

INDIANAPOLIS HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION  
DEPARTMENT OF METROPOLITAN DEVELOPMENT

# COMMISSION HEARING MINUTES

Wednesday, February 7, 2024, 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**), Michael Bivens (**MB**), Anson Keller (**AK**), Annie Lear (**AL**), Susan Williams (**SW**) (Corley, Watson and Sivilich absent)

**Staff Present:** Meg Busch – Administrator, (**Meg**), Chris Steinmetz (**CS**), Shelbi Long - Senior Architectural Reviewer (**SL**), Dean Kessler - Architectural Reviewer (**DK**), Grace Goedeker - Preservation Planner (**GG**), Melony Evans - Office Manager/Recorder (**ME**)

## BUSINESS

I. CALL TO ORDER 5:30PM

II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

December 3, 2023 & January 6, 2024, Regular Meeting

Motion: AL

2<sup>nd</sup>: SW

Unanimously Approved: WB, DB, AK, AL, SW, MB

III. OLD BUSINESS – NO PUBLIC HEARING

NONE

IV. NEW BUSINESS – NO PUBLIC HEARING

NONE

## PUBLIC HEARING

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

V. REQUEST TO WITHDRAW OR CONTINUE APPLICATIONS

2022-COA-112B (IRV) 5270 E. WASHINGTON ST. continue to May 1, 2024

SYLVIA GARCIA

Replace historic tile roof with alternate roofing material.

2022-COA-447 (IURS) 39 JACKSON PLACE continue to March 6, 2024

AMENDMENT 1 MICHAEL EICHENAUER for DMD

Amend approved plans: expand the use of brick from gutters to the full width of the parallel parking lane.

2023-COA-251 (FP) 529 FLETCHER AVE. continue to March 6, 2024

KIM COOK

Retain deck extension and fence in side yard constructed without approval.

2024-COA-002 (MCD) & 2024-VHP-001 38 E. WASHINGTON ST. continue to March 6, 2024

MAMADOU (BEN) DIALLO

Construct 3<sup>rd</sup>-story addition; replace front façade with new design; and a Variance of Use to reduce the required number of residential units from 5 to 2 in the CBD-1 district.

**Motion: AL**

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

**Unanimously approved: WB, DB, AK, AL, SW, MB**

**VI. EXPEDITED CASES**

**2024-COA-003 (CAMA)**

**626 E. ARCH ST.**

**SARAH HILL**

Construct rear addition and 2-story garage; add window on west elevation of existing house.

**Motion: AL**

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

**Unanimously Approved: WB, DB, AK, AL, SW, MB**

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

**NONE**

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

**2023-COA-518 (HMP)**

**1724 N. NEW JERSEY ST.**

**JASON WOLFE**

Construct 2-story, single-family house and 3-car garage with connector/breezeway.

**Jason Wolfe (JW) 1617 Cornell Ave.:**

To begin we have an updated version of the design that we want to show. A lot of it is mainly material changes. Nothing has changed as it pertains to the site.

**WB:** Anyone wishing to speak in support/remonstrance. Ok Dean we are ready for staff comments.

**DK:** Jason did a really good job in presenting the project. This is a great example of when an applicant and the neighborhood work together with staff. I can answer any questions.

**DB:** We were presented with 2 alternative versions of the front façade. Are we still looking at 2 or are you set on 1?

**JW:** I think that we are set on the one that is being presented today.

**AK:** I think the changes that have been made up until today are appreciated. I think this is a good design.

**MB:** I think it is a pretty bold design. I do think as it was originally presented it was probably too modern to fit within the historic character of the neighborhood. I am glad to see the metal siding change to lap siding. I am less friendly towards the flat porch, but I can be persuaded perhaps. The thing I was going to mention was the material of the chimney and it not being a material that is intuitively fireproof in its appearance.

**JW:** I think we are open to switching that to probably brick making the most since. Mainly it was the cost of having a mason on this project.

