



Indianapolis Historic Preservation Commission (IHPC)
HEARING MINUTES

Wednesday, May 1, 2024, 5:30 P.M.
2nd Floor, Public Assembly Room, City-County Building
200 E. Washington St., Indianapolis, Indiana

BUSINESS

I. CALL TO ORDER

Commissioners present: Bill Browne (President, BB), David Baker (Vice-President, DB), Susan Williams (Secretary, SW), Anjanette Sivilich (AS), Michael Bivens (MB), Annie Lear (AL), Disa Watson (DW)

Staff present: Meg Busch (Administrator, Meg), Chris Steinmetz (Legal Counsel, CS) Emily Jarzen (Principal Reviewer, EJ), Shelbi Long (Senior Reviewer, SL), Dean Kessler (Reviewer, DK), Grace Goedeker (Preservation Planner, GG), Melony Evans (Office Manager/Recorder, ME)

II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

MARCH 6, 2024, IHPC HEARING MINUTES
MARCH 27, 2024, SPECIAL MEETING MINUTES

Motion to approve minutes with no necessary changes

Motion: AL

2nd: AS

Unanimous Approval: BB, DB, SW, AS, MB, AL, DW

III. OLD BUSINESS – NO PUBLIC HEARING

2021-COA-585 (ONS) 1214 N. ALABAMA ST.
ONYX + EAST
2-Year extension of COA.

Motion to approve 2-year COA Extension

Motion: AS

2nd: DB

Unanimous Approval: BB, DB, SW, AS, MB, AL, DW

2023-COA-251 (FP) 529 FLETCHER AVE.
DANIEL & KIMBERLY COOK
ADOPTION OF NEGATIVE FINDING OF FACTS
Request to retain fencing in side yard installed

Motion for the adoption of the findings.

Motion: AL

2nd: DW

Unanimous Approval: BB, DB, SW, AS, MB, AL, DW

2023-COA-506B (ONS) 1201 N. DELAWARE
MIKE LYNCH & JAMEY SMITH
ADOPTION OF NEGATIVE FINDING OF FACTS
Request to maintain the replacement shingle siding on the west and south sides of clerestory and to retain non-matching metal cornice wrap as installed without approval.

Motion for the adoption of the findings.

Motion: SW

2nd: AS

Unanimous Approval: BB, DB, SW, AS, MB, AL, DW

IV. NEW BUSINESS – NO PUBLIC HEARING

NONE

Fire station number 18

Grace gives synopsis regarding fire house plan adoption. Proposal of plan at June 5, 2024, hearing.

PUBLIC HEARING

V. REQUEST TO WITHDRAW OR CONTINUE APPLICATIONS

NONE

VI. EXPEDITED CASES

2024-COA-014 (ONS)

1468 N. NEW JERSEY ST.

MARK CROUCH

Demolish existing rear addition and construct new rear addition.

2024-COA-091 (HMP)

2056 CENTRAL AVE.

JASON WOLFE

Construct 2-story, single family house and detached, 3-car garage.

**2024-COA-104 (MCD) &
2024-VHP-005**

136 E. MARKET ST.

RYAN NIKETH

Install sidewalk café, and a Variance of Development Standards to permit the café to be within 8 feet of an obstacle.

2024-COA-105 (HMP)

2108 N. ALABAMA ST.

EDITH GLOVER

Demolish non-historic rear deck and pergola; and construct rear addition with covered porch.

DB: For 1468 N New Jersey St. scalloped shingles are specified for the gables. I just want to make sure staff checks those and make sure they are the right kind.

MB: Yes

Motion to approve all expedited cases as read.

Motion: AL

2nd: DB

Unanimous Approval: BB, DB, SW, AS, MB, AL, DW

Motion to approve 2024-VHP-005 as read.

Motion: SW

2nd: AL

Unanimous Approval: BB, DB, SW, AS, MB, AL, DW

VII. APPLICATIONS TO BE HEARD (CONTINUED)

**2022-COA-447 (IURS)
AMENDMENT 1**

39 JACKSON PLACE

MICHAEL EICHENAUER for CITY OF INDIANAPOLIS DMD

Amend previous approval to eliminate all brick pavers from scope on Illinois and Capitol and install stamped concrete gutters.

