

INDIANAPOLIS HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION
DEPARTMENT OF METROPOLITAN DEVELOPMENT

COMMISSION HEARING MINUTES

Wednesday, October 4, 2023, 5:30 P.M.
2nd Floor, Room 260, City-County Building
200 E. Washington St., Indianapolis, Indiana

Commissioners Present: 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 5:30PM

DB: Chairing the meeting in Bill Browne’s absence. DB Called meeting to order.
--

II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

September 2023 – Regular Meeting

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

SW: 1st

AL: 2nd

Unanimous approval

III. OLD BUSINESS – NO PUBLIC HEARING
--

NONE

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

NONE

PUBLIC HEARING

DB: Introduces Commission, Staff and reads Rules of Procedure

V. REQUEST TO WITHDRAW OR CONTINUE APPLICATIONS 5:53

2022-COA-112 (IRV)	5270 EAST WASHINGTON STREET	<i>continued to October 4, 2023</i>
---------------------------	------------------------------------	-------------------------------------

SYLVIA GARCIA

Replace historic tile roof with alternate roofing material.

2023-COA-109 (IRV)	362 S. DOWNEY AVE.	
---------------------------	---------------------------	--

TRAVIS BARNES & KEVIN LAPKOVITCH

Replace vinyl widows installed without approval with appropriate new windows to match design of historic, multi-lite windows.

2023-COA-251 (FP)	529 FLETCHER AVE.	<i>continued to October 4, 2023</i>
--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

KIM COOK

Retain deck extension and fence inside yard constructed without approval.

2023-COA-252 (HMP)	2133 N. TALBOTT	<i>continue to November 1, 2023</i>
---------------------------	------------------------	-------------------------------------

LANCE CLELAND

Construct new 2.5 story, single family residence with detached 2 story 3-car carriage house.

DB: Is there anyone in the audience wishing to these cases? Seeing none, are there any commissioners wishing to speak to these cases?

BC: The property at 5270 E. Washington, the last time the applicant was before this body the commission asked if structural supporting would be done. I do not think we have heard anything about this. We have had a continuance before, and I am in support of the continuance tonight. I wanted to know if that has been done?

SL: I did ask the owners if it had been done and they said to the best of their ability. I have not received any additional updates on the condition of the structure.

DB: Has any staff been to look at the property recently?

SL: I have driven by there a few times but have not officially investigated the property.

DB: If you are in that area it would be good to go by and look at it to make sure there is not some imminent problem.

DB: Asks for motion to continue all four cases until November 1, 2023.

Vote for Continued and Withdrawn cases.

AS: 1st

SW: 2nd

APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY

VI. EXPEDITED CASES 5:56

**2023-COA-157 (HMP) &
2023-VHP-005**

**1721 (AKA 1717) N. TALBOTT ST.
TRADE DESIGN STUDIO**

Construct single-family house with attached garage; Variance of Development Standards to allow reduced main floor area.

Meg: reads case. As a reminder we will take 2 votes 1 for COA and one for variance.

AK: I have a comment. I just want to rise to the level of wanting this to go any further while well designed with the aesthetic. The support that they have put in their documents is subpar and a building in this area I recommend that there be more detail in their documentation.

DB: Anyone in the audience wishing to speak to this case? Hearing none. Any questions from commissioners?

AK: I do want to make a comment, while well designed, the two aesthetic principles the insulated value that they have put forth in their submitted documents is probably below the minimum required by code and it also should be for a building in this era should be a lot more. I would recommend this to people for future submissions.

DB: Asks for motion to approve the COA and Variance

COA Vote

MB: 1st

AL: 2nd

UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED

VARIANCE

AS: 1st

MB: 2nd

UNANIMOUS APPROVED

VII. APPLICATIONS TO BE HEARD (CONTINUED)

**2023-COA-306 (LS) &
2023-VHP-006**

**341 N. PARK (AKA 337)
MARK DEMERLY**

Construct house with attached garage; Variance of Development Standards to allow construction within the required clear-sight triangle.

