation were different sizes and this resulted in a design with a lot going on, she remarked that the design would be improved if they were all the same size.

The applicant agreed with glass transoms. Regarding the windows on the rear elevation, she explained that the smaller windows were located in bathrooms.

There was discussion of the size of the windows and the fact that they are in line with the overall massing. There was also discussion of elimination of the vent, and the possibility of adding a third window which would be a false window.

Law Director Albrecht remarked that discussions of improving the design were fine, however imposing conditions of approval related to the windows exceeded the scope of the board's charge with this application.

Chair Hinson confirmed the condition in the staff report regarding screening the rear garage door area from adjacent property, and installing landscaping along the west elevation.

The board confirmed that they could vote on the waivers collectively or individually.

Hearing no further comments or questions, Chair Hinson moved for approval of ARB-36-2026 based on the findings in the staff report subject to the following conditions:

1. The porch roof will match the pitch of the two adjacent roofs.
2. The glass transom will be included on the garage doors.
3. The rear garage door area must be screened from the adjacent property, and landscaping must be installed along the west elevation, subject to staff approval.

Board Member Brown seconded the motion.

Deputy Clerk Madriguera confirmed that the board was voting on the certificate of appropriateness and the four waivers.

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

The board thanked the applicant for her diligence and wished her good luck.

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

ARB-51-2026 4675 Reynoldsburg New Albany Road Certificate of Appropriateness

Certificate of Appropriateness for the demolition of the home and garage structures at 4675 Reynoldsburg-New Albany Road (PID: 222-0001729).

Applicant: The New Albany Company c/o Brian Hasson

Planner I Blackburn delivered the staff report.

Board Member Maletz confirmed the orientation of the site plan, and asked whether future building plans were known.

Planner I Blackburn responded that she was not aware of future building plans.

The applicant stated that he thought this would be a green space.

Hearing no further questions or comments, Board Member Brown moved for approval of ARB-51-2026. Board Member Moore seconded the motion.

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

The board wished the applicant good luck.

VII. Other business

VIII. Poll members for comment

IX. Adjourn

Hearing no further business, and no comment from the members, Chair Hinson moved to adjourn the meeting. Board Member Strahler seconded the motion.

Upon roll call: Mr. Hinson yes, Mr. Strahler yes, Mr. Brown yes, Ms. Moore yes, Mr. Davie yes, Mr. Maletz yes. Having six yes votes, the motion passed and the August 10, 2026 meeting was adjourned at 7:25 p.m.

Submitted by: Deputy Clerk Madriguera, Esq.

Appendix

ARB-36-2026

Staff Report (updated)

Record of Action

ARB-51-2026

Staff Report

Record of Action



Architectural Review Board Staff Report
August 10, 2026 Meeting

**6905 CENTRAL COLLEGE ROAD NEW HOME
CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS AND WAIVERS**

LOCATION: 6905 Central College Road (PID: 222-000349)
APPLICANT: Old World Custom Homes c/o Patrick Miller
REQUEST: Certificate of Appropriateness with waivers
ZONING: Residential Estate District (R-1)
STRATEGIC PLAN: Residential
APPLICATION: ARB-36-2026

Review based on application materials received May 18, July 6, and July 29, 2026.

Staff report prepared by Lauren Sauter, Planner

I. REQUEST AND BACKGROUND

The applicant requests a certificate of appropriateness and associated waivers for select design elements for a new single-family home at 6905 Central College Road. The new home is proposed to utilize exterior materials that require review by the Architectural Review Board, and due to variations from the standards contained in the Design Guidelines and Requirements (“DGR” or “DGRs”), waivers have been included as part of the certificate of appropriateness application.

Unlike development in the Village Center, the intent of this certificate of appropriateness is not to evaluate the proposal as a whole; rather, the certificate of appropriateness is specifically regarding the proposed exterior materials and waivers.

The applicant requests a certificate of appropriateness, as required by 1(I)(F) and 5(II)(F)(1), for the use of Hardie board and stone as exterior materials. Additionally, the applicant requests the following waivers as part of this application:

- (A) Waiver to DGR Sections 1(I)(G), 1(II), and 5(II)(B)(2) to allow an architectural style not aligned with the American architectural precedents of the DGRs.**
- (B) Waiver to DGR Section 1(I)(E) to allow a garage that is located in front of the main portion of the building.**
- (C) Waiver to DGR Section 5(II)(B)(3) to allow a garage door that is double-bay when single-bay garage doors are required.**
- (D) Waiver to DGR Section 5(II)(F)(4) to allow chimneys with stone exteriors when brick exteriors are required.**

This application was originally reviewed by the Architectural Review Board at its meeting on June 8, 2026. Multiple updates to the application were made to better conform to the DGRs and to respond to the comments and concerns set forth by the board and city architect.