BB Recused
DB Chaired

Eddie Shei- 200 East Washington Senior Project Manager w/DMD: March we came requesting approval to remove all pavers from project. At that time, we were to work towards getting them in the project. We have determined after removing the remainder of the public art to get grants and get approved at a later date. We are proposing a stamped concrete gutter on Illinois St. instead of brick. It would have the color, look, and feel of the existing brick pavers but not provide some of the hazards that the brick pavers present. The stamped concrete would not be something that DPW can maintain but it will be more cost efficient.

SW: Did I hear you say that DPW could not maintain the stamped concrete gutters.

ES: Yes, that is my understanding

John Bowing: DPW Chief engineer. 200 E Washington St. The brick pavers are difficult for us to maintain. The stamped concrete will be easier to maintain, and we have an outside contractor that will maintain the stamped concrete.

SW: Is the general maintenance just street sweeping, are you referring to if something is damaged?

DB: I just want to make sure that I understand. This does not include anything under the underpasses, correct? Underpasses under union station? I am not terribly moved by the problem to take care of them. DPW should train a group that is able to maintain these elements. There are a lot of neighborhoods that have these elements, and it would do the city some justice to have a dedicated team who can maintain them. I was a part of the effort to get them in the first place and I do not think I am ready to throw my towel in.

SW: I think I am keeping my towel as well. I think it is too important to pass. In terms of your reaching out to philanthropies, were you intending to use the funding for the bricks?

ES: No, the funding would be specifically for the art. The only way to make the numbers work currently is to use the stamped concrete.

JB: We do have the ability to maintain the bricks, but we have to hire that out to a contractor. We can maintain what we have. I think the situation here and the reason I was advocating for the stamped concrete is the placement of these bricks. They are typically in the wheel path where you park your cars which makes it more likely to deteriorate. The stamped concrete would lead to less operational and maintenance expense on our end in the long run. This would be more areas that we would have to include in the budget. That would be the issue.

DB: We are not considering Meridian Street, but we probably will be soon. It seems that what we decide on Illinois street it will be the same for Meridian Street. It seems to me in the materials I read, that it alluded to this use of stamped brick out in Carmel. Did I read that?

ES: Yes. At this time our intent is to keep the brick pavers at Meridian Street, and we know the importance of Meridian St. and intend to keep the pavers there.

SL: Reads staff recommendation. There are some examples of the material and we also handed out a map that shows the IHPC jurisdiction.

Meg: There are two recommendations one being the one preferred by staff the Continuance till June 5. The other is to approve a COA.

DB: At this point my vote would be against a COA but I am just one person.

SW: I think I would rather see concrete instead of something fake.

Motion to continue to June 5

Motion: AL

2nd: MB

Unanimously approved

AL: Can you give us examples of where we can go look at the stamped concrete.?

ES: We can try and find some and share them with staff.

**2024-COA-055 (LS) &
2024-VHP-004**

**420 N. EAST ST.
MISHA RABINOWITCH**

Variance of Development Standards to allow a temporary parking surface (up to and including, December 31, 2026).

Misha Rabinowitch: 1 Indiana Square suite 1800. (Explains property layout) They are committed to seeing that this property is developed properly. Since 2002 it has been vacant and operated as a parking lot. The owners have looked at ways to develop the property. There are a number of circumstances that prevent them from developing this property at this point. The parcel is located behind the athenium. The parking lot is used by the employees and tenants of nearby apartment. Owner acquired the property in 2016 with no knowledge of needing a COA. They did not know until code enforcement came to them in 2020. Then the applicant started working with IHPC staff under conditions that the development would begin prior to that COA expiration. The landscaping does not look like what was approved in the prior plan. A lot of those plants did not survive, and we have submitted a new landscape plan. They have asked us to explore the idea of a transition, something to prevent that gravel from spilling into the alley. Bottom line is we are not trying to hide from the fact that 3 years ago we were here asking for this approval. However, things have transpired that present a challenge in the development at this time. We are agreeable to the 2 commitments that are included in the staff report. There are letters of support in your file.