Mark Demerly (MD): 6219 Gilford Ave. With me this evening are the two owners. Eric Johnson and Kristi Hill. They have lived in the community for 43 years and worked on 2 other projects. So, this is their 3rd project in the neighborhood, and they are committed to the neighborhood. I appreciate last months hearing. We went back and met with our client and Emily. I will review the elements that the commission pointed out at the last meeting. One was regards to some of lines of the house. It is much better now with the revision of where that line follows through and it creates more of a setback for that front door. We added more definition to the front bay element of the house. The other point was the front porch roof. Originally we had a hip that went in two directions. We changed that so that it is a continuance line across that front bay window element , and added a more traditional aspect. The third thing is how the front gable was pushed back too far. The gable now is in line with the front door and then that bay element is pushed forward five more feet from that. So, I reduced our outdoor area at the very top. The final one was the opening at the top of the roof. It was not historically correct or influenced by other things that were happening in the neighborhood. We looked around the neighborhood and found that the arch opening at the top fit this context well and went back to a Queen Anne Victorian style even though there is a mixture of styles in Lockerbie. The staff report feels like we have addressed many of the issues that were brought up by the commission. I can answer any questions.

DB: Anyone wishing to speak to this application?

Helen Small: 325 N. Park Ave. One thing I would like to say is that my husband and I moved into Lockerbie in 1971. This kind of moving around in our own neighborhood is traditional, when you live in Lockerbie you don't want to leave Lockerbie. We moved to a house across from us that was smaller when our kids grew up and left, we downsized. So, it is not surprising that if there is a lot that a family wants to build on to stay in the neighborhood I can relate. That lot has been vacant quite some time. They are not doing anything by wanting to build on greenspace that was only there because someone knocked a house down.

Bob Small: 325 N. Park Ave. she instructed me to say that this is a very positive project. The fact that this is a lot that had a house on it, It is probably one more lot left that has not had a house moved in or repairs. We are strongly in support of their project. The design at the top where there is a little balcony at the top and it would be a perfect place to watch the fireworks.

MD: I just want to add one other thing Anson you had brought up before regarding the porch that will be removed. We are asking for a variance for clear site triangle as well.

DB: Asked for staff comments.

EJ: Staff is recommending approval of the revised design that was based upon the changes that the applicant has made according to the suggestions that commission made. As Mark stated there is a request for a variance to allow building in the clear site triangle.

DB: I think the way that you adjusted the design really makes it settle into the street scape and makes a big difference. I also like what you have done on the 3rd floor. There was a lot of discussion of having an open space on the 3rd floor, but this is a unique situation with this site and it makes sense to have that open space up there and this is a good way of providing some open space. You can not expect anyone to use the back yard space. It is unstable.

AL: 1st of all thank you for adjusting. We have situations where we give suggestions and people continue to come back and ask for the same thing. I walk past here when walking my dogs I thought about eliminating greenspace. If it is your property you are not eliminating the green space. It only provides the integrity that makes these neighborhoods so amazing, so I applaud you for wanting to stay.

SW: The only thing that is confusing to me about this project is that when most people reach a certain age they downsize, that is the only thing confusing to me.

BC: I think the updates really improve it from the first presentation. I do not support the 3rd floor space, am still not comfortable with the 3rd floor porch are, so this is the only reason I do not support this project.

DB: Any final comments?

MD: No

Meg: Staff recommends to approve a COA.

DB: Asked for motion to approve COA and Variance.

COA

MB: 1st

AL: 2nd

Approved 7-1 (BC NAY)

Variance

AL: 1st

SW: 2nd

UNANIMOUS

VIII. APPLICATIONS TO BE HEARD (NEW)

2017-COA-049

AMENDMENT 7 (CAMA)

901 CARROLLTON AVE. (AKA 820 MASSACHUSETTS AVE.)

LILLIAN COOPER, HOK

Amend plans for building 13 to include Nanawall system.

Lillian Cooper (LC): 300 W 22nd St. Kansas City MO. This project is located @ 820 Massachusetts Ave. We are proposing to switch out the existing storefront glazing on level 5 of the building to a Nanawall system. What that is, is essentially a sliding glass wall system that can fold accordion style and open up the wall so that the tenant of that building which is an office space inside of that space is a café breakroom and they want to open up the face of that building to the balcony outside. The new glass wall system is the same as the existing storefront so we will not need to change the door size. The muttons will match the pattern of the storefront above and below it. From street level where most people will be experiencing this, the 5th floor is hardly visible you will not be able to perceive the glazing. So that is what the view would look like. I feel it fits in fairly well.

DB: Anyone in the audience wishing to speak for or against this application. Hearing none. Do commissioners have questions?

AL: I am just gonna go on the record that it is totally irrelevant my comment, that you put a Tesla picture in the renderings.

SW: I hope mine is relevant. I was over there this evening looking at the vantage points, it is visible from St. Clair and College, Mass Ave and College and Mary St and College. It is visible and I don't feel there is enough information for us to really study where the window is and what it will look like. I would like to see a little more detail side by side. And short of that I cannot support this.

