



Indianapolis Historic Preservation Commission (IHPC) **HEARING AGENDA**

Wednesday, January 8, 2025, 5:30 P.M.
2nd Floor, Room 260 City-County Building
200 E. Washington St., Indianapolis, Indiana

Present Commissioners: President Bill Browne (**WB**), Vice President David Baker (**DB**), Michael Bivens (**MB**), Anson Keller (**AK**), Susan Williams (**SW**), Krystin Wiggs (**KW**) and Annie Lear (**AL**)

Absent Commissioners: Anjanette Sivilich (**AS**); Disa Watson (**DW**)

Present Staff: Meg Busch – Administrator, (**Meg**), Chris Steinmetz (**CS**), Emily Jarzen- Principal Architectural Reviewer- (**EJ**) Shelbi Long - Senior Architectural Reviewer (**SL**), Morgan Marmolejo - Architectural Reviewer (**MM**), Grace Goedeker - Preservation Planner and Recorder (**GG**)

BUSINESS

I. CALL TO ORDER 5:30

II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES 5:31

NOVEMBER 6, 2024 IHPC HEARING MINUTES

DECEMBER 4, 2024 IHPC HEARING MINUTES

Motion to approve: AL

2nd: MB

Unanimous Approval

III. OLD BUSINESS – NO PUBLIC HEARING 5:32

2024-COA-188A (WP) 958 WOODRUFF PLACE MIDDLE DRIVE

ALI KHAN

Violation correction check-in

Mr. Kahn provided an update on his project including that he received mock-up approval for railing and he is working with staff for other items.

SL: Provided no staff comments

WB: Thank you for the update and we will see you next month

IV. NEW BUSINESS – NO PUBLIC HEARING 5:32

2025 OFFICER ELECTIONS

Meg Announced the slate of officers and asked if there were any other nominations.

WB: Asked for a vote on the slate of officers which is Bill Browne President, David Baker as Vice President and Susan Williams as Secretary.

MB: Motion to approve the Slate of Officers

AK: Second

Unanimously Appointed

COMMISSION POLICY UPDATES

Meg: Gave a summary of the policy updates the committee drafted and mentioned there would be an annual review of the policies and updates to the formatting. Meg then asked for approval of the updated policies.

WB: Thanked everyone who participated.

DB: Motion
KW: Second
Unanimously Approved

WAIVER OF NOTICE
2024-COA-437 (LS)
524 EAST NEW YORK STREET
MADLINE SMITH
Request for a 4-day waiver of notice

Motion to approve: AL
2nd: AK
Unanimously Approved

PUBLIC HEARING

V. REQUEST TO WITHDRAW OR CONTINUE APPLICATIONS

NONE

VI. EXPEDITED CASES

5:37

Meg: Reads Cases

| | |
|--|---|
| 2024-COA-415 (IRV) | 5929 DEWEY AVENUE BRITTNEY SUTTLE Demolish garage |
| 2024-COA-424 (WP) | 730 WOODRUFF PLACE WEST DRIVE JASON WOLFE Construct new house with attached garage, install driveway and pool |
| 2024-COA-437 (LS) & 2024-VHP-011 | 524 EAST NEW YORK STREET MADLINE SMITH Construct carriage house and for a Variance of Development Standards for more square footage in a secondary dwelling unit than permitted |
| 2024-COA-438 (ONS) & 2024-VHP-012 | 1229 NORTH DELAWARE STREET SONYA SEEDER Variance of Use to allow employee office, conference space and lodging in D8 |

WB: Asked for comments.

DB: Stated he re-looked at the house/carriage house at 524 E New York Street after IHPC received letters about the case:

- Some refinements can be done but they can probably work with staff on that.
- There was a suggestion of windows being added but none of the other garages have windows on the first floor, but if they want to add windows that would be fine.
- A transom window over the door, a trim board between the floors or added dimension to the siding differentiating the first floor from the second would be helpful.
- He stated he was willing to leave that to the staff and applicant.

AK: Asked why the variance was struck if the ordinance states 720 square feet is the maximum allowable square footage.

SL: Clarified the Commission can determine development standards in HP-1.

COA's
Motion to approve: AL
2nd: AK
Unanimous Approval

Variance petition
Motion to approve: DB
2nd: MB
Unanimous Approval

VII. APPLICATIONS TO BE HEARD (CONTINUED)

5:44

2024-COA-405 (WD)

125 SOUTH PENNSYLVANIA STREET----- DB Chairs/BB recused and left room

LORI MISER (LM)

Install 88'x25' window sign

Tim Ochs (TO) attorney Ice Miller:

Provided an overview of the request for the proposed window sign. A material sample was provided so the Commissioners could see that in person.

LM:

Provided comments about the sign and confirmed it will not be used for advertising.

TO:

Provided additional comments and stated they think the effect on the district is insubstantial as it is on the edge of the district and non-contributing.

DB: Asks for support and remonstrance. There was none.

MM:

Provided staff comments.

SW:

What size would be the maximum size to meet the letter of the plan?

MM:

Per the district plan, the sign should be 20% or less and this is 73% of the window size.

AK:

In most circumstances I would agree with staff on a sign this large.

I feel like our ground floor windows are being taken up by these clings.

I support this installation because it does not take up the ground floor.

This is one of a few NBA teams in this region. It is an unusual circumstance.

KW:

Is this reusable? Will it be installed again?