Eric Gershman 350 Mass Ave. We are the only active developers downtown. It just has not been a suitable time to get this development going. Post 2021 we are navigating the recovery of LS. We are committed to downtown and committed to the development. In the interim we think it is better operated as a lot at this time.

Meg Storrow Mass Ave cultural arts 576 e Vermont street: We do support this application and we have been working with the applicant on our concerns. I think the big thing is why the extension. In our letter the maintenance needs to be addressed regularly. That is very important. I also think that Mass Ave. can help hold their feet to the fire. We will call you and ask you when you are going to get that done. Hopefully before the 3 years is up to move forward with development.

EJ: Reads staff recommendation with stipulations and end date. It is not optimal but in staff's opinion this lot needs to be asphalted.

SW: Yes, I am concerned because of the commitment that was made to landscaping and what we are seeing today is not what we had in mind. I would like to make certain the landscaping will be completed.

BB: The staff is recommending that the landscaping be installed by June 30, 2024.

SW: Well can we postpone until they complete the landscaping?

EG: I am totally comfortable with that.

BB: Get it done asap. As soon as it is done, we can approve it.
Continued to June 5, 2024

Motion SW

AL 2nd

Unanimous Approval: BB, DB, SW, AS, MB, AL, DW

VIII. APPLICATIONS TO BE HEARD (NEW)

**2019-COA-009 (MCD)
AMENDED**

**1 & 15 N. PENNSYLVANIA ST.
BRANDEN BURKE**

2-Year COA to amend previously approved plans.

So Khalima/ Gensler Architects/ 10 N Park Pl. New Jersey

The building in question, it used to be an office building. Turned into a new boutique hotel. 15 N Penn, the intent is to maintain the historical façade of the building and create a new tower addition behind the building. In order to do that the best solution is to catalog and dismantle the existing façade make the addition and reinstall. That is the only change in this application. There is no change in the restoration scope. We just have to dismantle the façade to do the work that we need to do and put it back together.

Fritz Herget 11050 Turfgrass Way: I am the masonry engineer for this project. We have submitted plans to restore this building according to guidelines. As we moved forward with the project it became evident that we needed an elevator. I believe you had already given a Cert. of Appropriateness for that project. There were questions about the façade, and this is where I come in to offer opinions on the best way to deal with that facade. It was constructed pre 1900s. (Explains features of building and plans to restore).

EJ: This is from a design perspective the same project that was approved. They are back here tonight to ask for this portion of the project changed from keeping the façade in place to asking to dismantle and reinstall it (reads staff recommendation).

DB: At circle center there were facades that came down and were reassembled, and there was one that was kept in place and collapsed. So, I am not particularly afraid of this sort of approach providing that the people doing it know what to do. Can you speak to your experience in this.

FH: We did the House of Crane. We did Cast Iron and reclaimed it from Central State Hospital. They need our help to make sure they do it right, I need to police them. It has to be taken down carefully, but you can do that. We are going to

handle this with care. And work from the top down. When we get to the areas near the windows that is where it may get interesting, but you have to know what you are doing. One of the reasons we are here is the mason is concerned about the safety of his workers.

DB: I was pretty sure there was a depth of experience and I wanted you to share that. Is this a tax act project?

Soche???: No

AL: I think this is a great idea. Saving this old façade cleaning it up and restoring it how it should be done. I appreciate your standard and the intention, and we will also hold you accountable.

BB: Please talk a bit about the option of holding in place.
I just want to try to understand if you see the risk of keeping it in place.

FH: The key here is the safety of the folks who are going to have to work behind this. It is not palatable to the contractor at this point. But from a risk of taking, it apart and putting it back. I think the terra cotta is more of a risk than the brick. There are some that are cracked, if we got a cracked brick it's going to be 292 A and 292 B, and we will glue them back together.

BB: Will this be stored indoors.

Dan Overbeck Summit Const. 1107 Birdsall Pkwy. We will store it outside protected on pallets at our space. We can clean out our storage space inside and make space for it if necessary.

Fritz: I think it will be best to store them inside.

BB: I have a background working with Fritz. I am confident in his ability I am just worried of taking these pieces apart and putting it all back as it was. Was the evaluation a cost or preferred choice.