**WB:** I would like to comment that I think the third design is the better design. I would ask if there were an option if you do not want the cost of the mason is to maybe go to a metal option. The one thing on the front elevation that continues to bother me are the two square windows. It felt like what you did with these windows in the second design might work better with this design.

**WB:** So, I guess the question for the commission is do we want to move towards an approval or a continuance. Meg we are ready for staff recommendations.

**Meg:** I just want to point out that the applicant and all the commissioners should have a copy of the alternate recommendation that is in your packet. The applicant has had a chance to look at it. (Reads staff recommendation).

**WB:** I will take a motion for the staff recommendation as read.

**SW:** Before I can vote I need to know if the connector is going to stay as is.

**WB:** I think you were willing to look at something that is not solid and a little more transparent.

**JW:** Yes, I think we can look at some options.

**WB:** Just make sure that you work with the staff on the chimney and the breezeway. If the staff feels there is a problem, we can bring it back under old business.

**Motion to approve: DB**

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

**Unanimous Approval: WB, DB, AK, AL, SW, MB**

**2023-COA-531 & 2023-VHP-009 (CH)**

**1323 POLK ST.**

**MARK CROUCH**

Construct addition and second floor on existing garage for living space; Variance of Development Standards to exceed the maximum square footage of an allowed secondary dwelling unit.

**Mark Crouch (MC) 124 E. Pleasant Run Pk. Rd.**

The case before you today is for reconstructing a garage into a carriage house. The owner is downsizing her life. She currently lives in the primary structure; she will be living in the new structure. The variance that goes along with it is due to a compromise with the neighborhood. Originally it would have been a 4-car garage, they did not want the additional garage bay to the back so that increased the square footage which then became a need for the variance. The variance does not apply to the scale of the building it just adds because of the garage space.

**WB:** Anyone wishing to speak in remonstrance/support of this application? Ok Emily we are ready for staff comments.

**EJ:** First I would like to thank the applicant and the owner for working with us and the neighborhood and coming up with a solution that seemed workable. What's driving the variance is the living space on the first floor. The neighborhood and staff were not comfortable with a 4-car garage. I can answer any questions.

**DB:** I think the proportions on the front façade could be improved slightly if the two first floor windows were just closer together and maybe a little taller. I would suggest that you experiment with that. I am not suggesting a stipulation, I just think the proportions would be a little bit improved if you moved it around a little bit.

**AK:** There is a little discrepancy between the south elevation and the site plan. There is a 42 ft driveway that connects to the alley. The elevation shows landscaping north of that garage door, which is the true design?

**MC:** We will not be needing that apron so I would be willing to take it down to what it should have been 16-17 ft would be appropriate.

**AK:** The east elevation I believe it is which is the side that is street facing. I feel like there should be an entry facing this street façade. I am ok with the size as they are, but those 3 things I would need a resolution on.

**MC:** Certainly, on the landscaping that is something that I missed, and it should be changed. I think bringing those windows in and making them larger will be a good idea. Emily had brought up do we do a door on the front or do we do a door on the side. So, the thought was we would do the door and the porch on the side. It could still happen.

**AK:** If that is a permanent dwelling, I have to stick to the idea we should have a street facing entrance.

**EJ:** My original thought was we should have a door on the front, there were two reasons that ultimately suggested that we leave it on the side. That is that high foundation, but mostly because the nearby cottages do not have a front entrance. There is no door visible from the front.

**AK:** I feel like the opportunity is there for a front entrance. Obviously, it would make the structure a little bigger, but I think ultimately it would make it more compatible with the neighborhood.

**WB:** I guess the question for the applicant is, is the back mass able to be widened enough to get a door facing the street in it?

**MC:** It would be more consistent to bring that in. Everything is possible.

**WB:** Do you think that is a reasonable thing to work with staff on?

**Shekimah Moore (SM) 1323 Polk St.:** The reason we didn't do a door on that front façade is because that is the existing garage. That would not lead you into the actual new dwelling.

