

INDIANAPOLIS HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION  
DEPARTMENT OF METROPOLITAN DEVELOPMENT

# COMMISSION HEARING MINUTES

Wednesday, September 6, 2023, 5:30 P.M.  
2nd Floor, Room 260, City-County Building  
200 E. Washington St., Indianapolis, Indiana

**Commissioners Present:** President Bill Browne (WB), Vice President David Baker (DB), Bernice Corley (BC), Michael Bivens (MB), Anjanette Sivilich (AS), Anson Keller (AK), Annie Lear (AL)

**Staff Present:** Meg Busch (Administrator), Chris Steinmetz (CS), Emily Jarzen (Principal Architectural Reviewer), Shelbi Long (Senior Architectural Reviewer), Dean Kessler (Architectural Reviewer), Grace Goedeker (Preservation Planner)  
Melony Evans (Office Manager/Recorder)

## BUSINESS

### I. CALL TO ORDER 5:33PM

### II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

#### August 2023 – Regular Meeting

**WB:** The August 2023 minutes were distributed in your packets, any comments, or questions? Seeing none, I'll take a motion for their approval.

**BC:** 1<sup>st</sup>

**AL:** 2<sup>nd</sup>

Unanimous approval

### III. OLD BUSINESS – NO PUBLIC HEARING

**2023-COA-498B (IRV) 5406 UNIVERSITY AVE.**  
**MICHAEL HORTON**  
Violation check-in  
Applicant not present. Case is complete.  
**WB:** I think we are finally finish after 2 years and 4 months.  
**SL:** I did go out and inspect the property and it is good to go.

### IV. NEW BUSINESS – NO PUBLIC HEARING 5:48

NONE

## PUBLIC HEARING

**WB:** *Introduces Commission, Staff and reads Rules of Procedure*

### V. REQUEST TO WITHDRAW OR CONTINUE APPLICATIONS 5:53

**2021-COA-583B (CAMA) 863 MASSACHUSETTS AVE** *continued to December 6, 2023*  
**ANNE SCHENEIDER**  
Construct a rooftop addition with deck.

**2022-COA-112 (IRV) 5270 EAST WASHINGTON STREET** *continued to October 4, 2023*  
**SYLVIA GARCIA**  
Replace historic tile roof with alternate roofing material.

**2023-COA-159 (HMP) 2030 N. ALABAMA ST.** *Withdrawal acknowledged*  
**JASON WOLFE**  
Demolish historic porte-cochere, enclosed rear porch, uncovered patio, non-historic sheds, driveway and curb cut.

2023-COA-251 (FP)

529 FLETCHER AVE.

continued to October 4, 2023

KIM COOK

Retain deck extension and fence inside yard constructed without approval.

2023-COA-252 (HMP)

2133 N. TALBOTT

continued to October 4, 2023

MARK CROUCH

Construct new 2.5 story, single family residence with detached 2 story, 3 car garage.

**Meg:** Reads case info

**WB:** Recusal from first case. 2021-COA-583B

**AK:** recusal from first case. 2021-COA-583B

**MB:** 1<sup>st</sup>

**BC:** 2<sup>nd</sup>

**UNANIMOUS APPROVAL**

*\*David Kingen from the audience approached the mic and asked President Browne if public comment about the continuances was going to be allowed. He was representing remonstrators opposed to 2023-COA-251 (FP)\**

**Meg:** The applicant has actually requested a continuance until October 4, 2023, for 2023COA251 and can do so as a matter of right since this is their first continuance request.

**WB:** So that would be the discussion at the Oct. 4, 2023 hearing.

**VI. EXPEDITED CASES 5:56**

2023-COA-309 (IRV)

5925 DEWEY AVE.

TAMMY RICE

Demolish historic garage & construct new detached garage.

2023-COA-316 (LS)

414 N. COLLEGE AVE.

MARIELENA (LENA) BURT (ANGLED FAÇADE LLC.)

Change of use in Lockerbie Square HP-1 district from office to retail; alter storefront; install 6 signs; install ADA ramps and bike rack and modify existing patio.

**Meg:** reads expedited case info.

**WB:** Is there anyone wishing to speak to any of the two cases?

**DB:** The letters of support suggest there may be some confusion about what we are voting on. I want the record to show that we are not voting on a rezoning and we are not voting on granting a variance.