DO: It is a safety issue for the work and the façade. We think it could be a more durable installation after it is reinstalled.

BB: Is there going to be a basement to this project?

DO: There is a basement currently but not in this proposed plan.

Meg: Reads staff recommendation.

Motion to approve 2-year COA with amended plans.

Motion: AL

2nd: SW

Unanimous Approval: BB, DB, SW, AS, MB, AL, DW

Meg: Material is to be stored indoors.

IX. PRELIMINARY REVIEW

NONE

X. APPLICATIONS TO BE HEARD – WORK STARTED WITHOUT APPROVAL

**5270 E. WASHINGTON
LUIS GOMEZ**

Work started without approval: replace historic tile roof on house with alternative material.

**Luis Gomez 5270 E. Washington St.
Jodi Sandoval 11258 Narrowleaf Dr.**

We are here to discuss the roofing portion at 5270 E. Washington. We are the new owners the old owners started the case. (note: Patrium, LLC is listed as the owner with Luis Gomez identified as an agent/President)

The property stood vacant for nearly 2 years, and it suffered greatly. It had taken in so much water. We originally when we got in contact with staff and took a calculated risk and just installed the roof with the alternate material. We felt the structural integrity was at risk if we left it open. We decided to cover up the house. The roof is not complete. There are additional factors of why it would be difficult to use the previous material. The current support does not have enough weight to hold up those previous tiles.

JS: When we spoke to the makers of the tile, they are like 30 weeks out on an order. The material alone would have cost over 80k.

LG: We reached out to our insurance company. We have not found a company that would cover that older material. Our main concern was preservation of the house. We are already seeing mold from the moisture that the house has been exposed to. There are several cost, insurance, and structural factors that influenced our decision.

SL: Reads staff comments. Provides case history for property. Reads proposed options for applicant.

BB: Did you all review this material at all?

SL: Yes.

DB: The issues about work being done without approval, those are issues that need to be dealt with. I went by and looked at the house when the first owner was not doing anything. The house was in such bad shape. I went by today and looked at it and yes there was someone working on the roof. In my opinion this is the best alternative material that can be put on this roof. It accomplishes what we as a preservation commission should be accomplishing. I do not want to do something that would cause them to stop working on that roof. The garage, is that the original roof?

LG: We have not inspected it. I am sure it needs some work, as of now it is still standing.

DB: Please do not start working on that until you have spoken with staff and gotten approval. I would approve that material if we can find a way to do that either now or in the future.

BB: The only thing that concerns me is how to reconcile how we have a stop work order and you are still working. I am struggling with working under a stop work order.

Meg: Procedurally there are fines associated with a stop work order. Some people are willing to pay those fines. Those fines do stack up. This particular property is owned by a construction company. (Explains potential fines for continuing work after stop work order.)

SW: I am wondering Chris if it would be appropriate to sit down with the applicant and staff to try to negotiate some sort of recompose and see if we can come up with a solution to make everyone comfortable.

CS: I am certainly willing to do that. I am not sure what we will end up with. Personally, I would prefer it to come in the form of an order from the judge on what needs to be done, but I am willing to sit down and see what we can come up with.

BB: I think the way we leave this tonight, are we continuing this, are we approving it?

Meg: We recommend continuing. and, to combine additional requests.

Motion to continue to June 5, 2024

Motion: AL

2nd: SW

Unanimous Approval: BB, DB, SW, AS, MB, AL, DW

**2024-COA-031 (NA) &
2024-VHP-002**

Russell Brown 320 N Meridian Suite 1100.

Explains petition request. Owner has maintained the property up until the day. Over the past 60 years various types of heavy or industrial uses have occurred at 4502. You will see the properties have been vacant. They are residentially zoned but not occupied. Currently onsite parking has approx. 25 spaces available. A majority of the traffic generated by this site is by the employees who work on site. Lemke has added landscape and added 20 ft of gravel on the western portion to allow employee parking. In December of last year, we began the process to legally establish an offsite parking solution. The site plan before you it is subject to the current request to legally establish the gravel area. It is proposed to remain gravel other than existing concrete paths. Landscaping is not currently there. The parking spots have been made to be less intrusive. Parking in the alley is not uncommon in this area. It meets the least impactful way possible. We believe this version of the site plan does meet the goal.