Changes to the application seen at the second hearing on July 13, 2026, largely focused on waivers A and B as they related to the garage mass, such as in reducing its height, reconfiguring its form, merging two single-bay garage doors into one double-bay garage door, and updating the architecture to conform to one

cohesive style. The Architectural Review Board was generally supportive of the updates; however, the board voted to table the application and requested that the applicant provide additional architectural updates to the west side elevation.

- Adding landscape screening to the gym mass's garage area.
- Adding faux windows or shutters to the gym mass and to the garage mass on the west elevation.
- Simplifying the roof condition on the west elevation.
- Continuing the eave over the gym mass from the garage façade to add a horizontal detail.
- Projecting the gabled form on the west elevation of the gym mass.

The applicant has made updates to the west side elevation that align with the Board's requests; however, the roof was not able to be lowered due to the internal configuration of this portion of the house. As an alternative way to reduce the impact of the gym mass, following discussions with the city architect, the gym mass of the building has been revised to appear more separate from and secondary to the main house by use of a barn design. As described in Section 1 of the DGRs for barns, the gym mass uses vertically oriented siding, a stone foundation, and gable rooflines. It also now features a continued eave, a faux barn door, windows, and landscaping.

The applicant has worked diligently with the city architect, staff, and the Architectural Review Board to align with their requests, meet the intent of the DGRs, provide an appropriate pattern of development, and create a high-quality, architecturally cohesive new home. The applicant requests approval of the certificate of appropriateness and associated waivers. Changes to this staff report from the previous hearing have been underlined.



*Image: Former renderings (top) and newest rendering (bottom).
Changes requested by the Architectural Review Board
have been implemented where feasible.*

II. SITE DESCRIPTION & USE

The approximately 3.63-acre site is located along Central College Road just outside of the Cedar Brook subdivision and across from Wentworth Crossing. The area is characterized by an older housing stock and low-density residential development.

At present, no structure exists on the site. Numerous mature trees are located on the lot, especially concentrated on its southern half. Sugar Run extends along the eastern portion of the site, which includes a pond shared between the subject site and the adjacent parcel; this offers unique natural aesthetics to the land. The site is encumbered by a floodplain generally along its entire eastern side due to Sugar Run. A

swale, fence, and above-ground utility line run along the parcel's frontage. The site is notably larger than most other parcels in its vicinity.

III. EVALUATION

Certificate of Appropriateness

Per New Albany Design Guidelines and Requirements Section 1(I)(F) and 5(II)(F)(1), the use of exterior materials other than brick or wood requires review and approval by the New Albany Architectural Review Board. C.O. Section 1157.08 states that review of a certificate of appropriateness should include evaluation of whether the proposed environmental change complies with the criteria set forth in the Design Guidelines and Requirements, and upon review of the application for a Certificate of Appropriateness, the Architectural Review Board shall determine whether the proposed environmental change promotes, preserves, and enhances the architectural and historical assets of the city.

Additionally, per C.O. Section 1157.12, any person or entity having an interest in property that seeks to obtain a waiver from the requirements of the New Albany Design Guidelines and Requirements shall follow the procedures set forth in C.O. Chapter 1113. C.O. Section 1113.09 defines that a waiver to standards may be approved by the Architectural Review Board as part of a Certificate of Appropriateness application. In considering this request for waivers, the Architectural Review Board is directed to evaluate the application based on criteria in C.O. Section 1113.11.