**Meg:** Just for the record David you are talking about 414 N. College Ave.?

**DB:** Yes. The HP-1 zoning district is unique in Marion County to just Lockerbie Square and that will not change and a variance from HP-1 is not needed. Unlike any other zoning district, we are simply approving a change of use. Since that is widely misunderstood by many people, I want to make sure the record is clear.

**AL** 1<sup>st</sup>

**DB** 2<sup>nd</sup>

**UNANIMOUS APPROVAL**

**VII. APPLICATIONS TO BE HEARD (CONTINUED)**

NONE

**VIII. APPLICATIONS TO BE HEARD (NEW)**

2023-COA-306 (LS)

337 N. PARK AVE

(WB recused)

MARK DEMERLY

Construct house with attached garage.

**MD:** Mark Demerly w/Pad Architecture 6219 Guilford Ave. Here on behalf of the owners. I do have a handout if I can share. This year they decided to reboot the project and developing the site that they have owned for several years. They wanted a

multistory building. They wanted large spaces. They also wanted a roof top access. There is a restriction of the use of the back part of the site. There is a transformer that lives in the back east corner of the project that is owned by AES. It pushed us in regards of connecting the garage to the house. We really didn't have a choice on this location and the others did not provide them with any outdoor space. It was a very specific requirement that drove the design. Most of the buildings throughout Lockerbie are close or on the property line. Also, regarding the existing houses, most of the homes are mostly pushed to the front. One exception is 349 which is to the north. Some of the houses are lower in height. Lockerbie as we know is a mixture of homes, historically it was more of a working man's neighborhood. As time elapsed more elaborate homes were built. 337 being the one that is their existing home, 333 and 349 are the more sizable homes. 337 is a simple gable and is probably one of the older more substantial homes. 345 is a hipped roof. Another component that we thought was important was the front porch. The front porch is one of the dominant features on the façade. The porch is something that they will use quite a bit. The building is about 20 ft wide. I will point out on the handout I gave you there is a picture, the middle home is our neighboring home which is 345, that front porch roof with the hip appears to be a little more substantial. That bay window almost looks like a flat roof. You can see the porch relationship between 333 and the subject property. We were trying to relate to both the adjacent homes. The house across from what I call the smalls house that house is basically a gable front with that 3-story element. From the street that component sits back quite a bit.

It does appear to be more of a flat roof. Which is what we are proposing for ours. We do have 13 letters of support as well as a letter that came from the Lockerbie Square Neighborhood Association (Mark Demerly describes materials proposed).

**WB:** Anyone to speak in support/remonstrance.

**LL:** Laura Langeneckert, 545 E. Vermont St. I want to thank Mark for his presentation in helping us understand what this will look like if this is built. I want to emphasize that we are not here because we do not want them to build the house. We just want to request 2 modifications to the design of the home. We can see this proposed home from our home. We support our neighbors wanting to build a home but modifications. Our first issue is the large, exposed roof deck, as shown on the renderings it does not support the overall aesthetic of our neighborhood. We are also concerned if someone buys the home and uses it for an Airbnb it would disturb the integrity of our neighborhood. Secondly, we are concerned about the overall footprint of the house. We believe it would be so large that it would eliminate all of the greenspace from the lot. We were told that all the mature trees would be removed on that lot. We are asking that the home be limited to the initial footprint of this lot. We would propose limiting the footprint of the structure to what was originally on the site. And we ask that as many of the trees that can be replaced be replaced on this site. We understand and just ask that they make some small modifications to this proposal so that we can all live in our neighborhood.

**EJ:** Staff is recommending discussion and continuance of this case. Staff is not comfortable with the design, we do not feel it respects the aesthetic of the neighborhood. Staff felt that based on the commission comments that we could discuss some design changes and it also is in the clear site triangle.

**AK:** Is this currently 2 separate lots?

**EJ:** It is currently 1 lot.

**MD:** Mainly for tax purposes

**AK:** So, it seems that the existing covered porch on the rear would need to be significantly modified or removed to accommodate this project. So, would that need to be a part of this COA?

**EJ:** My understanding is they are not sure if they are going to ask to approve or modify the design.

**AK:** Do you think that you could build that foundation without tearing down that porch.

**MD:** We can clarify that and add it to the continuance.

It could possibly be supported, or we could put foundations behind it.