Mark Patty 4636 W. 72nd St.: I support the revised plan. It offers the best of both worlds. This is a critical area for us. He has been an excellent neighbor, so I support it.

RB: The petitioner is somewhat a victim of his own success. We believe this is the least impactful proposal and we have been sensitive to the neighborhood and the plan.

Fran Holbrook 7102 Dobson St. I have been a resident since 1956. There could be a lot worse in this area. And we all want to get along.

Susan Blair PO Box 40458. Pike Residents Assoc. President. I have 19 board members and the majority were in favor of the amended plan along with the commitments. Normally we would not support anyone who wants to do gravel this

is why we suggested those 2 commitments. The gravel is ideal and not permanent. With all that in mind we are in support of this petition.

Lauren Nirschl: 4540 W 72nd I am his neighbor to the south. He has been a great neighbor since we have lived here. He is a good neighbor. I believe this is a good middle ground. With that landscaping put in we will only see the top of the cars.

SL: Provides staff comments.

SW: Have we ever approved gravel as a permanent parking surface?

Meg: Nothing is coming to mind.

SW: Nothing is coming to my mind either. It's usually a temporary situation. So, it makes me nervous that we are setting a precedent.

BB: What is the longest we have had, I guess permanent in place?

Meg: I just don't know; we would have to research that.

DB: I visited the site the other day. It is somewhat different from any other sites in any of our other districts. It almost has a rural kind of feel. The alley is gravel, so it almost seems like the right thing. It almost looks like it fits in just because the nature of the environment there.

MB: I saw the condition that if the corporation ever stops operating then the variance goes away. Then I saw the owner of the land is an LLC. Which I assume is the real estate company or the landlord. So, is there any concern from staffs point of view or the commission, suppose the landlord sales the parcel or the corporation is sold to another entity who operates to infinity is that ok? Have we ever put time limits on a temporary variance where they would have to come back and renew it?

Meg: I do not recall us ever doing something quite like this. On the case we heard earlier we did put some language in there about them coming in next year to check in with the commission about where they are at. I suppose we can request that they submit something on a regular basis about the ownership of the property.

RB: We are willing to work through that. This operator is a known operator. I think rather it is a time check in we could do that. I think a hard surface would be out of character.

DB: Could you help me to feel that this is necessary. When I look at the arial photo of the business I think how hard would it be to get 7 more spaces put in there?

RB: Provides response as to why it would be difficult to add additional spaces.

DB: That was helpful. In mind I was putting parking spaces where your well is.

BB: I think we are ready to go forth with an approval this evening rather than a continuance.

Meg: Reads staff recommendation. Staff recommends to approve a Certificate of Authorization to retain an existing parking lot with a gravel surface and for a Variance of Development Standards subject to the submitted plans and subject to the following stipulation that any changes to that plan will need to be approved by staff. That is the recommendation for the Certificate of Appropriateness. For the Variance of Development Standards staff recommends to allow a gravel parking surface per the submitted Findings of Fact, plan of operation, and submitted commitments in the IHPC May 1st Staff Report and Variance of Use. IF we can get concurrence from the applicant.

RB: I am ok with that motion.

Motion to approve COA to maintain gravel parking lot installed without approval as read in staff recommendation.

Motion: AL

2nd: DB

Unanimous Approval: BB, DB, SW, AS, MB, AL, DW

Motion to approve Variance

Motion: DB

2nd: MB

Unanimous Approval: BB, DB, SW, AS, MB, AL, DW

XI. CLOSING BUSINESS

Meg: I do have one little thing to add. Just want to let everyone know that we have been approved to move forward with a long-awaited scanning initiative to scan all of IHPCs 6000 files. So, we will be embarking on that here probably mid-May. We have the funding secured for that. Melony has been managing this project. If anyone who is listening that may need a building file, they may be offsite for a while, but we will be able to access them if needed.

CS: Just a reminder of the Statements of Economic Interest. Technically they are due today. If you have not prepared one and submitted, I would ask that you do so as soon as you can.

Adjourned 7:54PM