Per C.O. Section 1157.09, Criteria for Evaluation of Application for Certification of Design Appropriateness, the proposal should be evaluated on these criteria:

1. *The compliance of the application with the Design Guidelines and Requirements and requirements of the Codified Ordinances.*

Context and general applicable design standards

- The following sections of the DGRs apply to the development:
 - Section 1: Design Principles and American Architectural Precedent – This section of the DGRs generally governs all development in the city.
 - Section 5: Residential Outside Village Center – This section provides the requirements for residential development outside of the Village Center. The goal for residential development both inside and outside the Village Center is to create high-quality buildings that enhance the character and livability of New Albany.
- DGR Sections 1(I)(J) and 5(II)(B)(1) recognize that lots within areas where there are a number of existing buildings and lots that existed prior to the creation of the Architectural Review Board will not necessarily be expected to follow the American architectural precedent described in the DGR, and that greater attention should be given to the physical context of location so that the design is compatible with its neighbors.
- Wood and brick are the preferred exterior building materials for homes in the city of New Albany. DGR Sections 1(I)(F) and 5(II)(F)(2) state that the use of materials other than wood or brick, as noted in other sections, requires review and approval by the Architectural Review Board. Hardie board is noted in Section 5(II)(F)(1) as an alternative material that may be appropriate when used in the same way as traditional materials would have been used (i.e. the shape, size, profile, and surface texture of alternate materials must match historical practice; especially close attention must be paid to details such as corner boards and window and door trim to ensure a correct match to traditional wood elements). Additionally, numerous architectural precedent examples described in Section 1(II) note that stone examples can be found throughout their history. The Architectural Review Board shall review the appropriateness of the use of Hardie and stone exterior materials.

Evaluation

- The proposed architectural style appears to be inspired by transitional European design. Three main materials are proposed on the exterior walls of the home.
 - The applicant proposes the vertically oriented Hardie board-and-batten siding in Accessible Beige with the Select Cedarmill texture as one of the primary exterior materials. Staff is supportive of the use of Hardie board, which has been approved for many other homes and businesses in the city, including homes in the vicinity along Central College Road.
 - In addition to the Hardie board, the applicant proposes Hardie paneling in Urbane Bronze as an exterior material in certain locations. Hardie paneling appears to be similar to the Hardie board-and-batten.
 - Stone is recognized in the DGRs as an example material used in historical Georgian, Georgian Revival, Federal, and Greek Revival architecture, and stone is permitted in numerous residential subdivisions within the city. The applicant proposes the use of a Casa di Sassi Dente Quartz Ledge stone veneer as another exterior material. A majority of the use of stone is proposed on the front and left elevations; the stone will also be used along the foundation on all sides of the house.
 - The use of Hardie siding and stone as exterior materials appears appropriate. The materials are harmonious with the character of surrounding homes.
 - The setback of the front façade of the house from the roadway is not able to be “in line” with neighboring houses due to limitations imposed by the floodplain and required setbacks and given the size and configuration of the proposed home. The garage mass extends farther out toward the roadway than the front façade of its neighboring homes. Additionally, the developer will be required to install street trees at the time of permitting.
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.*
- This standard may not necessarily be applicable to the analysis of exterior building materials; however, the following information is still included as a supplement.
 - The site is encumbered by a floodplain generally along its entire eastern side. In addition to the required setbacks, this leaves a narrow, “long” buildable area on the site. The house plan fits the form of the site by use of a relatively “long” building form.
 - Numerous mature trees are located on the lot, especially concentrated on its southern half.
 - The new home is proposed to be set back approximately 81 feet from the centerline of Central College Road due to the garage mass that extends out from the primary building mass toward the public right-of-way. This appears to be slightly closer to the road than most other existing homes in the vicinity. The applicant requests a waiver to allow the garage to be in front of the main portion of the building (where its visual impact is not minimized). While the garage mass is the frontmost portion of the house, the garage doors face the eastern side yard instead of the front yard.
 - The existing site has no structures. A new curb cut is proposed to be installed to access the site and the new house.
 - Street trees will be required to be installed along the parcel frontage. The street trees may be placed behind the existing fence. A swale and above-ground utilities run along the frontmost portion of the site adjacent to the roadway, which may complicate adding the required pedestrian path in the area. Additionally, adding these improvements to the full site frontage would require disturbance to the floodplain area. Engineering staff is evaluating the site’s right-of-way and the feasibility of installing the pedestrian path; if the path is unable to be installed, the property owner will have to pay a fee in-lieu of the path. The fee-in-lieu amount must be approved by City Council.
 - No exterior lighting is proposed at this time.