**AK:** It seems like it would be touching the new home so it would need to be included in this application.

**MD:** I think the confusion is should it be 341 or 337? We can't construct 2 homes on one lot in LS.

**Meg:** You will have it dashed out as something exists. As opposed to not seeing it all on the drawings.

**WB:** Other comments or questions.

**DB:** One of the things when I was looking at this, it seemed like on the front façade there was a lot of stuff going on and so I had two thoughts on how to calm it down. One was taking the porch roof across the front instead of making it hipped. The other was the rather heavy cornice on the top of the bump out, carrying that around on the whole front façade. For whatever it is worth, I went ahead and did some drawings. I'll explain it and it since it may be hard for people to see it. It doesn't address some of the issues we are talking about. But it does bring a little bit of unity. Those are a couple of thoughts I had. You might want to think about that.

**MD:** We have gone through with the clients and most of it is because they want specific designs.

**BC:** I would just share that the comments from the remonstrator echoed what I had been thinking. I do agree with the concern of tree removal.

**MD:** The trees are not of something of substance, they are not long living trees like oak etc. We would be replacing some of the trees. I think the homeowner has become comfortable with the landscaping.

**BC:** The remonstrator had mentioned that there was an outdoor space at 602 E. New York St, would it be possible to speak to that.

**EJ:** That is a newer build house garage set up. There have been a lot of roof modifications and neighbors did have concerns with that regarding noise. So, they put a gable on top and the neighborhood did prefer that gable roof over the flat roof. So, it was open but covered.

**MD:** I think the comment about the property becoming an AIRBNB. This is a million-dollar plus house.

**AK:** I think staff can agree with some of the multiple designs. I think making it simpler would help. In all the precedence that you show in this view the vertical elements in the front are complete vertical forms. That is jarring because it is usually setback. That front L shape in the front I cannot get over because it so atypical and different from the forms of these homes in this neighborhood.

**MD:** Just to clarify, if the gable came out to form that vertical to continue up and the other would be to set the door back to align with where the gable setback is at this point.

**DB:** The lot coverage and the size does not bother me giving the history of the site and the loss of the trees does not bother me. When you look at the Sanborn maps it was not a green spot, it was probably not a neighborhood with a lot of trees, maybe more now than before. The trees that are there are not historic trees. The loss of this as green space per say is not a problem.

**AL:** I think what he is saying is pretty important. I think it is difficult getting used to how it was and what it is now. I think everyone would agree more trees are better. I also think it is a part of being in urban environment but there is some required flexibility to evolution.

**MB:** This is a fine point when I was listening to Anson talk about the door being set back if they could extend all the way down, I think it would be a nice touch. I think it would help move the detail regarding where the L is. I think if the door did recede it would be a nice touch.

**DB:** We understand this is a unique site because whoever is developing it is saddled with that thing in the back yard. To have some greenspace if you could do it, it would help.

**MD:** Originally the opening was smaller which created this hollowness instead of an opening in the gable. I would like to sit down with staff and work through some options and how to resolve that a bit more. We will take the trees down and replace them and

that AES pole will be moved. We will put back the historic fence that is there. There will be trees behind the house. There is a dogwood, we haven't had anyone to come look and tell us if it is saveable.

**WB:** This opening is the most jarring to me. I think other openings have more thought and detail where this one is just like a cut in the building. It would also free you up with this bay if you could treat it more like a bay and you could choose to treat that a number of ways that it could settle against the gable. I do think getting some type of consistent treatment would help. There are a number of ways to think about this. I agree to work with Emily and discover some options to help this read better.

**MD:** Instead of just a flat cap we could even do a small parapet. That appears like a roof.

**WB:** I do think if it's going to be an opening it needs to be a little more thought out.

**DB:** The issue of the door going back a bit, is it going to come out?

**MD:** I think they want that space it does not have to be a large space.

Motion to continue to October 4, 2023 made by DB.

**AS:** 2<sup>nd</sup>

**Continuance unanimously approved.**

<b>IX. PRELIMINARY REVIEW</b>
-------------------------------

**NONE**

<b>X. APPLICATIONS TO BE HEARD – WORK STARTED WITHOUT APPROVAL</b>
--

**NONE**

<b>XI. CLOSING BUSINESS</b>
-----------------------------

**NONE**

<b>XII. ADJOURNMENT 6:26 PM</b>
---------------------------------