AK: Why was it necessary to move that door to the complete extreme south?

LC: It has to do with the office layout in the interior of the space and to accommodate the office layout.

AK: The only jarring thing is the need to move the door so far to the south. Without having a view of what that layout is and that is why it is hard to support it.

DB: These are interesting comments. My initial reaction I went by and looked and from one angle you cannot see it. One may not even notice it unless you are searching and looking for it. I am not that familiar with a Nanawall system so. There is already something there correct?

LC: the profile of the windows will be the same the only difference is the need to have a track for the system to move. The mutton pattern which is what you see will match the pattern adjacent above and below and the color will be custom matched.

DB: Myself, I am not terribly uncomfortable with it but some of the commission is.

SW: When Bottleworks came to us with what would change we were very protective of what that would look like, I think this is the same case here. I would like to move to continue so that you could come back and provide us with more details of what this will look like.

LC: Would it help to bring back some closer details of what the system will look like?

SW: Normally this is what happens when we are being introduced to a new product.

DB: If it is alright with you we would like to continue and you provide us with more assurance of how this will work. I do not think there is a reason to. SW has made a motion to continue to next month. Do I hear a second?

SW: 1st

AS: 2nd

Unanimous to continue to November 1, 2023 hearing.

**2023-COA-379 (HMP) &
2023-ZON-090**

**1708 N. PENNSYLVANIA ST.
NEIGHBORHOOD DOWNTOWN ZONING ASSISTANCE**
Rezone from D8 to SU2

David Kingen (DK): 618 E Market St. With me this evening is Casey Osteker. VP of Operations of Herron Schools. This is a little confusing case. I have handled other cases over the years like this I believe it was the Wildwood Market in Fountain Square. The front of the property was in a historic district and the rear was not and that is what we have in this situation. So, we have filed a rezone to SU2 for the building. We had discussions with the DMD staff, although we held two separate public hearings that we merge those petitions. Unfortunately, this one was not able to move forward in this case. So, the building is rezoned SU2 already. So, the building that fronts on Meridian Street will be used for classroom and office space. We are here regarding the parking lot, we want to seek a rezone, the same rezone we sought for the prior building. Herron it is important to look at their recent track record. Late last year early this year we sought the rezone of the United Way Building. Herron has a real commitment to reusing existing structures and a love for preservation of historic structures. As the petition says the parking lot is presently zoned D8. Aerial photos are kind of fuzzy and you cannot determine if it was gravel then hard surface. So, we do not see any variance of use, it just kind of evolved. So, now as I said Herron owns both properties on their campus they have about 103 parking spaces this will add about 38. It will not be any expansion as it is today but we plan to be creative in restriping. The importance of zoning it to SU2 are many. What we are finding in Indianapolis is that use variances were very popular in the 1960s or 80s and not so much now. I know you have use variances coming but I think that you are going to see more rezoning than variances. We feel the SU2 usage is appropriate for the parking lot and the building. Staff asked us for a long-term plan. They just bought the property so we do not know what it may become in the future. We have offered a commitment. A commitment is a recordable part of the rezone and binding, and this is what we offered. What we said is that use of the parking will be for autos that come to Herron we will not be leasing the spaces to other businesses it will only be for Herron School use. The finding of fact were difficult to find.

Casey Ostercamp: 6430 Meridian Parkway. I am relatively new to Indianapolis. Right around the time we purchased 1715 N Meridian for expansion needs. We needed an administrative space and we were running out of office and classroom space. So, we have 996 students enrolled at the HS and 103 faculty and staff and that is a lot of people coming to the area. There are a lot of people looking for parking. We were excited to use what is a parking lot as a parking lot. So, we are just restriping and bringing it up to code. As it was previously mentioned we do not know what we will use that space for in the future but as of now we want to use it as parking.

Kelly Duval: 2102 N. New Jersey St. I just wanted to apologize that the commissioners received our letters so late. If they have received it, I just want to ensure that they are aware that we support this project. If we were not so busy sending love letters to IHPC we would valet cars for Herron school.

DB: Anyone else wanting to speak in support? Hearing none. Is there anyone wishing to speak in remonstrance?

DB: Seeing none, do commissioners have questions?

SW: My only question is if there is a plan to improve the screening/ landscaping. The neighborhood in their love letter was very supportive and I think out of respect for the neighborhood perhaps a little improvement would be well received. I just did not know what the plan was.

CO: We do plan to and included it in our commitment to improve the landscaping.

DK: We did offer in the commitment to offer a buffer fence to protect from lights shining into windows.