- No signage is proposed at this time.
 - A driveway extends along the western side of the house to a single garage door on the gym mass of the building. The west elevation meets the side yard setback requirements; however, it is somewhat close to the adjacent lot. Given its location, visibility, and scale, staff recommends a condition of approval that the rear garage door area be screened from the adjacent property and additional landscaping be installed along the west elevation, subject to staff approval (condition #1).
3. *The distinguishing original qualities or character of a building, structure, site and/or its environment shall not be destroyed.*
 - This standard is not applicable to the analysis of exterior building materials. However, it should be noted that the floodplain is shown to be undisturbed by the new home build.
 4. *All buildings, structures and sites shall be recognized as products of their own time.*
 - No historic structures exist or are being modified on the site. The proposed development is new construction and does not seek to create a false sense of history; however, the house is proposed to be more transitional in style, utilizing elements of both historical and contemporary practice. The home does not appear to meet this criterion.
 5. *Distinctive stylistic features or examples of skilled craftsmanship which characterize a building, structure or site shall be created with sensitivity.*
 - Following the feedback from the June 8 Architectural Review Board meeting, the applicant coordinated with the city architect to update the proposed design for a single, more clearly selected architectural style.
 6. *The surface cleaning of masonry structures shall be undertaken with methods designed to minimize damage to historic building materials.*
 - This standard is not applicable. No masonry structures are proposed.
 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.*
 - This standard is not applicable. No structures currently exist on the site.

Waiver Request

The Architectural Review Board's review of waivers is pursuant to **C.O. Section 1113.11, Action by the Architectural Review Board**. Within 30 days after the public meeting, the Architectural Review Board shall either approve, approve with supplementary conditions, or disapprove the request for a waiver. The Architectural Review Board shall only approve a waiver or approve a waiver with supplementary conditions if it finds that the waiver, if granted, would:

1. *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.*
2. *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.*
3. *Be necessary for reasons of fairness due to unusual building, structure, or site-specific conditions.*
4. *Not detrimentally affect the public health, safety or general welfare.*

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

(A) Waiver to DGR Sections 1(I)(G), 1(II), and 5(II)(B)(2) to allow an architectural style not aligned with the American architectural precedents of the DGRs.

The following should be considered in the Board's decision:

Context and general applicable standards

- At its meeting on June 8, the Architectural Review Board tabled this application and requested that the applicant work with the city architect to update the plans for a more cohesive, architecturally unified design. Originally, the application required a waiver to DGR Sections 1(I)(G) and 5(II)(B)(2) for the mixing of elements from different styles and for a design that is not of a traditional historical style; to Section 1(II), which outlines the traditional historical styles; and to Section 5(II)(F)(6) to use single-hung windows. While three of these waivers remain due to the proposal not utilizing a traditional historical style, the proposal has been updated to be more aligned with these standards, especially by minimizing the mixing of elements from different styles. The city architect has corresponded with the applicant on the updates to the proposal and is supportive of the architectural style.
- Further updates to the west side elevation strengthen the architectural quality and character of the home. As requested by the Architectural Review Board, these updates include adding faux windows or shutters to the gym mass and to the garage mass on the west elevation; continuing the eave over the gym mass from the garage façade to add a horizontal detail; projecting the gabled form on the west elevation of the gym mass; and adding landscaping. The roof could not be lowered due to the internal configuration of the gym portion of the house. As an alternative method of reducing the impact of the gym mass, and following discussions with the city architect, the gym mass of the building has been revised to appear more separate from and secondary to the main house by use of a barn design. As described in Section 1 of the DGRs for barns, the gym mass uses vertically oriented siding, a stone foundation, and gable rooflines. It also now features a continued eave, a faux barn door, windows, and landscaping.
- The applicant proposes a design that does not strictly follow any single American architectural precedent outlined in Section 1(II) of the DGRs. While variations from some requirements of any precedent example are normal and even encouraged—DGR Section 1(II) states each of the American architectural precedent examples provide opportunities for stylistic variations within each style—there are numerous considerations that vary from the DGRs or from an approved style, and thus a waiver is required. The requested waiver for variation from the DGRs is to allow an architectural design that is not found in the American architectural precedent, but the mixing of different styles no longer applies.
- DGR Section 1(I)(G) specifies that the design of buildings in the city should include attention to detail and ornamentation consistent with the precedents of American architectural styles. DGR Section 5(II)(B)(2) further verifies that designs must be accurate renderings of traditional historical styles.
- According to DGR Section 1(I)(J), building lots located within areas where there are a number of existing buildings will not necessarily be expected to follow the American architectural precedent described in the standards. Greater attention should be given to the physical context of location so that the design is compatible with its neighbors.
- According to DGR Section 1(II), the American architectural precedent examples in the DGRs share commonalities, including that they are all highly ordered with a certain formality to the design; utilize traditional building forms; and have detailing influenced by classical architecture. In particular, the buildings typically include a regular form, formal symmetry, brick or wood exteriors, an architecturally defined entrance, gabled or hipped rooflines, and divided-lite, multi-paned windows. Additionally, Section 1(II) states that contemporary interpretations of the American architectural styles may be considered.