TO:

Stated it could be swapped out in the future but would technically be a new copy and they would submit it to staff for their approval and would not be a backdoor for off premise advertising.

KW:

I would be in support of this because it is an expectation to see something like this.

DB:

Is the grid of the window applied or are they individual windows? If that is the case, is this one big thing or is it individual for each square.

LM:

They are not individual. It is one big piece that goes on the inside. The grid is on the outside.

DB:

There is huge sheet glass and then they put a grid on it.

AK:

They are typically applied in pieces.

MB:

The effect on the district might be insubstantial, given the way the building straddles the boundary line.

Are we looking at the size of the sign only or is it the design?

MM:

The main reason is the size, so it violates the wholesale district plan. If we weren't looking at the historic district and we were only looking as a zoning ordinance, the largest sign allowable is 100 square feet so this would substantially exceed it.

For the rolling approval they would submit it to staff to sign off on so we can ensure there is no off-premise advertising.

MB:

If for some reason in the future, if someone proposes something with off premise advertising then staff would be able to deny that?

MM:

Yes, we would tell them that they could not install that design but if they eliminated the off-premise advertising portion of it then we would approve it.

MB:

And that would be a staff level approval?

Meg:

Each sign is going to be as proposed but with different graphics. If anything other than the graphics change it would come back to the commission or to an administrative hearing.

DB:

If we approve this, we could spell out that any advertising would kick it to the commission.

MB:

I think I would be more in support of a certificate of authorization. If we found language we agreed to.

DB:

The insignificant effect speaks to an authorization over appropriateness. We would be saying it does not fit appropriateness.

SW:

It is hard to see if this fits within the grid. It looks like it might. I was just wondering how this lines up/.

LM:

The intent is to fit within the grid. It will fit closely within the grid.

SW:

I don't know why you would have those attractive young men look a bit wild.

TO:

It is supposed to be excitement.

DB:

I came here struggling with this.

It is not like any other facility, but it is so huge it seems like a billboard.

The building was designed to fit elegantly into its location and I feel it was done well.

This throws off the elegance of this building and I worry about the size of it and setting precedent.

Many of your reasoning, other business owners could say the same thing.

There is an argument that the effect to the historic district is minimal.

I could reluctantly go along with it if we wrap it with the restraints about the advertising.

AL:

Would these be on only in season?

LM:

There will not always be a banner.

AK:

This will not be used for events or concerts, correct.

LM:

Confirms that is correct.

DB:

Meg, can you create something, with the mentioned guardrails.

Meg: Reads revised Staff Recommendation for Certificate of Authorization

SW:

Can we remove the word advertising.

Meg:

Can we change it to for the regular season?

TO:

Can we say season and post-season?

Meg: Confirms that change.

WB: Recused

Motion: AL

2nd: KW

Unanimous Approval

WB returned to chair the remainder of the meeting.

Place" development)

Michael:

We were asked to jazz up the elevations.
There is attention to the east and north elevations.
We added contrasting brick and colors.
That is the representation of where we are at with the elevations.
We clipped the diving walls to follow the roofline.

WB:

Asked for staff comment.

EJ:

Just a reminder this is a different developer than the one where it was initially approved.
There were revisions to the design from last month.
We are asking the commission for comments.
Staff was thinking about changing the dark brick to something lighter, to create a better sense of entry with a canopy over the doors and to rethink the north façade change to bring the design together.

DB:

It is somewhat better, but I agree with staff comment.
A covering over the entrances would build a sense of entry.
I think the lighter color might help.
The north side is better because it has more openings.

AK:

I recognize the change to the divider, and it is better.
The commission asked for articulation, and I do not think the color change and set back qualifies as articulation.
The columns are shown as brick which would not structurally be sound so we would want to see what the treatment of that is in actuality.
Mainly, more articulation than just color changes, and changes in the header and sills. I would like to see a limestone sill or a metal cap at least.

Micheal:

A buff color, limestone sills and caps are something we could think about.
Protrusions are hard because it is edge to edge on the plat. We are open to other material suggestions.

AK:

You are allowed encroachment on the first floor.

WB:

There is a lot of solid walls with no windows and no articulations.
The windows seem very small on the north side.
It is a primary façade, but it looks like a side.
Technically it is a side, but it needs to look like the primary, with more articulation.
You can cross over with some elements, more like the original.
You do not want brick sills, limestone would be better.
Get something to break it up. It is very heavy, you need contrast.
The dark brick is not the way to go.
Gutters and downspouts are missing so we need to see those.
If there is exterior building lighting or numbers.
Work with staff and come back again.

DB:

It looks like the second and third floor are really tall floors. It makes the first floor look sunken.

WB:

The course could be moved to be more representative of the floors.

DB:

Larger windows may help. The first floor looks like a second thought.

WB:

You might look for a base material.

Micheal:

I did not want to introduce too many new materials on this building.

AK:

The building on the NE corner of New Jersey and New York Street has protrusions that are done well and could help your design.

WB: Asks for Continuance

SW: Moved

AK: 2nd

Unanimous Approval

VIII. APPLICATIONS TO BE HEARD (NEW)

NONE

IX. PRELIMINARY REVIEW

NONE

X. APPLICATIONS TO BE HEARD – WORK STARTED WITHOUT APPROVAL

NONE

XI. OLD BUSINESS – TO BE HEARD

NONE

XII. CLOSING BUSINESS

NONE

Adjourned: 6:30