SW: I am interested in the staff's comments. The use protects the neighborhood. I see this rezoning as a protection for the neighborhood against paved parking lots.

AK: To an extent I agree with Susan. That is the assumption that it stays Herron HS. What if something else requires it to be changed back I think it would be wiser to seek a variance instead of lock that in and not knowing what that will be in 5-10 years.

MB: I do not have the same faith regarding the protection of the SU district. I would be supportive of a variance of use rather than a rezone. I do not see a rezoning as being the best obvious use. I think if we rezone it in a way that goes against the plans. I would like to hear the staffs suggestions.

DB: I have quite a few thoughts. I was apprehensive since it has been a parking lot for so long and still will remain a parking lot, so why do we need to do this. Also read the neighborhood letter, very well done. I was there when we did the Herron Morton plan. Nobody wants parking lots but there they were. We came up with a compromise that not everybody was in support of. So, this is how we came up with this plan. It is interesting because I drove down Pennsylvania street today and in some ways what we were hoping to happen has happened. A lot of those parking lots have improved and have met our guidelines. Some of it has been converted to housing which is what we hoped would happen and may still continue. This lot as far as how the plan addressed it but time changes too the time we did the Herron Morton Plan I do not think the school was there and it is undoubtedly a very positive influence in this neighborhood. So, supporting it would be helpful. This is not actually a non-neighborhood serving because the parking lot would be serving Herron School and that serves the neighborhood because it serves the school. I am leaning towards this being acceptable. Having said that the commitments kind of make my head hurt. I am used to seeing commitments that are numbered. I wish I could see them in concise understandable lists. It would also give me more confidence if the commitments were a little more specific on the landscaping and I would also like to see fencing included. And this is kind of what you see on Pennsylvania. I think whatever eventually happens, on the other hand this commission would have to approve anything that gets built there. I am ok with it, but I wish you were more specific about the commitments and have them spell out what will actually happen and the timeframe. That would suggest we come back next month with some revisions.

AK: I think that we agree that Herron is an asset I think the question is what is going to be there and none of us know. What if Herron sales this property and someone else comes in and does not agree with the current zoning use. I think that it would be wise to leave that space to consider what it may become in the future.

AL: Do we ever really know what will happen in the future. But whatever may happen they will have to come back to the commission either way.

MB: My question is, is a rezoning really the best idea when it really can be done with a variance with some commitments. There should be something that secures the protection of the property. I think a variance of use is more reasonable.

DB: I sense that a variance of use with maybe some more clear commitments would be easier to get approved. I think I am ok with the rezoning; I sense that is not what everybody else feels. Is that a possibility.

DK: I do not want to argue with the commission. I thought Kelly's letter did an excellent job. I think we have attempted to present findings of facts to stand up in court. I am more appreciative that some of the comments regarding SU2 rezoning, that anything that goes on that property would have to come back before commission. I would like to go back and make an attempt at leaving the rezoning in place and I take heed that they

could be better written and detailed. But we will continue to work on those to see if we can come up with better commitments

DB: I think we are heading towards a continuance till next month and you can work on a possibility of a variance or if you still feel strongly for the rezone that you would work on better commitments. I think there is support in improving the site but not so much the rezone.

DK: Asked for a moment to talk with his client.

Meg: Reminded DB to call for staff comments.

AK: So, my understanding is the commitments are tied to the rezone so if it is sold those would be out the window. I think we would be a little remised if we did not have clear information.

Meg: Someone could always come in and change the commitments.

DK: We are aggregable to a 1-month continuance

DB: We need to hear the staff comments first.

SL: Staff is recommending to deny the request to rezone. The district plan is a bit contradictory. It does suggest it be used as a parking. And none of the zoning districts allow commercial parking lot. Due the contradictory recommendations we feel the variance of use would be better for this project. We also requested that the commitments be better outlined.

DB: Apologized for getting staff comments out of order and asked for other comments from commissioners.

BC: So, we heard from Mr. Kingen that the buildings have already been rezoned to SU2 so is there any concern about the incongruity of the lot and the building?

SL: Not that I am aware of, the building is not in the district.

DB: Asks applicant for final comments.

DK: No additional comments.

DB: Asked for a motion.

AS: Moved to continue.

MB: 2nd

Continuance to November 1, 2023. Approved 7-1 (SW Opposed)

IX. PRELIMINARY REVIEW

NONE

X. APPLICATIONS TO BE HEARD – WORK STARTED WITHOUT APPROVAL
--

NONE

XI. CLOSING BUSINESS

NONE

XII. ADJOURNMENT

DB Adjourned meeting at 6:52 PM
--