Evaluation

- It is not uncommon for older homes or homes in areas with an older housing stock to deviate from the styles, exterior materials, and architectural details that are required for newer, more visible homes and lots. Many existing houses along Central College Road were built in the 1960s through 1980s and do not meet the newer standards contained in the Design Guidelines and Requirements.
- The city architect is highly supportive of the updated plans. Most of the updates apply to the garage portion of the home, which the city architect and Architectural Review Board found to be large, bulky, and architecturally unrelated to the main house form and appeared to dominate the rest of the building. The city architect states that he believes the new composition is the correct approach, as it allows the garage to be a cohesive part of the architectural strategy.
 - The applicant added a turned gable at the end of the garage, running in the same direction as the main house mass. The new gable allows the overall garage mass to be reduced while “breaking up” the formerly long façade into elements with a more human scale. This gable allows the garage to appear more comparable to and cohesive with the main house mass.
 - The left elevation of the garage mass was divided between the area with the new gable form and a newly inset “connector” between the main house and new gable. The applicant also proposes one double-bay garage door on the “connector” part of the façade (see waiver C), which further breaks up the former repetition and visual dominance of the full elevation. Additionally, there is a single shed roof dormer centered above the double-wide garage door, which helps ground the architectural strategy.
 - Windows were added to the frontmost façade on the garage, facing the public right-of-way. As supported by the DGRs, the windows give this portion of the house the appearance of being “lived in;” the garage mass feels more human-scaled and as an active part of the rest of the house.
- DGR Section 5(II)(F)(6) requires double-hung, true or simulated divided-light windows with vertically oriented glass panes, correctly profiled muntins with a visually three-dimensional internal spacer, wood material with either vinyl or aluminum cladding, and historically accurate proportions. The applicant revised the application to have double-hung, divided-light windows that meet this requirement.
- The design is not appropriate in terms of site context. While most surrounding homes are modest rural structures, the proposed house exceeds the scale of the homes in its vicinity and has a more contemporary architectural style. A similar material combination and exterior style does not appear to be present in the vicinity. However, the site is much larger than most other lots in the area, which may grant flexibility concerning an appropriate form and style.
- While the overall character of the home does not conform to the American architectural precedent, the proposal meets a few common details found in the American architectural precedent examples by using gabled rooflines and an architecturally defined entrance. The main portion of the front elevation additionally utilizes formal symmetry. Additionally, the home does conform to a more



Image: Rendering of the front of the proposed home.

uniform architectural character, and DGR Section 1(II) states that more contemporary styles may be considered.

- The waiver may be necessary for reasons of fairness. Many of the homes in the vicinity do not conform to the intent of or standards set forth in the DGRs, and a new build that more comprehensively conforms to the DGRs would not provide an appropriate pattern of development given the character of the existing area. Further, with a larger acreage than that of most homes in the vicinity and with a unique natural character due to being next to Sugar Run, the parcel offers a unique opportunity to develop a larger, more architecturally flexible building. There is a high level of design consideration that reflects the high standards of quality found in the city, though approving the waiver could set precedent for architecturally contemporary proposals. Additionally, there are no site-specific constraints that prevent traditional architecture from being used.
- The waiver will not detrimentally affect the public health, safety, or general welfare.
- Should this waiver be denied, the applicant will have to follow an architectural precedent and the other standards described in the DGRs, subject to staff approval or future waiver requests. Otherwise, the Board may approve this waiver and allow the proposed style or approve this waiver with conditions that specify the extent of architectural flexibility from the DGRs, keeping in mind the waiver criteria, the aforementioned evaluation, and the site context.

(B) Waiver to DGR Section 1(I)(E) to allow a garage that is located in front of the main portion of the building.