**WB:** Can you put the door in the back mass and not the front garage?

**SM:** Yes, that is possible.

**WB:** If you are comfortable with that I could work with staff, I think that might be better if we could do that. Other questions from the commission. Ok Meg I think we can approve this and if there is a problem we can come back under old business.

**Meg:** Just as a reminder I am going to ask you to take two votes one for COA and one for the Variance.

**Motion: SW**

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

**Unanimous Approval: WB, DB, AK, SW, AL, MB**

**Variance**

**Motion: SW**

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

**Unanimous Approval: WB, DB, AK, SW, AL, MB**

**IX. PRELIMINARY REVIEW**

**NONE**

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

**2023-COA-506 (ONS)**

**1201 N. DELAWARE ST.**

**MIKE LYNCH & JAMEY SMITH**

Retain cameras and non-matching siding and cornice wrap installed without approval.

---

**Mike Lynch (ML) 1201 N. Delaware St.:** Mr. Smith is our contractor he did the roof work. He texted me after the meeting had started and stated that he had some transportation issues and was not going to make it. I came this evening to address any questions or concerns specifically related to the security cameras because I have no knowledge of any of the other work. To address the security camera issue, when we purchased the property in 2016 at that time there were 4 existing cameras on the property. We replaced the cameras but used the existing penetration and did not have any exposed conduit. In 2021 we asked staff to add 4 additional cameras on each corner of the building. Staff gave approval with some stipulations. When our contractor installed those, we had some exposed conduit. So, when that was pointed out to us, we corrected it. The only thing that I want to make sure is clear, the two cameras on the front corners of Delaware St. just above the cornice. There is a steel column there that upon review the contractor could not penetrate the building. There is some exposed conduit there, but it is not visible to the street. I can answer any questions.

**WB:** Anyone speaking in support or remonstrance? I think we have a different situation because the issue that we wanted to address is not able to be here this evening. So, I do not know if we want to split this to a Part A and B. I assume we are going to continue Part B. I think we are going to approve Part A.

**Meg: Reads Part A staff recommendation to approve the security cameras as installed**

**Motion: AL**

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

**Unanimous Approval: WB, DB, AK, SW, AL, MB**

**Continue Part B (retain non-matching siding and cornice warp installed without approval)**

**Motion: MB**

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

**Unanimous Approval: WB, DB, AK, AL, SW, MB**

---

**2023-COA-519 (ONS)**

**225 E. 13<sup>th</sup> ST.**

**MELISSA LARCOM**

Retain privacy fence installed without approval.

**Melissa Larcom (ML) 225 E. 13<sup>th</sup> St.:**

We have been before the commission previously speaking in remonstrance and support of different projects. When we purchased our house, the fence was stable, but we knew it would have to be replaced eventually. We assumed that replacing like for like would be our best course of action. We had the fence contractor come out and we signed off on the project. I then said I need my COA. Some holidays passed and we did not reach clarity that this was not acceptable and what would be acceptable until the day the contractor showed up. I expressed to **SL** that we had already installed the fence. We did not realize it was not historically appropriate.

**WB:** Anyone speaking in support or remonstrance?

**SL:** Reads staff recommendation.

**SW:** I am curious, the original fence had to probably be approved under our commission? **ONS** has been a historic district forever.

---

**SL:** The only fence that I could find was a dogeared fence but there were no pictures attached.

**MB:** I appreciate the applicant for being transparent. I have to say I do not find it appropriate, and I would have a problem with setting a precedence of approving it.

**DB:** I agree with **MB**. I think the only way I could consider approving it is with a Certificate of Authorization rather than calling it appropriate. And the only reason I can say that is because it mimics the fence that had already been there so long. It does not suggest that I have found a new love for shadow box fences.

**WB:** Any other comments from the commission or the applicant? Ok Meg lets try the Certificate of Authorization to see if we can get enough votes.

**Motion: AL**

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

**Unanimous Approval: WB, DB, AK, AL, SW, MB**

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

<b>NONE</b>
-------------

<b>XII. ADJOURNMENT 6:45 PM</b>
---------------------------------