The following should be considered in the Board's decision:

Context and general applicable standards

- The city architect and the Architectural Review Board identified this waiver as a primary concern regarding the original application heard by the board at its June 8 meeting due to the size and massing of the garage portion of the home. The garage height was reduced, and the garage form was reconfigured to create a more architecturally cohesive and appropriately scaled structure. This directly meets the requests of the Board and allows the garage to be a cohesive part of the house's architectural strategy.
- The applicant proposes a new home with a large garage mass extending approximately 55 feet from the main portion of the home toward the public right-of-way. The garage mass includes garage doors that face the eastern side yard and are not front facing, though they are in front of the main portion of the house. The garage mass is one of only a few portions of the house with a second-story dwelling area.
- DGR Section 1(I)(E) states that parking areas and garages should be placed in locations to minimize their visual impact through a combination of garage location and landscaping or other screening methods. It further states that garage doors should not be on primary façades of buildings. Similarly, the Engage New Albany Strategic Plan encourages rear or side-loaded garages, and when a garage faces the street, the front façade of the garage should be set back from the front façade of the house.
- When garage doors face a primary street, DGR Section 5(II)(B)(4) requires the façade of the garage to be set back from all portions of the principal façade by a minimum of 10 feet. While the intent of this standard might apply, the garage doors are technically side-loaded and are not required to meet this standard.
- According to DGR Section 1(I)(J), building lots located within areas where there are a number of existing buildings will not necessarily be expected to follow the American architectural precedent described in the standards. Greater attention should be given to the physical context of location so that the design is compatible with its neighbors.

Evaluation

- The applicant revised the height and layout of the proposed garage to respond to the concerns raised by the Architectural Review Board at its first hearing of the application. The revisions were coordinated with city staff and the city architect.
- In the original application, the massing of the forward-facing garage was large, bulky, and architecturally unrelated to the main house form and appeared to dominate the rest of the building. The city architect believes the new composition is the correct approach, as it allows the garage to be a cohesive part of the architectural strategy. See waiver A for more specific descriptions of the updates to the garage.
- It is not uncommon for older homes or homes in areas with older housing stock to have unscreened, front-facing garages located on the primary façade of the building. Many houses along Central College Road were built in the 1960s through 1980s and do not meet the newer standards contained in the Design Guidelines and Requirements.
- The waiver does not meet the intent of the standard or the goals of other city regulations. The garage doors technically do not face the primary road as recommended by the DGRs and Strategic Plan; however, the garage form and location do not minimize the visual impact of the garage. The height of the garage mass has been decreased, and the architectural details of the garage mass have been updated to appear more integrated with the rest of the house, which helps reduce its visual impact.
- The waiver is not necessary for reasons of fairness. While there are unique site constraints—largely due to the floodplain encompassing the eastern portion of the lot—other layouts are feasible where the garage is not located in front of the main portion of the building or where its visual impact is decreased.
- The waiver will not detrimentally affect the public health, safety, or general welfare.

(C) Waiver to DGR Section 5(II)(B)(3) to allow garage doors that are double-bay when single-bay garage doors are required.

The following should be considered in the Board's decision:

Context and general applicable standards

- DGR Section 5(II)(B)(3) states that garages must use single-bay doors no greater than 10 feet in width.
- Following correspondence with the city architect, the applicant proposes the use of a double-bay garage door.
- According to DGR Section 1(I)(J), building lots located within areas where there are a number of existing buildings will not necessarily be expected to follow the American architectural precedent described in the standards. Greater attention should be given to the physical context of location so that the design is compatible with its neighbors.

Evaluation

- The home was originally designed with four single-bay garage doors accessible from the front motor court. The city architect argues that, aesthetically, four individual garage doors off of the front elevation would be overwhelming; as such, he advocates the use of two single-bay garage doors under the new gable form and one double-wide door between the main house and new gable. The double-wide door is inset from the single doors and acts as a “connector” between the forms. The design of both single- and double-wide doors express the same proportional intent. Additionally, the applicant has centered a single shed roof dormer above the double-wide door, which grounds the architectural strategy. The architect is highly supportive of the new configuration.
- The waiver is appropriate in terms of site context. It is not uncommon for older homes or homes in areas with older housing stock to have double-bay garage doors and other existing non-conformities; given the nature of the existing housing stock in the vicinity, double-bay garage doors are not unusual. Additionally, both adjacent properties have double-bay garage doors.

- The intent of the garage width standard appears to be to reduce the visual impact of large, monolithic garage doors and minimize the scale of the automobile in favor of the pedestrian. While the proposed garage door does not appear to meet this intent by way of width, it complies with the design guidelines by not facing the public right-of-way and by utilizing a design that creates a single-bay appearance. Additionally, the façade on which the double-bay garage is located is set back a bit from the façade with single-bay garage doors, limiting its visibility.
- The waiver is not necessary for any unusual site-specific constraints. The home has not yet been built, and the façade can be extended to make room for two single-bay garage doors instead of one double-bay garage door.
- The waiver will not detrimentally affect the public health, safety, or general welfare.

(D) Waiver to DGR Section 5(II)(F)(4) to allow chimneys with stone exteriors when brick exteriors are required for chimneys.

The following should be considered in the Board's decision:

Context and general applicable standards

- DGR Section 5(II)(F)(4) requires all exposed exterior chimneys to be constructed of brick.
- The applicant proposes the use of stone for the exterior faux chimney material. The material reflects the use of stone being proposed as an exterior material on the front façade and water table of the house.
- According to DGR Section 1(I)(J), building lots located within areas where there are a number of existing buildings will not necessarily be expected to follow the American architectural precedent described in the standards. Greater attention should be given to the physical context of location so that the design is compatible with its neighbors.

Evaluation

- The city architect is highly supportive of the use of chimneys for the proposed development, especially to support the architectural style. Given the certificate of appropriateness for the use of stone as one of a few building materials, the applicant proposes stone as the exterior material of the faux chimneys as well.
- The intent of this standard is largely for aesthetic purposes, requiring chimneys to reflect the historical precedent described in the DGRs and the character of the area. While the use of stone may not meet the historical precedent, it conforms to the character of the vicinity and to the rest of the proposed house.
- While the waiver is not necessary for any unusual site-specific constraints, it appears fair and appropriate should the material certificate of appropriateness be approved. The stone on the chimney will match the proposed stone used on the home's foundation and largely around the primary entrance to the house.
- The stone provides an appropriate design and pattern of development considering the context in which it is proposed. since the material is also used as the foundation material.
- The waiver will not detrimentally affect the public health, safety, or general welfare. The applicant is proposing faux chimneys, so the exterior material does not pose any fire-related concerns.

IV. SUMMARY

The applicant requests a certificate of appropriateness for the use of Hardie board and stone as exterior materials in addition to waivers regarding architectural style, garage location, garage door width, and chimney material. The certificate of appropriateness is for a new home along Central College Road, just outside of the Cedar Brook subdivision and offered a unique natural setting next to Sugar Run. Due to the older nature of the area, the evaluation of the application's appropriateness should consider the physical context rather than strict adherence to the Design Guidelines and Requirements.

The city architect is highly supportive of the updates to the plans. Most of the updates apply to the garage portion of the home, which the city architect and Architectural Review Board found to be architecturally unrelated to the main house form and appeared to dominate the rest of the building. The city architect believes the new composition is the correct approach, as it allows the garage to be a cohesive part of the architectural strategy. The waivers for the double-bay garage and stone chimneys assist in creating a well-designed, cohesive architectural style, though this style appears more contemporary and does not adhere to an American architectural precedent described in Section 1(II) of the Design Guidelines and Requirements.

Should the Architectural Review Board find that additional architectural updates may be warranted, staff recommends approval with the condition that the applicant coordinates with staff and/or the city architect to facilitate additional review during the permitting process.

V. ACTION

Should the Architectural Review Board find sufficient basis for approval, the following motion would be appropriate (conditions of approval may be added):

Move to approve Certificate of Appropriateness application ARB-36-2026 with the following condition:

1. The rear garage door area must be screened from the adjacent property, and landscaping must be installed along the west elevation, subject to staff approval.

Approximate Site Location:



Source: NearMap



Community Development Department

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

Dear Old World Custom Homes c/o Patrick Miller,

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

Tuesday, August 11, 2026

The New Albany Architectural Review Board took the following action on **08/10/2026**.

Certificate of Appropriateness

Location: 6905 CENTRAL COLLEGE RD

Applicant: Patrick Miller, Old World Custom Homes

Application: PLARB20260036 (ARB-36-2026)

Request: 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.

Motion: To approve

Commission Vote: Motion Approved with Conditions, 6-0

Result: Certificate of Appropriateness PLARB20260036 was Approved with Conditions by a vote of 6-0.

Recorded in the Official Journal this August 11, 2026.

Condition(s) of Approval:

1. The porch roof will match the pitch of the two adjacent roofs.
2. The glass transom will be included on the garage doors.
3. The rear garage door area must be screened from the adjacent property, and landscaping must be installed along the west elevation, subject to staff approval.

Staff Certification:

Lauren Sauter
Planner



**Architectural Review Board Staff Report
August 10, 2026 Meeting**

**CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
BUILDING DEMOLITION**

LOCATION: 4675 Reynoldsburg New Albany Road (PID: 222-000172)
APPLICANT: The New Albany Company c/o Brian Hasson
REQUEST: Certificate of Appropriateness for Building Demolition
ZONING: Urban Center District within the Village Core sub-district
STRATEGIC PLAN: Village Center
APPLICATION: ARB-51-2026

Review based on: Application materials received on July 08, 2026

Staff report prepared by Kylie Blackburn, Planner.

I. REQUEST AND BACKGROUND

This certificate of appropriateness application is for the demolition of a vacant single-family residential structure and garage located at 4675 Reynoldsburg New Albany Road. The structure was previously used as a residence and, according to the Franklin County Auditor, it was built in 1953. The demolition of this building is being requested due to the state of the building.

Per C.O. 1157.07, alterations that change, modify, reconstruct, remove, or demolish any exterior features of an existing structure that are not considered to be minor modifications are categorized as major environmental changes. Per C.O. 1157.08(b)(1), any major environmental change to a property located within the Village Center area requires a certificate of appropriateness from the Architectural Review Board.

I. SITE DESCRIPTION & USE

The property is located on the north side of the new Market Street roundabout and south of Village Hall Road. There is vacant land to the east of the property, and to the north is the Farmers Insurance building and the New Albany Police Station.

II. EVALUATION

The ARB's review is pursuant to C.O. Section 1157.06. No environmental change shall be made to any property within the City of New Albany until a certificate of appropriateness has been properly applied for and issued by staff or the Board. Per **C.O. 1157.09 Demolition**, at least one of the following criteria must be met in order to approve the demolition.

1. *The structure contains no features of architectural and historic significance to the character of the individual precinct within which it is located. (1157.09a)*
 - According to the Franklin County Auditor, the building was constructed in 1953, and the city has no records of any remodels done on the residence.

- It is approximately 1,777 square feet and does not appear to contribute to any historical architectural significance for the Village Center.
 - The home is constructed with vinyl siding and stone accents. The building requires many repairs both inside and outside.
 - The building does not meet the architectural standards found in the New Albany Guidelines and Requirements for a residential building within the Village Center
2. *There exists no reasonable economic use for the structure as it exists or as it might be restored, and that there exists no feasible and prudent alternative to demolition. (1157.09b)*
- There does not appear to be any economic use for the structure as it stands today.
 - Reuse potential for the structure is minimal based on the number of repairs that would need to be done to the structure.
3. *Deterioration has progressed to the point where it is not economically feasible to restore the structure. (1157.09c)*
- There are a lot of internal and external repairs that would need to be made for the home to be livable. The applicant has stated that due to the significant repairs required on the house, it would not be economically feasible to restore the house.
 - The structure appears to be in poor to fair condition as evidenced by staff's visual inspection of the site and the images provided by the applicant.

III. SUMMARY

The demolition of the single-family home does not seem to result in the loss of any architectural or historical significance in the area. The structure exhibits visible signs of deterioration, with the interior in even poorer condition. Given its current condition, restoring the home appears economically unviable.

IV. ACTION

Should ARB find that the application has sufficient basis for approval, the following motion would be appropriate (conditions of approval may be added).

Move to approve application ARB-51-2026.

Approximate Site Location:



Source: NearMap



Community Development Department

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

Dear Brian Hasson,

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

Tuesday, August 11, 2026

The New Albany Architectural Review Board took the following action on 08/10/2026 .

Certificate of Appropriateness

Location: 4675 REYN NEW ALBANY RD

Applicant: Brian Hasson,

Application: PLARB20260051

Request: Certificate of Appropriateness for the demolition of the home and garage structures at 4675 Reynoldsburg-New Albany Road (PID: 222-0001729).

Motion: To Approve

Commission Vote: Motion Approved, 6-0

Result: Certificate of Appropriateness, PLARB20260051 was Approved, by a vote of 6-0.

Recorded in the Official Journal this August 11, 2026

Condition(s) of Approval: N/A

Staff Certification:

Kylie Blackburn
Planner